

I wish to express my deep sympathy to the Thomas family and pray for God's blessings upon them to endure their sorrow.

New Needs and New Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in this body, contains a number of excellent institutions of higher education. Among them, of course, is the University of Michigan, one of the oldest and most distinguished State universities in the Nation, and, indeed, one of the great universities in the world.

Last week, I had the honor of being asked to serve as congressional host at the 14th annual congressional dinner, held by the University of Michigan Club of Washington, D.C. The main speaker that evening, Dr. Harlan H. Hatcher, projected the future of the university. As its president, Dr. Hatcher is, of course, concerned with that future. But he is also vitally interested in the future of all higher education in this country.

Under permission granted, I include at this point in the RECORD, an article by President Hatcher, discussing some of the trends in higher education. The article appeared in the January 1966, issue of the Michigan Business Review, published by the Graduate School of Business Administration of the University of Michigan.

The article follows:

NEW NEEDS AND NEW OPPORTUNITIES

(By Harlan Hatcher)

Let me feed into your personal computers some items of information, and then we can try to draw some conclusions and some new directions.

Item: In August, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that during fiscal 1966 more than \$3 billion will flow from the Federal Treasury through a single agency, the U.S. Office of Education, to schools and colleges, teachers and students, libraries and librarians. Since that report was made, the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been signed by President Johnson, notably providing 140,000 undergraduate scholarships.

Item: In fiscal 1966, four of the largest Government agencies contracting with colleges and universities for research—the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the U.S. Public Health Service—will spend an estimated \$840 million through our colleges and universities. Please note that this figure does not include the operation of the research centers which a few of our universities administer for these agencies, nor does it include the training programs of these agencies.

Item: The published listing of the programs for which Federal money will be spent in 1966 through the Office of Education includes 67 titles. Every one of them is mission-oriented; every one of them has a given, specific purpose for which alone the money can be spent. The grants and contracts for

research are equally specific and project-centered.

Item: In 1 recent year, the total current fund income from all sources of all our colleges and universities was \$7.3 billion—only about twice the sum of the two Federal items I have already mentioned.

Item: Corporate giving to higher education has risen from \$80 million in 1954 to \$250 million in 1964—a notable increase. But some observers note a leveling-off in corporate giving and some murmurs are heard to the effect that such giving is now less necessary because of the influx of Federal dollars.

A CARROT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Let me make one other point concerning the magnitude and nature of Federal spending before turning to something else. Just a week ago, in reporting the ceremony of signing the Higher Education Act, the New York Times education editor, Mr. Fred Hechler, made this statement: "The law is, perhaps first and foremost, a carrot to persuade higher education that it ought to lead in the search for the Great Society."

In other words, the legislation was written, not so much to help the colleges and universities reach the goals they have set for themselves, but rather to use these institutions to achieve certain goals for society which the makers of the laws perceive.

This is, of course, entirely legitimate. Setting goals for the Nation and selecting methods for achieving them is a proper task of Government. Participating in this task is also proper for education—but it is not the whole of the universities' responsibilities.

DIMINISHING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Now let us take a look at another set of facts which have a bearing on the topic "New Needs and New Opportunities."

We have long been accustomed in this country to distinguishing between colleges and universities on the basis of whether they are "private" or "public." We have today 743 institutions which are considered public, and 1,357 classed as private. In the public institutions, we have now well over 60 percent of all the students enrolled, and by 1980 probably three-fourths of all our students will be in the public institutions.

But this distinction between public and private is harder and harder to make—and less and less significant. Already, private institutions of higher education receive enormous sums of "public" money—including more Federal research funds than go to all the so-called public institutions. And conversely, some of the public institutions own some of the largest endowments, even though endowment is often considered the hallmark of the private college.

Still another interesting development is the growth of cooperative programs of various kinds which involve both public and private institutions. I will cite just two, centered in our own Midwest. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation embraces the nine public universities of the Big 10 and the one private member—Northwestern—plus the University of Chicago. The CIC is blazing a trail in interinstitutional cooperation which is being noted by educators throughout the country. Another organization is the newly formed Argonne Universities Association, comprised of 16 public and 10 private institutions. This association will formulate policies for the operation of Argonne National Laboratory.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

What we are seeing today is a blurring of the once sharp distinction between public and private and the emergence of another distinction of great importance. This is the distinction between college and university—certainly not a new phenomenon, but one that has great significance for us in this time

of swift evolution of our total educational system.

Traditionally, the emphasis of corporate giving has been upon the private colleges—the traditional 4-year liberal arts institution under private control. The results are cause for national pride, for we have a truly outstanding group of private colleges—such institutions as Amherst, Beloit, Carleton, and so on down the list. Over the years, this Nation has looked to such institutions as these for its leaders in business, industry, government, and the professions.

We still expect a considerable portion of our leadership to come from the liberal arts college, both public and private. But today, more and more of those prospective leaders graduate from their liberal arts studies and go on to a university for advanced and professional training. And this is the level—the graduate school and the professional school—at which great new needs and opportunities exist for private support.

Perhaps I can illustrate this by mentioning a report I received a few days ago from the school of business administration of my own University of Michigan. The report indicated that last year more than 300 corporations sent representatives to our campus to interview prospective graduates about jobs. The median starting salaries for the people employed by these companies were \$590 per month for bachelor's degree people, and \$700 for master's degree recipients. The top salaries were \$725 per month for the bachelor's degree and \$1,350 for the master's. Obviously, our corporations place a considerable monetary value on graduate study.

This is not a point which needs belaboring, for I think it is now widely recognized that as our total supply of knowledge expands—and it has been expanding at a dizzying rate this past half century—the number of years which an individual spends on his formal education must likewise expand. And we know also that these graduate and professional programs of instruction are expensive, a great deal more expensive than the basic 4-year undergraduate liberal arts sequence.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT

Out of these somewhat disparate items, let us now see if we can chart some new directions for corporate participation in support of higher education in the next several years.

First of all, it seems to me that the only possible direction for corporate support is upward. This is not simply because Federal spending is expanding. Rather, corporate support should go up because the need is greater and because the capacity of our economy to meet that need is greater than it has ever been in our history.

Second, corporate support must move upward in another sense. It must be increased at the graduate and professional levels of education, both because this, too, is where needs are growing most urgently and because this is the level from which corporations are increasingly drawing their technologists and their managers. Farsighted corporate policy dictates support for this level of education because business is changing too, and will need more and more technologists and better trained managers in the future.

Third, private contributions must expand in order to maintain the diversity of higher education in the United States. For many years, we have thought of that diversity in terms of a balance between public and private institutions. But now we need to maintain both public and private interests in both public and private institutions. If the public institutions become solely dependent upon tax funds, then we may be sure that their programs will be geared to fit the mission-oriented funds available through Government agencies. If private institu-

February 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2875

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF MRS. MINK TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 22, 1966.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago I spoke in this Chamber on the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam and what I felt could and should be done about it. Among other things I suggested that we establish a blacklist of these ships which would prohibit them from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes. Such a blacklist has existed for 3 years with respect to those trading with Cuba. I am gratified to be able to acknowledge that late last week I was informed by the State Department, in a response to my letter of February 4 urging the President to take such action, that such a blacklist has been approved. The details of this Presidential order are found in the Federal Register of Saturday, February 12, 1966, on page 2706.

In my opinion, such action is overdue since our official policy too long has maintained a double standard of exempting those who trade with Ho Chi Minh from the penalties imposed on those who trade with Castro. In no way should the Hanoi regime be led to think we consider trade with them in any sense less detrimental to our national interest than trade with Cuba.

This action is a step in the right direction and I shall continue to press for the enactment of legislation prohibiting free world ships that aid Hanoi from doing any business whatsoever in U.S. ports—public or private—and to insure that no U.S. aid goes to any country that allow its ships to help supply North Vietnam's war economy. We have tolerated this aid and comfort to Ho Chi Minh far too long.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM: WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, I have called upon this administration to bring an end to the shipment on their ships by our allies of goods for our enemies in North Vietnam. I made speeches from this rostrum of the House calling for an end to free world

shipping to North Vietnam by any means necessary: Specifically, I did so on January 12, January 19, January 26, and February 2.

In the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a week ago, it was said that the British could effect an embargo on Rhodesia with our over-eager help in 48 hours. Yet we have been unable to get their support in cutting off the supply of the Vietcongs by sea. After many months of effort, Britain is still the No. 1 violator among the free world nations.

On December 21, I telegraphed the President urging action on this and, to this date, I have received nothing more than an acknowledgment from the White House.

Now, finally, the administration has stuck out its chest and announced that, as of January 25—25 days after my telegram—it was blacklisting any vessel shipping goods into, or out of, the North Vietnam port of Haiphong.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this action.

However, it seems to raise this question. We have been fighting in Vietnam since mid-1962. We have suffered 2,005 dead and 9,658 wounded through February 7, 1966, and spent almost uncountable billions.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we just starting to blacklist these ships? Either it should have been done 3 years ago or this is a blind to avoid effective action, diplomatic or naval.

It simply boils down to this. If blacklisting is not effective, why bother with it at all. If it is effective, why did we not do it in 1962 or 1963 instead of waiting until 1 week ago.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the American fighting men in Vietnam have a right to know the answer to this question. So do the American people.

One further question: Is this all we are going to do about free world shipping to North Vietnam?

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are at war in Vietnam. It is a war none of us wanted and a war we want to end honorably as quickly as possible.

Every good citizen would like to support his President. Every citizen wants the President, the executive branch, the Defense Department, the generals, to be right.

In order to find the correct solutions as quickly as possible, we need open debate and deliberation.

Secret decisions, managed news, "pat" answers, summary dismissal of inquiries, refusals to respond to proper questions do not supply the right answers, or fortify the confidence of the U.S. fighting-man, or the public.

Every patriot can support his country and yet ask pertinent questions at the same time.

One of the most knowledgeable patriots in my district—with practical mili-

tary experience and firsthand experience in Chinese and southeast Asian affairs—Col. Allen Griffin, asks a number of questions, editorially, in the Monterey, Calif., Peninsula Herald newspaper.

Each Member of Congress, as well as the President and his advisers, ought to ponder these questions.

The full text of the editorial by Colonel Griffin follows:

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

The pursuit of the war in Vietnam has been a demonstration of a series of wrong "estimates of the situation."

This is a term that is used by military people, usually preliminary to a decision to move, to remain in place, go backwards, or what have you. It is a term particularly of military intelligence. Nearly everything that is involved in the strength and weaknesses of the enemy is comprehended within the "estimate of the situation."

And, of course, the enemy also is making his estimate of the elements of strength and weakness in your situation, local, regional, global.

President Charles de Gaulle gave the late President John F. Kennedy his estimate of the situation in Vietnam and suggested that the United States begin a process of seeking peace immediately.

The late President was not convinced by General de Gaulle's estimate and decided, contrariwise, to become more involved. That was the tragic beginning of escalation—the beginning of an infantry war of Americans against Asians on Asian land among Asian people, the last thing the U.S. Army ever wanted to be engaged in again after Korea.

Up to this time this wasn't a war in which U.S. ground forces were engaged, but one in which U.S. materiel backed by a handful of advisers was sent to the assistance of a friendly government. Now by degrees it became our war. Escalation by manpower became a fact.

When President Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office he inherited a war as well as a vast, scattered domestic program.

Determined to do everything better and faster than his predecessor, he was psychologically prepared to provide the force necessary to push this war to an early conclusion. After all, it was a war against the spread of communism, which was and is further justification.

Surely his advisers gave him an estimate of the situation. That called for escalation. It didn't work very well. Then came a further estimate and a further escalation. That also fell short. And so on until nearly 200,000 American troops became hostages to this war, and North Vietnam came under continuous bombing attack except in the immediate vicinity of the capital city, Hanoi, and the most important seaport, Haiphong.

Then again, surely operating under an estimate of the situation, the time was deemed ripe for a peace offensive. That estimate could not have been on anything other than the possibility of bringing the war to a peace table. Wrong again. It didn't work.

Now we have returned to bombing. Where do we go from here? How much of a land war of Americans against Asians are we going to throw our Army into? And where do we go from there? These are legitimate questions for congressional debate. And they are legitimate questions for the debate of patriotic citizens.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read

and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report required of the National Capital Transportation Agency by section 6 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—Public Law 89-173.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five was marked by significant advances toward solving the transportation problems of the Washington area.

Congress approved plans for a rapid transit system, authorized its construction, and authorized grants from the Federal and District Governments as a first stage in financing its development. As soon as funds were made available, the Transportation Agency began the necessary work still remaining before actual construction can begin.

There is, nonetheless, much left to do. The rapid transit system will achieve maximum usefulness only when it is extended into Maryland and Virginia suburbs. The interstate compact among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia will be promptly presented to Congress for its consent, in order that the interstate authority may develop plans for a full regional system and a financial plan for its construction. Arrangements must be perfected to transfer the responsibility for the system in an orderly and proper way from the Agency to the interstate authority. These tasks are not easy, and it will require diligent effort on the part of many people and agencies to master the problems that remain.

The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

PRESERVATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The period of expansion and exploration, the great era of successive western frontiers, has now become a part of our American past. To the pioneer of history the wilderness was a foe to be conquered, so that he might make farms and pastures out of the endless forests.

Today's pioneer has a new purpose—to preserve some remnants of that wilderness from the onrush of modern civilization.

The ax and the plow will not serve us in this struggle. Today's instruments are more subtle. They are progressive law and informed public opinion—de-

manding that we maintain our wilderness birthright.

The Wilderness Act is one in the long list of creative conservation measures that Congress has passed and I have signed into law.

Legislation is one thing; administration is another. The executive branch must fulfill its responsibility with commonsense and imagination. Our people must be given the opportunity to know, even for short periods of time, the wonders of God's creation expressed in earth's wilderness areas.

The maintenance of our existing wilderness system is a priority program of the Federal Government. We are constantly reviewing primitive and roadless areas to determine whether they should be recommended for preservation as part of our wilderness system.

The Congress has wisely provided for public participation as reviews of the primitive and roadless areas proceed. I am determined to assure that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior will provide full opportunity for the expression of public views before final recommendations are prepared for transmittal to the Congress.

I am pleased to send to Congress today the second annual report of our progress in implementing the Wilderness Act. We are well underway toward protecting God's gift of mystery and wonder that is the American wilderness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1966.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, due to a speaking engagement at the 45th annual stockholders' meeting of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., at South St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, February 9, 1966, it was necessary for me to be absent on rollcall No. 16. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 16 on H.R. 706, the bill to amend the Railway Labor Act.

ISOLATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FROM DOMINANCE BY BIG BUSINESS

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, isolation of the Small Business Administration from dominance by big business has long been preached and praised by the Congress. From the agency's beginning in 1953, its independent status has been jealously guarded and constantly supported. Among the most vociferous champions of such organizational independence when Members of the Senate were President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. Without doubt the status selected for it by the Congress has proven the most effective in order for it to best serve the small business community.

Such independent status, however, cannot alone guarantee the success of an agency or of its programs, nor can it countervail the absence of leadership, direction, and inspiration.

Of late we have seen the business loan program, the key program of SBA, through poor planning and poorer management, virtually disappear. We have seen another important SBA responsibility, procurement assistance, dwindle to ineffectiveness.

And now, we hear rumors that what remains of the Johnson administration's operation of the Small Business Administration is to be buried by its transfer to the Department of Commerce. Apparently, this once fine and potentially great agency is to be swept under the gigantic rug of a major department.

The proposed transfer of the Small Business Administration represents White House recognition of its failure; this alone explains the present condition of SBA and its programs. Loss of its independent status will only make permanent the injury. Without independent status, the agency cannot and will not provide the services small businesses across the country so desperately need. The spokesman for small business in big government will be dead.

Mr. Speaker, bipartisan support of independent status for the Small Business Administration will prevent the piracy of a facility dedicated solely to the betterment of the small business community.

To preclude this demotion, if not the disappearance of SBA, the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses call upon us to reiterate our long held insistence upon independent status for the agency. I urge unanimous approval of the following concurrent resolution, which today has been introduced by all the Republicans serving on the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives:

H. CON. RES. 588

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Small Business Administration should continue to be an independent agency within the executive branch of the Federal Government, under the general direction and supervision of the Pres-

progress in economic development is essential if internal Communist seizures are to be prevented. In 1947, the Greek Government was engaged in a struggle for survival against Communist guerrilla forces. President Truman pronounced the Truman doctrine—that Americans must support free people who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure. He asked Congress to appropriate \$400 million for economic assistance to Greece and Turkey. By 1950, the Communist guerrillas in Greece had abandoned their struggle. Similarly, in the Philippines, after World War II, the Communists built a force composed of dissatisfied peasants. As it became obvious that military measures by themselves would not solve the problem, the Philippine Government carried out a broad program of social and economic progress in connection with renewed military offensives. Only in this manner was the Communist guerrilla movement in the Philippines actually destroyed.

The revised aid program not only protects our vital national interests but it does so in an economically sound fashion. We can look forward to the day when the aid program will no longer be necessary.

Economic aid to Western Europe was terminated for most of the nations by 1960. Progress in Greece and Israel permitted the United States to terminate grants in 1962. Self-support was achieved in Lebanon in 1963. Iran is in a transition to self-support. Turkey plans to eliminate reliance on foreign aid by 1973. India and Turkey now finance over three-fourths of their development programs from their own resources, and Pakistan over 60 percent. All told, about 14 nations are approaching the time when they will not need any further low-interest loan or grant assistance from the United States.

In the past 15 years, the burden of foreign assistance on the U.S. taxpayer has declined sharply. As a share of gross national product, economic aid has fallen from 2 percent to 1949 to less than two-fifths of 1 percent this year. As a share of the Federal budget, economic aid has declined from 11.5 percent to 2 percent over the same period. Most developed countries are contributing about the same percentage of their gross national product as the United States, some even more.

Foreign aid spending has little effect upon our balance-of-payments position. Eighty percent of the funds will be used to purchase goods and services in the United States. In fact, a sizable share of some American exports are now financed by foreign aid programs. In 1962, 33 percent of our locomotive and fertilizer exports and 25 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were purchased under the foreign aid program.

Foreign aid also helps to boost foreign trade indirectly. AID workers abroad introduce American products and techniques in places where they may never have been seen. Trade connections are established and a market for reorders is created.

The aid program has also facilitated private investment abroad. Since November 1961, AID has authorized 17 loans totaling \$146 million directly to private firms to establish new plants and extend existing facilities in the Near east and south Asia countries alone. Technical assistance also helps to foster private enterprise. The investment guarantee program provides a strong stimulus to U.S. firms investing abroad.

The State of Wyoming has a right to be proud of the significant role it has played in assisting less fortunate people through the foreign-aid program. The University of Wyoming has a contract with AID for a 3-year technical assistance program in Somalia. A team of Wyomingites in Somalia is working to improve present agricultural crops and survey other crops that may prove feasible. The University of Wyoming and Columbia University are assisting the faculties of engineering, agriculture, and education of Kabul University, Afghanistan, as well as assisting the Afghan Institute of Technology and the Secondary schools.

As the self-sacrificing Wyoming citizens working on these projects are aware, the path to economic development is not an easy one. Yet, the proposed aid program, with its justification embodied in the defense of our vital national interests, its basis on a sound economic foundation, and its mechanisms encouraging self-help on the part of recipients, is a remarkable bargain for the American people. There will be spectacular successes and ignominious failures in the years ahead. But, as Economist Robert Hellbroner states, we must proceed with our foreign economic aid:

Once the great march has begun, it is no longer possible to turn back. The changes in the balance of the old static society cannot be undone. There is no choice but to tread the road to its conclusion—however long and agonizing the journey may be.

WAR AND HOPE

(Mr. RANDALL (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that only good can come from the meeting of heads of state and the restatement of aims and policies in the Vietnam war.

As is well known, the Allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness," and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

The candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state in Hawaii "should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation," the Washington Daily News has commented, and it adds that "more meetings, as suggested by the communicate, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort."

The newspaper feels that the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

Here is a concise and well-presented résumé of the events—and of the encouragement we can take from them—and I should like to suggest that the editorial be printed in the Record, where many may want to read it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 9, 1966]

WAR AND HOPE IN VIETNAM

Even if Ho Chi Minh has started, or eventually does begin, some type of "peace offensive" of his own, this would be no cause for an abrupt change in the plans President Johnson and Vietnamese leaders worked out at Honolulu.

Communists don't normally cave in suddenly. (It took 2 years of talks to arrange the settlement in Korea.)

The United States is engaged in Vietnam to achieve two objectives: to free the Vietnamese people of the communism invasion and to help them build a country of independence and stability, something they never before have had a chance to accomplish.

Anything which stands in the way of these goals (particularly the Communist terrorists and armies now being fought in South Vietnam) must be overcome. Anything, including a possible change of mind in Hanoi, which may help reach these goals is to be diligently encouraged.

But the success of the effort to restore freedom in Vietnam and to give the country a real chance in life depends almost altogether on the Vietnamese themselves and heavy American assistance.

The Vietnamese not only have to fight but they must take care of refugees from the battle areas, organize local government, and stabilize the economy.

The understandings reached in Honolulu between President Johnson and the Vietnamese leaders (Premier Ky and others) are designed to meet these needs.

The two allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness" and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

Mr. Johnson said, for our part, we would "move steadfastly ahead" on the military front and at the same time "move vigorously" to assist the Vietnamese with their economic, social, and political problems.

All of this appeared to support Premier Ky's position that the allies must operate from strength, and evidence of willingness to use their strength, if there is to be "any kind of just and lasting settlement" with the Communists. There is no other way, as history has shown, to deal with Communists.

The payoff for the Honolulu conference does not lie in the stilted communicate, but in the results over the long haul.

Nevertheless, a restatement of aims and policies for this war—this time jointly by the top leaders of the two countries, is another step in smoothing out world opinion of the justice and necessity of the U.S. presence in Vietnam.

And, as a practical matter, the candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state—who never before had met—should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation. More meetings, as suggested by the communicate, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort.

No one knows how long it will take to force a decision from Hanoi—either by military force, diplomatic means, or both—but the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), from February 14 through Feb-

ruary 28, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for an indefinite period, on account of official business (interparliamentary).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RONCALIO, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 16, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. RONCALIO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. RYAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. LOVE in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa in two instances.

Mr. CALLAN in three instances.

Mr. RACE.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be

held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2034. A letter from the Acting Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2035. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriations request for three urgently needed and essential programs of Government: the National Teachers Corps, the rent supplement program, and the Selective Service System (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2036. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2037. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Bostwick Park project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2039. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Battle Act Report for 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2040. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2041. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1966 report of the Office of Coal Research relating to coal research activities undertaken during calendar year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2042. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and Executive Order No. 11007, issued February 25, 1962;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2043. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of certain publications, as follows: Glossary of Important Power and Rate Terms, Abbreviations, and Units of Measurement, 1965; Statistics for Interstate Natural Pipe Line Companies, 1964; Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1964; All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2044. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 1966, the following bills were reported on February 11, 1966:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1784. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10431. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10674. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12264. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

February 14, 1966

A709

**Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of
1966**

SPEECH

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, for some time during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I had been prodding some of my friends on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to report out H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, so I was extremely pleased to see it on the calendar early in this session.

Many of my constituents have written expressing their concern about this measure, particularly with respect to our boys fighting in Vietnam.

This is an excellent bill, Mr. Speaker, as it designs a permanent program for our veterans. As the committee pointed out, the structure of veterans' laws which have developed over the past 200 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. In the past, war veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans and this system worked very well through World War II. However, after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, problems began to arise. It has been during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today, however, our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, makes this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this period of our history, are to receive equitable treatment.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to: first, enhance and make more attractive service in the Armed Forces of the United States; second, extend the benefits of a higher education to qualified and deserving young persons who might not otherwise be able to afford such an education; third, provide vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities to those servicemen and women whose careers have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty after January 31, 1955; and fourth, aid such persons in attaining the vocational and educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

The committee emphasizes that, as in the case of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, it is not the intention of this legislation to establish a program which completely subsidizes the

cost of a veteran's education program, as well as his living costs. This legislation is designed as an aid program and it is expected that in many cases the veteran will be required to make a contribution to the cost of his own education program. It is believed that the veteran will maintain a greater interest in the use made of the funds provided by this bill, if he is required to make a contribution from his own resources.

Moreover, the purpose of the committee is not to equalize educational opportunities for the veteran population, but rather to provide assistance to help a veteran follow the educational plan that he might have adopted had he never entered the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation further insures that the Nation shall be able to utilize the highest skills and abilities of the veterans who benefit from it. This is especially important since at this time the number of young men available to fill the essential technical and professional posts is the lowest in ratio to our total population which we have had or probably ever will have for a decade to come. In my opinion, it is doubly essential that we make fullest use of the skills of the young men who are available.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, this bill has my unconditional support.

**Milwaukee Journal Cites United Nations
Responsibility in Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, while we all know that the road ahead may be long and arduous, the submission of the Vietnam issue to the United Nations is a hopeful step forward.

The charter of the U.N. makes clear that the Security Council is the forum where threats to world peace are initially discussed.

The resolution offered to the Security Council would open the way toward a durable peace in southeast Asia based upon the 1954 Geneva Conference.

The Milwaukee Journal's recent editorial, "It Is U.N. Duty To Seek Peace," follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 3, 1966]

IT IS U.N. DUTY TO SEEK PEACE

The U.S. resolution seeking a full-scale debate on Vietnam has reached the United Nations Security Council agenda and a long debate probably is in store. The Soviet Union will undoubtedly offer a counterresolution demanding that the United States pull out of South Vietnam completely. In the end a compromise may be reached as a first step toward peace negotiations. Or it may reach a point where the Soviet Union vetoes the whole effort.

Original French and Soviet opposition to any consideration of peace moves in the Security Council ignored the clear responsibility U.N. members have to seek peace. Chapter 1, article 1 of the U.N. Charter starts

by saying that among the purposes of the organization is:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

To argue that action is not possible because China and North Vietnam are not members is to ignore article 2(6) of the charter, which says:

"The organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Peace is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council. Chapter V, article 24(1) says:

"In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

Chapter VI clearly states the methods the Security Council is to use in settling disputes. Chapter VII even provides that the Council may use land, sea, or air forces to maintain international peace and security.

George Kennan Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last week the eminent diplomat and scholar, George F. Kennan, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. Kennan, after many years in the State Department as an Ambassador to the Soviet Union and later Yugoslavia, is considered by many to be our top expert in the cold war.

His remarks, I believe, present a very clear and rational picture concerning American involvement in Vietnam:

KENNAN STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(NOTE.—George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow and now a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., testified on Vietnam yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Here is the official transcript of Kennan's prepared statement, as delivered.)

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam.

I would like to explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no specialized knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there except as it has been revealed in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my official service in Government or subsequently, been drawn by the executive

branch of our Government into consultation on the problem of our policy in southeast Asia, or even been made privy to the official discussions by which that policy was decided.

I am sure that there are many data that are relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me, and this being the case, I have tried in recent weeks and months not to jump to final conclusions even in my own thoughts, to remain sympathetically receptive, both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics.

EXPERIENCE NOTED

I have not been anxious to press my views on the public, but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except perhaps that they flow from experience with Communist affairs that runs back now for some 38 years, and also from the deepest and most troubled sort of concern that we should find the proper course, the right course, at this truly crucial moment.

The first point I would like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I could think of several reasons why we should wish not to.

Vietnam is not a region of major military, industrial importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive developments of the world situation would be determined in normal circumstances by what happens on that territory.

If it were not for the considerations of prestige that arise precisely out of our present involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable, and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not, in my opinion, present dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention.

Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, and by that I have, of course, in mind primarily the Soviet-Chinese conflict, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent course.

There is no reason to suspect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable in present circumstances to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger that its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this, I think, would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power.

In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia, and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect—that is, the effect that would be produced by a limited Communist success in South Vietnam—seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that have led to our present involvement.

Let me stress, I do not say that that danger does not exist: I say that it is less than it was a year or two ago when we got into this involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate, as something we would not choose deliberately, if the choice were ours to make all over again today, and by the same token, I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious on the other hand that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions ul-

terior to the long-term problem which have to be taken into account; a precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests, and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved by our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place.

This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, is going to have to be recognized both by the more critical of our friends and by our adversaries.

But at the same time, I have great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if by the use of that term we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will and the complete realization of our present stated political aims.

I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes.

There seems to be an impression about that if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation on the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. I don't say that it is absolutely impossible, but it is a dangerous assumption in the light of the experience we have had with Communist elements in the past.

The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have between them a great deal of space and manpower to give up if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that if really pressed to extremity on the military level these people should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence rather than to accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayal of the future political prospects of the cause to which they are dedicated.

Any total rooting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life and of civilian suffering generally for which I would not like to see this country responsible.

And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly, it seems to me, have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty, and this is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. This involvement seems to me to represent a grievous misplacement of emphasis on our foreign policies as a whole.

Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our involvement in Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy and, hopefully, possibilities we should be developing are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater.

Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously, as was to be expected, and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than

what is ultimately involved in Vietnam and when we had special reason, I think, to cultivate those relations, and more unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feelings entertained for us by the Japanese people.

The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where the sinews of modern war can be produced on a formidable scale there, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia.

There is no success we could have in Vietnam that would conceivably warrant, in my opinion, the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people.

Yet, I fear that we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing, a process to which the Japanese for historical reasons are peculiarly sensitive and adverse.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort.

It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among peoples normally friendly to us.

Our motives are widely misinterpreted, and the spectacle, the spectacle emphasized and reproduced in thousands of press photographs and stories that appear in the press of the world, the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary our operations may seem to us to be or may genuinely be, this spectacle produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country.

HOLLOW VICTORY

I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that this is so, and that it is bound in the circumstances to be so, and a victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

Now, these are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces, and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict, and these are reasons why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously, and I may say consistently, the quest for such a peaceful resolution of the conflict, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives, and even if the resulting settlement appears to us as something less than ideal.

I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation. But everything that I can learn about its political aspects suggests to me that Gen. James M. Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there.

I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that

A716

ton was a farmer and recognizing this, a group of America's finest young men have selected the week of his birthdate as their national week. I am speaking of the Future Farmers of America who will observe their 38th anniversary the week of February 19 to February 26.

I am sincere when I speak of the Future Farmers of America as a group of this Nation's finest young men. At home, in the Second District of Kentucky, one cannot but be aware of the very strong and the very positive influence that the members of this organization exert in their homes and in their communities. I know of no group that commands more respect or receives more wholehearted support than our Future Farmers and I am sure this is true not only in our section of Kentucky, but across the board expanse of our country.

Thirty-eight years ago, some high school students in Kansas City, Mo., believed in the future of farming. They formed a new organization—an organization for farm boys—and employed this belief in their creed. Their faith has been justified, for it was then as it is now—farming is the backbone and the heart of agriculture.

It was in 1928 that these boys first met and set forth their ideals and goals. The outgrowth of their meeting has been a national organization, the Future Farmers of America, with more than 454,516 active members in 9,156 local chapters. This membership is distributed throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico. Operating under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts, it has become an educational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical farm youth movement and has as its aim and purpose the development of agricultural leadership, of citizenship, and of patriotism.

As our great Nation has expanded its growth and power, as our population has increased, and America, in its compassion for the hungry of the world has increased its foreign commitments, so too have the Future Farmers of America augmented their program to meet these new demands upon our agricultural resources. Vocational Agriculture now embraces the study of science, technology, and management. The American farm and American farmworkers remain the center link in our present agricultural system. Servicing and supplying these 7 million people are some 6 million workers. In the third and final link, an additional 10 million handle and process our abundant farm produce. Agriculture, in a sense, has become agribusiness.

To those who love the land, however, agriculture is more than a career—more than a business. It is a very rich and rewarding way of life. The dreams of forefathers are nurtured and harvested and the good earth is replenished with hope for the farmers of tomorrow to tend. A farm is a masterpiece of nature and a symbol of the eternal bond between man and soil.

I salute the Future Farmers of America upon their 38th anniversary. A great trust is their and I wish for them a future of even greater achievement.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Pete Hamill, who is reporting on the war in Vietnam for the New York Post, has been writing a series of articles from that region which shows great insight into the nature of the struggle. I include the fourth article in the series which was published on February 10. I especially want to call to the attention of my colleagues his two concluding sentences:

If anything at all is clear about this confused war, it is that its roots are political. Ultimately, its solution will be political too.

The article follows:

Vietnam: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE IV:
THE MILITARY STRUGGLE

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The correspondents who were there still remember the last terrible days of the French in what was then known as Indochina. Every evening in that spring of 1954, the bars of Hanoi would grow emptier. The young French officers would toast each other with champagne, sing gay, brave songs, and then fly off in the morning, heading 180 miles to the west for a town in the valley of the Namyoum River called Dien Bien Phu.

The young men would leave in groups of 50 or 60 in those first days of the 57-day siege; then in groups of 30 or less; and at the end, one or two at a time. The music in the Hanoi bars played to empty rooms. The prostitutes walked home alone. The customers of both were off being slaughtered.

And while those thousands of young men were again proving that France produces the bravest soldiers and the worst generals of any modern nation, while they were being shot down like trapped animals in that valley without exits, the French military kept lying. The war was not finished, they told visiting correspondents, no matter what happened at Dien Bien Phu. Small military gains were being made in the Red River Valley. The Vietminh were getting discouraged. The pacification program was spreading like oil on water through the countryside.

The Vietminh were resorting to terror in the collection of troops and the peasantry was abandoning the cause. It was all related in careful, rational tones, and all of it was nonsense.

On May 7, 1954, Dien Bien Phu was overrun, by the forces of Vietminh Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap; the next day, the Geneva Convention opened and the colonial empire France had fought so bravely and stupidly to retain was finished. Today, the second part of that war continues, though the names of most of the players have changed. In what Bernard Fall describes as the second Indochina war, the old hands have a distinct sense of *deja vu*.

"There are some crucial differences between the French phase of the war and the American phase," one veteran American journalist told me several weeks ago. "For one thing, the French were fighting to stay in a colony; we're fighting to get out. We have overwhelming air power and, with the helicopters, more flexibility. Despite the peace movement, we don't have anything like that anti-war feeling in France at the time of the war, which choked off supplies and needed manpower; the French after all had a large,

powerful Communist Party. But in other ways, it seems to me we're making a hell of a lot of the same mistakes."

Even some of the American politicians admit that host of our mistakes to date have been political; but they also feel that we are in danger of making some of the same military mistakes.

"Our greatest weakness here is the ARVN," one American military man told me. (The initials are for Army of the Republic of Vietnam.) "If they were doing their job, we wouldn't be here. We could stand off like the Chinese are doing, give them the guns and let them do the fighting. But even though they are individually brave, they are lousy as an army."

There are about 250,000 troops in the South Vietnamese Army and some units perform well. Others are a hopeless grabbag. One unit I visited in the Mekong Delta was made up of 250 fighting men and 750 women and children, all dependents of the soldiers. It is rather difficult to get a soldier to desert the warmth of his family bed at 3 in the morning to do battle with the Vietcong. Desertions continue to bleed the army of its stability. The pay is abysmally low—\$20 a month for a private, or about what a prostitute earns in an hour on Saigon's Tu Do Street.

Few ARVN soldiers have any respect at all for the commanders, most of whom seem more interested in turning their weapons on the latest Saigon government than in fighting the Vietcong. In addition, the Vietnamese Army is riddled with Vietcong agents, to the point that some American outfits refuse to work on operations with them. "It's impossible to plan a large operation with them," one Marine colonel said. "By the time we get to where we want to go, the Vietcong are gone. It's like a cop from the vice squad working for Lucky Luciano."

An even more serious problem is that most of the Vietnamese officers have been trained by either the French or the Americans. Their military thinking runs along conventional lines. The Australians—some of whom are most caustic about American military strategy—say that the Vietnamese would be great soldiers in some open flat field in the south of France, but that they still don't understand jungle warfare.

"In this kind of war," one Australian officer who had served in New Guinea said, "you have to slide up on your man and cut his throat. You don't come barging in like a horde of bloody elephants, letting him know you're coming."

(The Australians, by the way, rate the Americans third in the jungle warfare league. "The Japanese were best, because they used the jungle; the Australians were second, because they learned to live with the jungle; Americans—they remove the jungle.")

The French thought they could hold Indochina with strings of forts from which they could strike with some sort of mobility; but the Viet Minh controlled all of the countryside, had the support of most of the peasantry, and knocked off each fort with brutal efficiency until at Dienbienphu, they knocked off the biggest fort of them all.

Many observers feel we are doing the same thing. Our position at Da Nang, Anh Khe, Bien Hoa, Pleiku, and Nha Trang are reasonably well defended (though the Vietcong slipped through two regiments of Vietnamese to mortar Bien Hoa a year ago, and managed to blast the Da Nang airstrip a few weeks ago). The Americans, because of the kind of warfare they are waging, must have these bases. Unfortunately, they control no more of the countryside than the French did. When I asked to visit the battlefield of the Ia Drang Valley where, last November, we took heavy losses, and killed almost 2,000 Vietcong, I was laughed at. "Unless you can find a spare battalion around here," I was told, "forget it."

February 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A715

U.S. Space Program Chalked After 1970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an article by Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor, January 18, discusses the recent report of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences completed at the request of the White House on post-Apollo programs. This study clearly outlines the need not only for our efforts in space in the 1970's but makes a strong case for sufficient Earth-based effort to supplement our space effort. This brief article by Mr. Stanford identifies well several of the most promising opportunities for our national space program following the lunar landing in this decade. The article follows:

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM CHALKED AFTER 1970
(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The American space program is outlined until 1970, when it is to put men on the moon.

While there is a lot of talk and speculation about what the United States does after that in space, there is no official program, no announced goal.

The first step toward nailing down a specific space program for the post-Apollo years, running from 1970 to 1985, has been taken now.

The Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, at the request of the White House, has come up with a long list of projects and given them priorities.

Top priority goes to unmanned exploration of Mars.

Next comes detailed investigation of the lunar surface.

Third is unmanned exploration of Venus.

EARTH-BASED STUDY STRESSED

Then comes investigation of other major planets, comets, asteroids, and interplanetary dust.

This program is not too different from what has been expected, and from what probably will be approved. But what the space science board has done now is propose 50 different specific space investigations for the post-Apollo years, and explain why these have been chosen.

The report takes issue with certain present policies and premises on space research and exploration.

It suggests that earth-based studies of the planets and solar system must not be neglected just because man now has a means of making deep-space probes. It says with some sharpness: "There is great concern over the gap between present programs in ground-based observation of the planetary system and what could be done with existing facilities."

In other words: Don't do in space what can be done more cheaply on earth.

QUESTIONS OUTLINED

Here are some of its proposals and recommendations for this period:

Launching an orbiting planetary observatory

More observation of planets through ground-based telescopes.

Landing a Martian capsule early in the 1970's.

Putting life-detection experiments in early landers on planets, even though they have a low chance of success.

The report makes pertinent points about various space programs:

Mars: The purpose is not only to look for existence of life on Mars, but to see if it geographically has a core, a mantle, a crust; not just study volcanic activity, but determine whether Mars came from the same chemical crucible as the Earth.

Moon: The moon should be mapped both from lunar orbit and then from landings and traverses. It is important to know such a simple thing as how a handful of moon dust would distribute itself if allowed to fall back.

Venus: It is possible scientists have been too hasty in accepting the assumption from radiation measurements that the surface temperature is too high to support life. Such heat could come from nonthermal sources, and low temperatures could exist at the summit of the high mountain ranges. Also some form of life could even develop in suspension in the dense atmosphere.

This is only the first of three reports the space science board is making on space research directions for the future.

There is no question but that there will be a space program after 1970. This first report tries to suggest what it will—or should—look like.

Lutz Cabinet Co., a Wyoming Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always taken pride in the recitation of a single man's success in our free enterprise system. An integral part of our culture is the firm and abiding belief that our economic system offers each man an opportunity to seek a better way of life through dedication, hard work, and a continuing faith in our Nation's potential.

This lesson is all the more valuable when it demonstrates that there are still developing markets in our Nation that offer great rewards to men of these aspirations. Wyoming is such a place, with abundant natural resources, reserves of trained manpower, an excellent transportation system, amidst an area of well-to-do consumers.

I am proud today to call attention to the achievements of a friend of many years, Louis Lutz of Laramie, Wyo. Beginning as a carpenter in Laramie, Mr. Lutz recognized Wyoming's potential and pursued his career in Laramie, ultimately building one of Wyoming's fastest growing industries. His cabinet company, founded in 1949, now represents an investment of over \$300,000, employing 25 persons. It is Wyoming's largest wood milling shop and one of the largest custom furniture producers in the Rocky Mountains.

The following article from Wyoming Progress Reports, a monthly publication of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board, explains Mr. Lutz' good cause for faith in Wyoming's growing ability to sustain profitable industrial ventures. I recommend his philosophy to those who seek a promising and profitable career in the great undeveloped markets of the Rockies.

The article follows:

One of Wyoming's fastest growing businesses recently occupied a new plant in Laramie, representing an investment of more than \$300,000.

Lutz Cabinet Co., the State's largest wood milling shop, began operations at its new 26,000-square-foot facility late in 1965, signaling the latest achievement in a proud growth record.

Louis Lutz, a native of Laramie, founded Lutz Cabinet Co. in 1949 as a small-scale operation. The company now employs 25 persons and is among the largest custom furniture producers in the Rocky Mountain region.

The firm does not manufacture furniture for the general market. Its products are custom built for specific contract purposes. For example, work is currently underway on a \$500,000 contract to supply dormitory furniture for the University of Wyoming in Laramie.

Major supply sources for the company are the East (for birch and oak) and the Pacific Northwest (for plywood).

Lutz Cabinet Co.'s principal product is cabinet work for Laramie area contractors on such projects as apartments and residential developments. In recent years, the company has broadened its base of operations with the receipt of many contracts for college dormitories, hospitals, and State institutions. For these projects, Lutz Cabinet Co. produces drawers, wardrobe units, and desks.

As an added feature of its operations, the firm designs many of its products and much of its equipment, enlisting the assistance of University of Wyoming specialists as consultants on specific projects.

Lutz cites several advantages of his Laramie location. Transportation facilities—both truck and rail—are excellent. In addition, the Laramie area offers an abundance of skilled labor. The firm's proximity to its growing market facilitates shipping of the highly finished company product.

Within a 150-mile radius of Laramie are the University of Wyoming, Colorado State University, Colorado State College, Colorado School of Mines, University of Colorado, Denver University, and several junior colleges—comprising an excellent market for Lutz Cabinet Co.'s products in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska.

Finally, Lutz credits the Laramie area's highly favorable business climate with helping the growth and prosperity of his company.

The Future Farmers of America—
Guardians of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country is once again preparing to celebrate the birthday of our first President. Americans, throughout the land will pause on that day, February 22, and pay due tribute to the splendid and unselfish genius of his great man who gave so much of himself and his talents in his efforts to establish and sustain this then fledgling young Nation. History records George Washington as a leader in many fields and certainly not the least of his accomplishments were in the area of agriculture. At heart, George Washing-

So we are killing Vietcong, but regaining very little territory for the Vietnamese Government we are fighting for. In some areas, such as the Mekong Delta, we have less territory under Government control than we had 18 months ago.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland is in charge of the American military effort here. Like Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in World War II he finds himself spending almost as much time in the airy sphere of diplomacy, soothing the wounded egos of other military men, as he does in fighting the war.

Unlike Eisenhower, though, Westmoreland doesn't even have the luxury of a unified command. In theory at least he must ask permission from the Vietnamese generals before moving his men into battle. And for reasons stated above this is often not in his best interests. Too often in this war, large, expensive military operations are pulled on empty valleys. One operation last year resulted in a net kill of 26 water buffaloes. No one could determine whether they were Vietcong sympathizers.

In certain ways, Westmoreland is representative of the entire American effort here. For one thing, he looks like a general. He is lean of jaw, steely of gaze, with fierce black eyebrows that John Ford's makeup men would have a hard time inventing. He doesn't smoke, seldom drinks, and utters only an occasional "dag rabbit" when upset. To some of those working with him, he is still the Eagle Scout he once was.

"Westmoreland is a very nice guy," one American political expert says, "but I don't think he understands much about evil. He wants his men to be gentlemen, noble warriors preserving freedom for an imperiled country. They should be out cutting throats."

Most homefront heroes cannot understand why a war in a small country like Vietnam should be giving a great power like the United States so much trouble. They believe we should blow up Hanoi or Halphong, drop our nuclear weapons and blast the Communists off the map. (It is interesting that the atom bomb advocates are always willing to drop the bomb on Asians; it is doubtful they would drop it if this war were being fought in Sweden.)

The American military men understand some of the folly of these arguments. For one thing, Saigon is the hostage for Hanoi. If our bombers took out Hanoi—no simple matter, since it is conceded that the Communist capital has more formidable anti-aircraft facilities than wartime Berlin—the Communists could take out Saigon in 3 days. Their supporters could blow up most major facilities, hotels, and the communications and sewer systems; if Halphong goes the Saigon River could be bottled up with a few well-placed mines and mortar fire could wreak havoc at Ton Son Nhut airport.

So the strategy has become relatively simple. The military must operate on the theory that no peace will be negotiated. Starting from that point they believe that for the next several years an all-out war of attrition must be waged against main-force Vietcong and North Vietnamese units.

While the Americans and the best Vietnamese units are waging that kind of war (it will require at least another 200,000 Americans), the Vietnamese Popular Forces and regional militia units will have to deal with the guerrilla units in the countryside. Keep the pressure on, and the guerrilla war will simply peter out. The lowest time estimate for accomplishing all this is 7 years.

A lot of people have severe doubts about this strategy. It echoes the French methods, and denies the fact that large-scale operations too frequently result in the deaths of the very peasantry the government is supposed to be winning over.

Probably the only hope of winning lies with the kind of pacification program being

run under the direction of Gen. Lewis Walt and his marines out of Da Nang. The marines have been treated harshly by some critics because they have not gone out and killed as many people as possible. But Walt understands the futility of battles like that of the Ia Drang in which great numbers are killed and the government still cannot walk back in. His men have been working quietly, with some efficiency, village by village.

It would be unfortunate if the Marine Corps alumni association forces them to give up and go back to all-out assault. If anything at all is clear about this confused war, it is that its roots are political. Ultimately, its solution will be political too.

Marine Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is ever-increasing interest and discussion on the future of our great maritime industry. The technological aspects of it are of particular concern to us all.

It was with a great deal of interest when I read the remarks of Adm. John Harlee, U.S. Navy, retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, before the Transportation Association of America's National Transportation Institute on January 12, 1966, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

His remarks follow, and I commend them to the attention of the Congress:

REMARKS OF ADM. JOHN HARLEE, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA'S NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE ON JANUARY 12, 1966, AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY

These are exciting times in the marine transportation industry and unquestionably one of the most exciting phases is the new impetus in containerization which could achieve a technological revolution in ocean transportation.

But, while the year ahead will unquestionably see the first manifestations of transatlantic containerization it might be years before the full impact of this new type of shipping service is felt by the industry.

Before containerization arrives full blown, we at the Federal Maritime Commission must reexamine and reassess our governing statutes, the rules and transportation principles enunciated thereunder, and our body of case law, all formulated under traditional concepts of break-bulk service, and determine whether they meet future transportation needs and whether, in their present form they are equal to the task of providing regulatory guidance and assistance to steamship operators and protection to the prospective users of containerized ocean transportation.

As you know, the transatlantic steamship trade is one of our most important, whether it be viewed in terms of the number of vessels committed to it, the type of cargo moving, the volume of that cargo or its value. Today the carriers in that trade operate services largely indistinguishable from those existing when the Shipping Act was passed in 1916. That is changing fast and within the next few years the trade may become unrecognizable. Within that time at least four major U.S.-

flag carriers and four foreign-flag carriers will inaugurate integrated container service with significant numbers of high speed vessels between the United States and northern Europe. Most of these vessels expect to load and discharge containers on a lift-on, lift-off basis, but some may be designed for roll-on, roll-off operations. This technological revolution has been long in coming to our foreign trade and should be welcomed not only by this Nation and its trading partners in Europe but also by the shippers and consignees engaged in that trade.

The need for high-speed container service in the transatlantic trades is manifest. Obviously, operators of containerized vessels will continue to be confronted by operational and labor problems. There is also the problem of international trade rivalries. While the United States may feel it has the advantage of a head start there is every indication that foreign-flag interest in containerization is accelerating. All in all, however, the prospects for the success of containerized service in this and other trades appear encouraging. The capital required to move these new vessels from the drawing boards to the berth is staggering. We should tender a hearty well done to all those steamship companies who intend to participate in this venture to so dramatically improve service. Containerization should bring benefits to carriers and shippers alike and make a substantial contribution toward achieving the national goal of expanding our foreign trade.

The full impact of the operational changes that will be forthcoming from containerization of the transatlantic trade cannot be evaluated until we have had actual experience with this method of ocean transport. Nevertheless, prudence and commonsense dictate that we make preparations now for what is coming. The Federal Maritime Commission and the other agencies who regulate transportation must reevaluate their regulatory programs on the basis of what is about to happen rather than what happened yesterday. We do know that containerization will bring changes in more than the physical features of the vessels involved. We do know that the maximum efficiencies of containerized service can be realized only when the containers are loaded at inland points, where most of the cargo originates, and are tendered for delivery at inland points of destination. We know that containerization has encouraged the through movement of goods and that this trend will be greatly accelerated when containerized service is fully established in the transatlantic trades. The carriers have been attempting to comply with existing legislation by segmenting the charges for the service they perform by filing with various regulatory agencies those applicable segments of the through rates. For example, motor carriers file with the Interstate Commerce Commission rates covering the portion of the haul in the United States. Under present rules those carriers must file with the Federal Maritime Commission their port-to-port rates based on the theory that they are non-vessel-owning common carriers by water in foreign commerce. That portion of the haul occurring within the foreign country is not required to be filed anywhere. When such transportation involves air carriers they must file a portion of the through rate with the Civil Aeronautics Board and their port-to-port rates with the Federal Maritime Commission.

This type of segmented rate regulation may be unwieldy, time consuming, costly, and of marginal utility to both shippers and carriers. A single factor through rate filed with a single governmental entity may be more conducive to an effective transportation system. Perhaps a joint board similar to the one proposed by the Federal Maritime Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Board to exercise jurisdiction over through rates in certain of

our domestic offshore trades should be expanded to include our foreign trades. Matters such as these have been under continuing study by the chairmen of all three of the major transportation regulatory agencies and we intend to maintain this liaison. However, neither a joint board nor the respective staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, or Federal Maritime Commission can effectively deal with these problems unless we receive the counsel, advice, and cooperation of the carriers involved and the users of their services. We need to know more precisely the types of services contemplated, the problems both operational and regulatory that are envisaged by the carriers and the shippers, and most important the views of all concerned as to how the joint efforts of the Government transportation regulators can be utilized to accommodate carriers and shippers alike while maintaining the protection of the public interest.

We must also direct our efforts to find answers to these problems which are likely to arise from major containerization problems:

Will containerization bring changes in traditional rate patterns and rate structures? Will containerization change the method of pricing transportation service?

For instance, under containerization will pricing relate more to the movement of the container rather than to its contents?

Will "freight all kinds" rates be available in these services?

Can a single bill of lading with a single factor rate be utilized to cover the through movement of goods from an inland point, across the ocean and then to another inland point?

Will containerization reduce the need for the proliferation of shipping documents that are now necessary to move cargo from an inland point in the United States to an inland point in Europe?

Will containerization permit simplifications of the shipping documents that will be required?

What effect will containerization have on independent ocean freight forwarders and nonvessel owning common carriers now regulated by the Federal Maritime Commission?

Containerization will obviously bring manifold changes in the method of loading and unloading vessels. What effect will these technological changes have on traditional terminal operations? Indeed, considering the heavy capital outlays that will be required to adapt present terminal facilities to containerization will it be possible for the lines to operate such facilities at all ports presently being served? If not, will it mean that certain ports will have the benefits of containerization and others will not? More important perhaps is the question of whether containerization will draw substantial amounts of cargo from ports where such service is unavailable. If this is so, will it be consistent with the public interest and compatible with sound transportation policy?

Is it feasible to move all types of general cargo in containers? If not, what accommodations will be made for moving such items?

Will containerized vessels attract only the highway paying cargoes? If so, what will happen to those operators of modern yet conventional vessels who will be relegated to the carriage of low paying cargo?

How are the regulatory agencies to police such malpractices as misdeclaration of freight, misweighing, and rebating? Which agency will have jurisdiction over these matters? Who is to be held responsible for these practices, the shipper, the freight forwarder, the non-vessel-owning common carrier, the inland carrier, or the ocean carrier? Fortunately, the Federal Maritime Commission with the cooperation of the Interstate

Commerce Commission has embarked on a compliance program on containerized freight moving in our domestic offshore trades. We are hopeful that that program when adequately tested will serve as a model for similar programs in foreign trades.

I would be less than candid if I pretended to know the answers to all the questions raised here. But I intend to do my part in preparing myself and the staff of the Federal Maritime Commission to be in a better position in the days ahead to come to grips with these problems and others, and if possible to formulate rational and effective responses. I know my colleagues at the Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board join me in these pursuits. Time is one of the luxuries seldom enjoyed by a regulatory agency. Usually, we are required to react to a crisis already in being. Here we are confronted with a grand opportunity to lay plans for a revolutionary change in the techniques of transportation. But we cannot wait too long or this problem too will be upon us.

Every regulatory program should have a purpose and I can assure this audience and those with whom the Federal Maritime Commission deals more directly that if our programs are found purposeless in the light of changing transportation conditions they will be promptly reevaluated. When our programs and policies no longer serve to protect those involved in ocean transportation from the evils the Shipping Act was designed to eliminate the Federal Maritime Commission will act promptly. It is essential that technological advances in transportation not be hamstrung and frustrated by governmental policies which have no place in a modern transportation system.

I solicit your assistance and advice as to how the Federal Maritime Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board can effectively discharge their regulatory responsibilities in the technological challenges we all await. The information and assistance you are able to provide regarding this new concept of transportation may be determinative of whether we spend our time wisely.

Misdirected Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, too often the Congress and the Federal Government are unfairly criticized for assuming legitimate responsibilities in meeting the needs of our people.

When editorial praise for a controversial Federal service occurs, it is an occasion to be noted. For this reason, I request to be inserted in the RECORD at this point, the following editorial from the February 12 edition of the Sheboygan, Wis., Press:

MISDIRECTED CRITICISM

The forthcoming meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which opens a 4-day session at Las Vegas Monday, is a timely reminder that the rural electrification program in this country is approaching its 30th birthday with a becoming maturity.

In the present era, it is difficult to recall that as recently as 1935 only about 10 percent of the Nation's farms were receiving electric

service. The inability of private industry to extend electric service in those days led to the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This measure promoted farm electrification through low-interest Government loans. As a result, today more than 98 percent of the country's farms have some sort of electrification.

Despite this worthy accomplishment, the REA unfortunately is constantly being made the whipping boy by ultraconservatives and disgruntled politicians. They attack the Rural Electrification Administration program as another form of Federal bureaucracy that is creating unfair competition for private industry.

Such criticism is unfair. Should the Federal Government be criticized for stepping in and meeting a need that obviously should be met? Certainly the Nation has benefited by the Government's rural electrification program. Perhaps there were good reasons why private industry was not able to extend its services in the 1930's. But that does not mean that the necessity for rural electrification could be overlooked or indefinitely delayed.

When private industries or individual States fail to function to provide a necessary public service, the Federal Government inevitably steps in to meet the need.

Shortage of Technicians a Problem for All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, improved and expanded vocational and technical education is vital to the continued growth of our economy. The United States—indeed, the world—is faced with a gigantic rebuilding task, and this can be successfully accomplished only with the assistance of thousands of new technicians.

This is a problem in which I am vitally interested. Last year, I sponsored the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. I had the honor of seeing this act become Public Law 89-287. This is one step and one approach toward providing more technicians to our workforce.

The problem in general is being vigorously approached by the U.S. Office of Education's Division of Vocational and Technical Education, under the direction of Assistant Commissioner Dr. Walter M. Arnold. A training program on the vast scale envisioned, however, can only be successful if there is close cooperation between all parties concerned—Government, educational institutions, and private industry.

This point is brought out effectively in a stimulating article, based in large part on statements made by Dr. Arnold, which appeared this month in *Testing World*, a magazine published by Soiltest, Inc., long a pioneer in the use of electronic methods in subsurface investigations and quality control of construction work generally.

It is a pleasure to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ing, as the wife of a key Government official, will be caught up in considerably more social activity.

That is uncertain, however, considering the fact that most of the people around Johnson, a hard taskmaster, are too busy for much social life. Certainly the Flemings will be sought out socially, since they are now in the White House inner circle.

JOB PAYS LESS

Even though his family will see less of him, they approved of his taking the job, which at \$28,500 a year pays somewhat less than he made at ABC.

Mrs. Fleming was the first to know about the offer of the job made to Fleming on February 1, by Bill D. Moyers, White House press secretary.

She talked it over with Fleming at length. After conceding that the longer hours would keep him away from home, she agreed with him that the job presented an opportunity and challenge that would have its compensations.

The Fleming boys were not told of the offer until the following Friday—February 4—just before Fleming took off for Honolulu with the President. They took the same attitude as their mother.

BORN IN MILWAUKEE

It was generally agreed that being thrust into the middle of national and international affairs would supplement the boys' schooling.

Robert, Junior, is a senior at Woodrow Wilson High School, not far from his comfortable four-bedroom home in northwest Washington.

Fred is in the ninth grade at Alice Deal Junior High School. Both boys were born in Milwaukee.

As a result of the earlier family discussions of the matter, the excitement was partly over by the time the President made the announcement Friday at an impromptu news conference.

The telephone began to ring immediately at the Fleming home. For an hour Fleming took the calls, which were from Washington correspondents and associates in the broadcasting industry who were calling to congratulate him.

GET ACQUAINTED DINNER

Then the Flemings drove to the Moyers home for dinner. This was a get acquainted session for Jean Fleming and Judith Moyers, who had not previously met. And it gave Fleming and Moyers a chance to talk business.

The conversation was interrupted by a number of calls transferred from Fleming's home to Moyers' home through the White House switchboard. Presidential press secretaries are always reached through the White House, since the operators there know where they are.

The first call to Fleming through the White House came while he was at Moyers' house. It was from Mrs. Polly Greenberg, daughter of Lindsay Hoben, editor of the Milwaukee Journal. One of Fleming's sons had told her he was at the Moyers.

Mrs. Greenberg wanted to arrange for ABC coverage of the visit to Washington of a child development group from Mississippi composed of 48 children and 25 parents and teacher involved in Project Headstart.

MORE CALLS SATURDAY

The group came here to demonstrate the quality of the Head Start program to Congress and to express its disappointment over the delay of the office of economic opportunity in refunding the project.

Fleming called ABC from Moyers' home to assign a camera crew to the Mississippi delegation.

Fleming took a few more congratulatory calls when he got home just before midnight

as well as Saturday morning before he finally escaped to the weekend cabin.

But even there the calls kept coming, from old friends and associates like Anthony G. DeLorenzo, former Wisconsin newspaperman now vice president for public relations of the General Motors Corp., and Fred W. Friendly, an official of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Fleming spoke wistfully Saturday of those restful weekends in the country. He still holds out hopes of continuing to go there.

Hopeful Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, from a magnificent height, United Nations delegates can look over the East River and a part of the world and perhaps be inspired to play a meaningful role, with some quiet diplomacy, which could eventually lead to peace negotiations in Vietnam.

The realist cannot be too optimistic, but still the presenting of a resolution on the Security Council agenda represents a victory for this administration.

According to the Des Moines Sunday Register:

The Security Council set no date for debating the resolution in the hope that quiet diplomacy would accomplish something.

The U.N. meeting was worth while—

The editorial continued—

because it showed in action that the U.S. peace drive is not ended, even though U.S. bombing in North Vietnam has been resumed. It reminded U.N. members who have been reluctant to spend money for U.N. peacekeeping operations how valuable a U.N. peace force might be.

Despite what may be a long road ahead, the Des Moines paper sees the U.N. Security Council meeting as a sign of hope—as “one more drop of water on the stone.” So that others may see this summary of why reasonable talk might eventually lead to peace, I recommend this editorial and include it in the RECORD:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

The United Nations is the worst possible form of world organization (to paraphrase Winston Churchill), except any other form of world organization the world has yet had. For years people of good will have been saying, “Why doesn't the United States bring the Vietnam war before the United Nations?” Now the U.S. Government has done so.

The results so far show why referral was delayed so long.

U.N. member nations in the charter conferred on the U.N. Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and power to issue binding orders, enforceable by their combined armed might, to members and nonmembers alike. That was on paper. The practice for 20 years has been rather different.

The practice has been to refer disputes back to the disputing parties, sometimes with mild suggestions about principles to follow.

The most the United States thought it practical to ask of the U.N. Security Council was a nonbinding resolution. The proposed resolution “notes” that the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 on southeast Asia “have not been implemented.” It calls for immediate discussions without preconditions “among the appropriate interested governments” to arrange a conference “looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia.”

The proposed resolution also “recommends” that the parties start by reaching agreement on a ceasefire “under effective supervision.” The resolution goes on to offer U.N. assistance “by all appropriate means,” including arbitrators or mediators if desired, a “call” for “cooperation by all concerned,” and the services of Secretary General U Thant.

The United States just barely got this mild resolution placed on the agenda, and the debate showed there would not be the votes needed to pass the resolution and that in any case there would probably be a Soviet veto.

The Security Council set no date for debating the resolution in the hope that quiet diplomacy would accomplish something. Even if the resolution should be adopted, it simply passes the buck to the Geneva conference powers, some of whom have been refusing for months to reconvene the conference.

Yet the U.N. meeting was worthwhile. It showed in action that the U.S. peace drive is not ended, even though U.S. bombing in North Vietnam has been resumed. It reminded U.N. members who have been reluctant to spend money for U.N. peacekeeping operations how valuable a U.N. peace force might be.

In Vietnam, both sides say they accept the principles of the Geneva agreements, but each wants to control South Vietnam militarily while the people decide in free elections. The United States would accept a properly constituted U.N. force or neutral force pending free elections. So far the Communist side will not. North Vietnam and Red China say they won't accept any U.N. role there at all. They have not been admitted as members and regard the U.N. as a U.S. front.

But North Vietnam and the Vietcong might come to accept some kind of neutral force (1) when they find that is the only way to get U.S. Armed Forces out; and (2) when they become convinced that the United States really is willing to get out on those terms.

The U.N. Security Council meeting was one more drop of water on the stone to drive these points in. Not blood, water.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before the 25th Anniversary Celebration of United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 3, 1966, there were held throughout the Nation a series of celebrations marking a quarter of a century of service by the United Service

WE CAN TRAIN TECHNICIANS NOW

Although there is still a serious shortage of technicians in civil engineering and other engineering and science fields, it should be possible now to solve this problem if we can see it not as a problem just for educators but for all of us—employers, businessmen, government officials, and students alike. This, plainly stated, is the belief of Dr. Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare.

The solution to the technician shortage is now possible, says Dr. Arnold, because of new Federal vocational education legislation and the joint Federal-State vocational education and training programs this legislation makes possible. In short, the money is available. Now, the people must use it.

STEPS TO VOCATIONAL PROGRESS

The money, the legislation, the programs for educating and training technicians and others in vocational fields did not come easily or quickly. Attempts to meet the Nation's vocational education needs have come in gradual stages, through the years.

Step by step we have pursued the solution to the vocational education problem with new laws, new provisions, but always the ultimate solution has seemed illusive. If we have met the needs for vocational education in one field, then needs in another field have developed. And gradually, in recent years, a great need has been mounting for more and more technicians. It is reassuring for our faith in the democratic method, however, that as the problems of technician and other vocational education have grown more serious and complex, our national solutions have become more ingenious and now, it is believed, ultimately successful.

The major steps toward vocational education progress began with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, which provided \$7.2 million to the States for vocational programs, and range forward to the Higher Education Act of 1965, which gives financial aid for work at the college and university level.

WHAT EMPLOYERS CAN DO

Clearly the legislation exists now to do this job of education. But just as clearly, says Dr. Arnold, "vocational educators cannot carry this new and tremendous burden alone." What is needed is the help of employers, the Nation's businessmen. Says Walter F. Carey, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"The businessman is the key element in this whole education picture. Far better than any educator or government administrator, he is in a position to know what his company's manpower requirements will be for the next 5 years, the next 10 years."

And yet at the same time the businessman himself often is impeded in playing his full potential role in the education and employment of technicians. Dr. Arnold comments:

"The character effectiveness and economic value of capable technicians is still not universally appreciated in American industry * * *. Some employers have never had a chance to hire a really good technician, much less appreciate him." The probable cause for this situation, Dr. Arnold reasons, is the limited number of schools training highly competent technicians combined with the ready employment of these graduates by the relatively few firms near to the schools.

THE NEED, THE LEGISLATION

This short supply and restricted employment of technicians in past years was one of several causes which has contributed to the overall national technician problem—and its solution.

Some of these causes have grown more intense and others have developed anew during the great period of national growth since World War II. Taken together they have

produced the push that in turn produced the surge of corrective Federal and State legislation of the late 1950's and the 1960's from the beginning of the decade to the present.

The national need for technicians is further indicated in Dr. Arnold's enumeration of conditions that he says led directly to Congress enacting title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958:

"First of all, the highly skilled technician was becoming an increasingly essential part of the scientific and management team in modern scientific research, development, production, and services. The team is composed of professional scientists, engineers, specially trained technicians supervisors, and skilled production or laboratory workers.

"Second, technicians are in short supply. The ratio of technicians to scientists or engineers is usually less than 1 to 1, but there is need for two or more technicians to support each engineer or professional scientist.

"Third, * * * the explosion of scientific knowledge (has been) creating changes in scientific education so that the professional scientist or engineer (has) received little laboratory experience. Thus, a vacuum (has developed) in the area of applied laboratory knowledge which (has) had to be filled by highly skilled technicians."

To cope with these interrelated factors the Federal Government, in the past few years, has moved to vastly improve American vocational education, including the education and training of technicians.

AUDIOVISUAL AND OTHER METHODS

One of the key areas in which the new education laws effectively help technical education is in the research and development of new techniques, methods, and materials for teaching.

The intent here is to educate and train technicians more efficiently by developing and using new teaching aids such as the Soitest, Inc., 35-millimeter training film strips. Other provisions are made for research and development of programed learning techniques.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 covered specifically the construction of facilities for public and nonprofit colleges, authorizing \$1.2 billion for this purpose. Of this total, 22 percent is earmarked for public community colleges and public technical institutes, institutions which offer numerous vocational courses.

FIGURES TELL THE RESULTS

These have been the plans, the new laws, the techniques aimed at producing enough technicians and other vocational workers to meet the needs of the United States which has grown from 140 million population at the end of World War II to 200 million in just two decades. The needs of other nations in the world are comparable.

The results can be seen in some simple statistics, as explained by Dr. Arnold:

"For many years (prior to the new laws) the number of new technicians formally prepared to work with physical scientists and engineers had been limited to about 16,000 graduates of a relatively few publicly supported institutions and a number of private nonprofit technical institutes. Studies of physical sciences and related engineering fields indicate a need for at least 100,000 new technicians each year."

How close is the United States coming to these goals? Is the Nation meeting its needs for the technically educated?

Since 1958, when the NDEA was passed, some 63,000 new technicians have completed training under the provisions of the act.

Enrollment of full-time students in technical education programs swelled from 20,000 in 1958 to 102,000 in the 1964-65 school year. Total enrollment, both full time and part time, has grown from about 94,000 in 1958 to about 250,000 in the 1964-65 school year.

Of these, 148,000 were employed adults in upgrading and refresher courses.

The number of schools offering technician training has grown from 260 at the beginning of NDEA in 1958 to nearly 1,000 in 1965.

The Nation, it is apparent, has recognized its need for educating technicians. It is beginning to meet these needs.

"We are all in this endeavor together," says Dr. Walter M. Arnold. "* * * Leaders in industry and in vocational and technical education * * * are being called upon to provide realistic, high-quality occupational education to meet present and future manpower needs at the lowest net long-term cost. Modern America requires technicians * * * and their counterparts in management, marketing, and servicing—with better basic training at the start of their careers than ever before. The pattern of the past * * * is not good enough largely because of the impact of research on all facets of modern living.

"Educators alone cannot perform this task, but together we can meet the challenge in a truly American tradition of cooperative accomplishment."

Appointment of Bob Fleming as Presidential Press Secretary Is Good News**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

MR. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the appointment of Robert H. Fleming as Presidential press secretary was good news. He brings outstanding talents to a very demanding job.

Mr. Fleming has had a long and distinguished career in journalism. He is a native of Wisconsin, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, and a former reporter for the Milwaukee Journal.

I include hereafter an article written by Milwaukee Journal reporter Laurence Eklund on Mr. Fleming's appointment:

FLEMING'S NEW JOB MEANS HECTIC PACE

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The leisurely week-ends of Robert H. Fleming, his wife, Jean, and their sons, Robert, Junior, 17, and Fred, 14, are coming to an end. Usually the Flemings drive 40 miles to their quiet retreat, a cabin they own in the country near Mount Airy, Md., leaving home Saturday morning and returning Sunday evening.

This weekend, the jaunt to their refuge was cut to only Saturday, because of the flurry caused by President Johnson's appointment of Fleming, former Milwaukee Journal reporter, as his new press aid.

HAS ABC WORK

Before assuming the hectic job of maintaining liaison with all the news media covering the White House, Fleming must wind up his affairs at the American Broadcasting Co., where he has been Washington bureau chief since 1960.

When Fleming takes over the White House hot seat—probably the hottest in all of official Washington—his family's mode of living will change.

The long hours of the demanding job mean that he will see much less of his family. It probably means that Mrs. Flem-

Can we persevere in our search for peace-ful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened. We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world. And we shall.

Our Stand Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the President's recent peace offensive was not the utter failure it has been made out to be by Mr. Johnson's critics. Despite Hanoi's refusal to even take notice of our invitations to negotiate, the President's overtures met with success in other areas.

Our motives for being in Vietnam and our determination to stay there were made clear to other nations throughout the world. We showed the world that we want peace—but not at any price. If nothing else were gained by our peace offensive, it still must—in light of this fact—be considered at least partially successful.

The district which I represent, the Seventh Iowa District, is well known for its conservative nature—especially in foreign affairs. I am presenting a recent editorial from the Carroll Daily Times Herald to give my colleagues the benefit of the views of a conservative section of Iowa concerning Vietnam.

OUR STAND CLEAR

The war in Vietnam is apparently back where it was at the end of December, before the moratorium on bombing raids on the north began.

Yet the nature of the conflict has changed in a very important way, despite the failure of the peace offensive to move the Hanoi regime toward the negotiating table.

It is now clear to all but the most rabidly anti-American that no nation is more anxious to put an end to the fighting than the United States. It is now clear to all but those immovably committed to viewing the world through red-tinted glasses that this country desires peace and will take any feasible and honorable steps to secure it.

Our call for a full-dress Security Council debate on Vietnam was such a step. The pressure for peace has now been placed upon the international community, and some of that pressure must inevitably permeate to Hanoi.

On the surface, the bombing lull accomplished nothing, though no one can say with certainty just what went on during those 37

days in the minds of the North Vietnamese leaders.

The resumption of the raids will likely have little effect on the immediate course of the fighting. It was essentially a stalemate, though slowly escalating on both sides. It will remain essentially a stalemate until either a cease-fire is achieved or until all possible paths that could lead to a cease-fire have been explored and found useless.

But while both the military effect of the resumed bombings and the political force of a United Nations resolution may be limited, the two combined would amount to considerable and continual pressure on the North Vietnamese.

Whether they realize it or not, the nature of the war has changed.

The Vietnamese Communists can no longer pose as the sympathetic underdogs fighting valiantly against an immoral, imperialistic bully. They have nothing to gain by disdainful rejection of the peaceful offers of other nations. Neither now nor next year nor 10 years from now are they going to take over South Vietnam and drive the United States out by force of arms.

Sooner or later, these truths must get through to Hanoi and Peiping. Until they do, however, continued fortitude, patience and restraint will be required of the American people, and continued sacrifice will be asked of their sons.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before Panel on Science and Technology of House Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, January 25 to 27, 1966, the Committee on Science and Astronautics held its seventh annual meeting with its Panel on Science and Technology. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, the committee was pleased to welcome one of the great spokesmen of science in the world, Sir Charles Snow.

It was appropriate that this eminent forum began with an address by the Vice President of the United States.

His talk covered many of the great scientific and technical challenges of our time. He stressed the need for increased partnership between Government and science in order that the greatest benefits of this age might be realized.

I include the text of Vice President HUMPHREY'S address in the RECORD:

OPENINGS REMARKS, VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, PANEL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 25, 1966

I would like you to know, Mr. Chairman, how proud President Johnson is of the work which your committee has performed. This committee has provided a model of congressional oversight. Your panel of 15 outstanding scientists and engineers has provided invaluable counsel—not only to the 31 mem-

bers of this committee but—indirectly—to the Congress as a whole.

May I say to our distinguished Speaker, you can be very proud of having been a father of this House committee. The record of history will show that you, Mr. Speaker, played a crucial role in the House of Representatives effective response after Sputnik I.

May I say, too, to my friend JIM FULTON that one of the most gratifying aspects of this committee's work is that you have acted on a bipartisan or better still, nonpartisan basis.

In the full committee, in the Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Development chaired by Congressman DADDARIO, and in other subcommittee work, there has been a scientificlike search for facts and for the best opinion. The committee and its subcommittee have "experimented" and the experiments have been very successful.

It is appropriate that this committee, which enjoys so outstanding an international reputation, should be host today to so great a world scientist and scholar as Lord Snow. We are proud to have him as our guest.

May I begin today by saying that, as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, I am continually astounded by the expansion of scientific knowledge and its technological applications.

One brief visit to Cape Kennedy is all the average citizen needs to realize how far science and technology have gone beyond his everyday capacity for understanding.

I am in fact often reminded of the words of the Queen to Alice in Wonderland:

"Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

Sir Charles Snow has warned of the gap between science and the humanities—the two cultures, as he has called them.

There is danger of another gap: a gap between public policy and advancing science and technology. In government we face the task of closing that gap.

One of our panelists, Dean Price, has stressed the importance of this in his scholarly and helpful book, "The Scientific Estate." He says:

"Only if a nation can induce scientists to play an active role in government, and politicians to take a sympathetic interest in science (or at least in scientific institutions) can it enlarge its range of positive freedom, and renew its confidence that science can contribute progressively to the welfare of mankind."

It has often been said that to govern is to choose.

Those of us in government, who have the responsibility to choose, must have the insights and foresights that scientists and technologists, in government and outside, can offer us.

Among the decisions that have faced the President in recent months, many have involved scientific and technological considerations. I think of decisions concerning water resources, desalting, oceanography, arms control and disarmament, transportation, urban problems, education, defense—and the list is by no means complete.

And our Government is not unique in this respect. Virtually every developed nation is wrestling with the problem of adapting its laws, procedures, and institutions to meet advanced science and technology.

To cite only two examples, the British Government has recently reorganized its structure for dealing with scientific matters, and so has the French.

Here in the United States the President has had a Special Assistant for Science and Technology since 1960. The Office of Science and Technology has been in existence only since 1962.

February 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A721

Organizations. No one who has been a member of our Armed Forces or who has had a loved one serving for our flag could fail to be indebted to this great organization for the wholesome entertainment and recreation it has provided our troops throughout the world.

In New York City, the principal speaker at the USO banquet was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. His vital theme was the historic challenge facing our Nation for the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression.

A Gold Medal Award was presented to the Vice President. Previous high winners of the award, I am happy to point out, included His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur—posthumous.

I insert the text of Vice President HUMPHREY's outstanding address in the Record and precede it by the inscription of the award which was so appropriately conferred upon him.

TEXT OF INSCRIPTION ON GOLD MEDALLION PRESENTED ON FEBRUARY 3, 1966, BY USO OF NEW YORK CITY

The USO of New York City takes pride in presenting to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, its Gold Medal Award in recognition of his dedicated leadership and wholehearted support of USO as it continues to keep the faith with America's Armed Forces, February 3, 1966.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, USO, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

It is a high honor to receive your Fifth Annual Gold Medal, as it is a privilege to join with you in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the USO.

During this quarter of a century, over 20 million American men and women who have worn the uniform of their country have found in the USO a home away from home.

USO seeks to answer the two questions always on the mind of every GI wherever he is:

"Does anybody know I'm here? Does anybody care?"

And to these two questions you answer, in actions as well as words: "Yes, we do know and we do care."

We have an obligation to our American young men away from home—young men serving without complaint and with a high standard of performance.

At Clark Field, near Manila, I saw recently young Americans—some of them terribly wounded—fresh from the battlefields of Vietnam. As I talked with them, they showed in every word and action those special qualities of courage and determination which Americans have always demonstrated in every war. We can surely be proud of them.

In Korea, I traveled north to the truce line and talked with American and Korean soldiers in this cold and bleak place.

Here, over a decade after the U.N. repelled Communist aggression, our American soldiers are still standing guard in one of freedom's loneliest and most remote frontiers.

The soldiers I saw in Clark Field and Korea, like those in other remote and often dangerous areas of the world, deserve the assurance that the American people have not forgotten them. And USO—which I saw in action at Tokyo, Manila, and Seoul—provides that kind of assurance.

And I think it is in the best spirit of American democracy that USO, representing our three major faiths, is nongovernmental and represents a wholly voluntary commitment on the part of the American people.

Why are so many American soldiers in Asia either standing guard or engaged in a shooting war?

They are there, primarily, to insure the peoples of the countries in which they are stationed the right to choose, the right to decide their own futures—in other words, to have the basic human rights of self-determination and of independence.

Self-determination and independence are threatened today by Asian communism. And so is man's search for peace. For we face adversaries who seek to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud—that militancy and force are the paths to final Communist victory.

During my two recent trips to Asia, I had the opportunity to talk with many national leaders. I sought their impressions of Asian communism, with which all of them have had firsthand experience. I did so because it is vital to know one's adversary as thoroughly as possible, and through many different eyes.

I did not come back with simple answers or simple panaceas.

Asian communism is a complex ideology. It is deeply rooted in the tragic past of Asia, yet it is raw and dynamic.

It isn't the timeworn, bureaucratic communism that has evolved in other places. It is aggressive. And its leaders are convinced of their ultimate success.

Its approach is not merely economic, although it capitalizes on the poverty and despair of the Asian peasant.

Its tactic is not merely political, although its hard-core followers are dedicated believers in Marxist doctrine, and although it wraps itself in the robes of nationalism to attract those who aren't yet ready for the full gospel.

Its thrust for power is not simply military, although it never has won power except by ruthless use of force—and I believe it never will.

The immediate threat is in Vietnam. What are the realities of today in Vietnam?

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led revolutionaries seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the south. Some are from north. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the south. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peiping. Their creed is communism and their means is terror.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation. In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that—faced with this aggressive force—our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April, President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the north in the hope that

this might stimulate negotiation. In December we suspended the bombing again.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means toward peaceful negotiation.

Initiatives outside our own—by the U.N. Secretary General; by 17 nonaligned nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India, and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI—have been undertaken without success.

We have stated unequivocally that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peiping? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

"The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people.

"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."

From Peiping has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's—and I quote—"filthy and vicious * * * basket of peace."

It is clear that—in this time as in the past—those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam.

In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

For we must not permit the struggle to become purely military, either in Vietnam or elsewhere.

We must persist with diplomatic initiatives for peace, in the United Nations and in all the capitals of the world.

We must counter the Communist political thrust with better politics—the politics of democracy, of self-determination, of human dignity.

We must help the nations of Asia move forward with economic and social reform so that the Asian citizen will have a real stake in his country.

This is where the struggle will be decided in the long run.

We have a clear obligation to help the people of Asia and of other continents to help themselves. It is for this reason that I commend to you the foreign aid program which President Johnson submitted to Congress this week.

The President has proposed, and I quote, "to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills, and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

We have set ourselves no easy task. It will require patience and fortitude for years ahead.

But I believe we can, in the end, succeed. For I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

May I close with Churchill's words, spoken at Harvard University some years ago: "If we are together nothing is impossible. If we are divided all will fail. I therefore preach continually the doctrine of the fraternal association of our two peoples, not for any purpose of gaining invidious material advantages for either of them, not for territorial aggrandisement or the vain pomp of earthly domination, but for the sake of service to mankind and for the honour that comes to those who faithfully serve great causes."

General Gavin's Vietnam Strategy Gains Impressive Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the number of distinguished and influential Americans who support the strategy for Vietnam proposed by Gen. James M. Gavin continues to grow. While it is true that one man's view may vary subtly from the next, the basic approach is the same: Remain in Vietnam but avoid escalation; limit the fighting while continuing the effort to transfer the conflict to the negotiating table.

The list now includes: General Gavin; Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army, retired; George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia; Walter Lippmann, the distinguished author and columnist; James B. Reston, associate editor of the New York Times; and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The case against escalation was forcefully presented last week by General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was summarized as follows in a New York Times editorial of February 11:

THE CASE AGAINST ESCALATION

Two Americans once deeply involved in top-level planning on the diplomatic and military fronts have now given the Nation strikingly parallel analyses of the dangers of escalating the war in Vietnam in quest of victory.

George F. Kennan doubts that "the most formidable military successes" would bring victory if that term means the end of Vietcong resistance and the realization of all our stated political aims.

Gen. James M. Gavin warns that escalation could impair the capacity of the United States to meet more vital commitments elsewhere in the world at the same time that it created the risk of unlimited war on the mainland of Asia against Communist China.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the evaluations by the former chief of the State Department's policy planning staff and the onetime chief of plans and operations for the Army—both delivered to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—is the extent of their concurrence. President Johnson would find it difficult to place either man in his category of "special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam."

For Kennan and Gavin concede that the United States cannot simply pull out of Vietnam. Their plea is for limiting the fighting

to the minimum necessary to insure the security of our forces while continuing the effort to transfer the conflict to the negotiating table. And their concept of minimal necessity involves a military commitment significantly smaller than that envisioned by the Pentagon or Marshal Ky.

The Kennan and Gavin testimony clearly challenges many of the things said during and after the conference in Honolulu earlier this week, if not the carefully drawn language of the communique. It recalls certain basics that Americans in this difficult situation need to keep in mind: Powerful as it is, the United States is not omnipotent; wise Americans have long warned of the perils of getting mired in land war on the Asian mainland; and in the nuclear era few things are more delusive in a major conflict than the goal of victory.

If the Senate committee had heard only General Gavin and Mr. Kennan, its inquiry into American policy in Vietnam would have been worth while.

Small Business Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

This bill would replace the present revolving loan fund utilized by the Small Business Administration with three separate funds. The first of these funds would finance the business loan program authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and the loan program established by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act. The second fund would support the disaster loan program, and the third would finance loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, other than the lease guarantee functions.

As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, since October 11 of last year, the Small Business Administration has not only failed to grant any further business loans, with a minor exception during the New York transit strike, but they have also refused to accept any applications for direct financial assistance, regardless of need. The city of Dayton, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, made application for a small business development center but was turned down. I was told by the Small Business Administration that these drastic steps are necessary because of drains on the present loan fund due to several natural disasters.

I strongly feel that this emergency requires another supplemental appropriation as well as a change in the structure of the loan program itself.

Congress created the Small Business Administration in 1953 because independent and vigorous support was needed in the executive branch of Government for the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen. There is no area where such support is more essential than the granting of small business loans.

Big business often has the flexibility to withstand temporary setbacks simply by

shifting resources from another section of the firm or calling upon their ample conventional credit sources. When the same challenge is hurled against a small businessman, he may go under, not for any lack of ability or dedication, but simply because he does not have time to gather money needed to provide a transition to the next opportunity for profits, financial repair, and growth.

Since last October, however, the assistance that Congress has declared should be available from the Small Business Administration has been denied. In effect, we have said to the small businessman, "When disaster strikes elsewhere in the Nation, you must bear a special burden. You must survive without the programs that Congress said you should have." And, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means the first time that regular business loan suspensions have been decreed. And, unless Congress acts, it will not be the last.

The loan program suspension comes upon the heels of another serious blow at small business credit by the Government—the increase in the rediscount rate by the Federal Reserve Board. The consequent rise in the cost of credit is already being felt throughout the Nation. Therefore, small business now faces a two-pronged crisis in credit.

The purpose of this legislation is to insulate the business loan program against drains caused by natural disasters. I recognize that my bill does not solve the problem of stabilizing the disaster loan program so that its proper benefits will always be available. The unpredictable timing and scope of such disasters poses special dilemmas in assuring the full effectiveness of such a program. Possible remedies in this field merits the attention of Congress but I strongly insist that the brunt of such disasters should not be placed upon small businessmen throughout the United States.

The business loan program must be given a permanent and protected status. Appropriations for these loans must be carefully planned, fully evaluated by Congress, and should not be permitted to rise and fall on the whim of nature.

Congress has wisely recognized the crucial value of small business to our free enterprise economy, therefore, I come before you today, Mr. Speaker, to plead for the reform and reinvigoration of the small business loan program and recommend this bill as a most important measure to translate congressional promise into permanent performance for the small businessmen of America.

Several of my colleagues have introduced similar bills and I am happy to join with them in this legislation.

Scouting Commemorates Federal Charter

SPEECH
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Wednesday morning, Feb-

February 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A725

Britain's defeat—but to be clearly understood that it must be at his own expense.

A typical hidebound viewpoint, I admit—but if my distinguished French colleague will not take it amiss, less rigid than President de Gaulle, who would have no truck officially or personally in joining with us in Britain last year in celebrating the Sesquicentennial of the Battle of Waterloo.

And if I may perhaps pay one more tribute to Mr. Wilkinson—a personal one of thanks and appreciation—it would be for his timely advance notice that I should be expected to say a few appropriate words this evening.

Because I shall always remember among the highlights of my experience on arrival in New Orleans last year, the first banquet I ever attended in this city that care forgot—it was about this time last year 2 or 3 days after we got here—the sesquicentennial dinner at the Roosevelt, in the company of members of the Cabinet, the congressional delegation from Louisiana, descendants of the Pakenham family and of the Andrew Jackson family—a great bevy of distinguished people.

I recollect that I had just enjoyed the first course—oysters, my very favorite indulgence here, and was settling down to enjoy the rest of the meal and listen to the distinguished speeches—when suddenly I heard ominous noises coming from a few places down the table where my wife was sitting next to the Postmaster General of the United States.

She seemed to be frantically drawing my attention to something—apparently the banquet program. I glanced casually down the program until my eye fixed upon my name—and against it the words, “the principal speaker.”

No one had remembered to tell me beforehand.

This little incident, and some of the other events that followed during the sesquicentennial week, is always coupled in my memory with your distinguished Congressman, Mr. EDDIE HÉBERT. He seemed to make everything seem easy, and a great deal of fun as well, regardless of the hazards that beset us occasionally during the week's celebrations. I recollect too that he promised to introduce me to red beans and rice, real country style, when we had time to relax. That treat is still to come.

Enough of small talk—and I must bear in mind the admonition of Bacon's words printed in your program, “Let him be sure to leave other men their time to speak.”

Indeed, this admonition is reinforced by the quotation from Cato, also on the program, “Speak briefly and to the point”—and we still have the benediction, I notice.

This battle that we celebrate the anniversary of tonight was in a way a blessing in disguise. The outcome in every sense was a redoubtable victory for you and a severe defeat for us. As everyone knows, it should never have taken place. The war was over, the Treaty of Ghent had been signed, and whatever campaigns had been planned should have forthwith been called off—most importantly, General Pakenham's. But, the news of the peace had not reached these shores.

Why, then, a blessing? Should any war or battle with all the attendant cruelty and casualties be thought a good thing? Why could it by any stretch of the imagination, even in retrospect and scores of years later be condoned—unless either it was fought in the cause of freedom and justice and to withstand an unacceptable tyranny or ideology—and there has been no shortage of such challenges in our history since that time?

Or the beneficent results which followed—even if unintended at the time, were such that they perhaps justified the cost in suffering and human lives at this time.

Looking back I doubt there will be many who disagree with me if I say that the War

of 1812 was unwarranted and uncalled for, on either side—achieving very little in terms of political or military advantage—and doing little credit to either adversary apart from some notable exceptions of individual courage and initiative and particularly in naval combat on the high seas and on the inland waters of America.

The point I am making is that most historians—and I refer mainly to American historians—think that the war was needless. The causes all derived from the power struggle in Europe, not from any challenge by one side or the other to vital interests of either the United States or Great Britain.

But the Battle of New Orleans was another matter. For America it was a dramatic victory which fired the country's imagination. Its effect upon the people was spontaneous and acted like magic. It was of far greater importance than all the other engagements put together.

It is generally agreed, I think, that if there was one thing the war achieved, in which Jackson's victory here against General Pakenham's veterans was the paramount ingredient, it was the consolidation of national sentiment, the emergence of new found self-confidence and pride in national unity and a strengthening of collective patriotism. It united the Nation as never before.

The Battle of New Orleans, though it occurred after the peace had been declared, was the decisive contest and, of all the forays elsewhere, it perhaps alone produced results of really lasting importance and value to the United States at a point in history when this stimulus was most needed.

For us also it heralded the beginning of an era reaching down to the present time—the results of which have been of incalculable values—not only to ourselves but to you and all free people. The defeat in 1815 marked the last military adventure undertaken by Great Britain in North America. When next Britons and Americans met on a battlefield, more than 100 years later, it was as comrades in arms and in sentiment.

This era which had its origins in 1815, an era of peace, of amity, of friendship and solidarity with the American people—a friendship based on common ideals and principles, the rule of law, of democratic government by the majority but having full respect for the rights of the minority, above all a common belief in and respect for personal liberty, and the recognition that the individual is greater than the State—this era had its beginnings in 1815—in a real sense its birth was here.

It is unnecessary to dwell on what this meant historically for the English-speaking peoples, and indeed for the world, in this century alone. But long before the outset of the two World Wars, this unwritten but nevertheless very real alliance of the two great English-speaking nations had begun to manifest itself.

There emerged for instance in the world scene of the last century a period of comparative peace which came to be known as the Pax Britannica.

On this side of the ocean in the Western Hemisphere a direct result was the formulation and practice of an American policy to be known as the Monroe Doctrine. Its origins stem from a ganging up by certain European powers in the early years of the last century, the formation of an axis which became known as the Holy Alliance. This alliance had, amongst other things, its eye on the Americas, particularly South America. One of its proclaimed objects was to quash any further development of what was described in the articles of alliance of this group as “the system of representative government” as practiced in some European countries, and to prevent this system being “introduced in those countries where it is not yet known.”

The ultimate danger to America from these avowed objectives of the alliance was obvious, and President Monroe was alarmed and sought advice from Thomas Jefferson, then your greatest living statesman who was living in retirement, on what should be the American reaction.

You may remember what Jefferson said when he replied to President Monroe. His letter in part reads, “The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation, this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. * * * One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit, she now offers to lead, and, accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of anyone, or all on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause.”

Basically this unwritten alliance between the British and American Navies became the Monroe Doctrine, an important contribution of the Pax Britannica, and for 100 years America was free from any real menace of invasion, and she prospered accordingly.

There were disputes as well in this halcyon period as the 19th century advanced. Most occurred during the Civil War. Some were heated and caused much emotion, but always they were settled as warm disputes between reasonable, law-abiding citizens, and were sensibly settled by negotiation or arbitration. Among such disputes you will remember was the case of the *Alabama*, a man-of-war built in Liverpool and allowed by the British Government to slip out to sea manned by Confederate officers and sailors. America demanded reparation and got it. As a result of arbitration we paid to the tune of \$15 million in damages—exactly the same sum as you paid Napoleon for the real estate acquired through the Louisiana Purchase. Values get mixed, don't they?

But the ultimate fulfillment of the unwritten alliance between Britain and America came in the first half of this century, when aggression on the grand scale and playing for the highest stakes ever, was let loose, twice in the lifetime of some of us here. Freedom and liberty were threatened as never before.

It was in these catastrophic years of the 20th century that the full realization of Anglo-American unity and friendship, born of the War of 1812, came to full fruition. There is no need to dwell on our “togetherness” in the last war. The partnership developed in the blood, sweat, and tears of that time, was of a degree unparalleled in history.

The victory we achieved has not brought us universal peace. Today we continue to face together new dangers and threats from many quarters of the world. We are not as powerful as we used to be. The struggle and the cost of two world wars in the cause of freedom has weakened us. A greater share of the burden which was once mainly ours now falls on you. Nevertheless the partnership, the special relationship continues, and we are still able to give you powerful support.

Indeed the immutable guiding light and focus in policies pursued by successive British Governments have been and remain today—above all else to maintain and strengthen the now closely interwoven threads of our alliance and ideals which have brought us together through so many grave dangers in the past.

Mr. Speaker, also honored at the charter year breakfast were 14 Scouts and Explorers chosen by merit to represent 5,732,708 members of the Boy Scouts of America at report to the Nation activities during 1966. These fine young men were later to have the high privilege of a visit with the President of the United States at the White House and reported to him concerning the progress, achievements, and activities of Scouting. Eagle Scout James C. Smith, 17, of Columbia, Tenn., spoke for the Scouts; and National American Legion Commander L. Eldon James, of Hampton, Va., responded in behalf of the 95,000 local institutions who sponsor Scouting units.

Some historical highlights of the Boy Scouts of America were presented on stage in a visual and in the printed program. Since these highlights reflect the tremendous role that Scouting has played in the strengthening of America through its program of character building, citizenship training, and physical fitness, I wish to incorporate them in my remarks:

Boy Scouts of America incorporated February 8, 1910, under the laws of the District of Columbia.

Sea Scouting for older boys started. Boys' Life became the official magazine 1912.

Federal charter granted to the Boy Scouts of America, June 15, 1916. Number of chartered institutions at the close of the year was 9,500. Membership totaled 245,183.

Unprecedented service rendered by 418,984 Boy Scouts to World War I effort. Scouts sold over \$200 million in Liberty Loan bonds and war savings stamps, 1919.

First World Jamboree held in England attended by 301 Scouts from United States, 1920.

Outstanding good turns rendered in forest conservation throughout the country. Membership reached 513,015, 1921.

First National Training School for Scout Executives opened, 1925.

The Cub Scout program formally launched, 1930.

The Mortimer L. Schiff Scout Reservation dedicated, 1933.

Membership passed the million mark and the 5 millionth copy of Boys' Life was published. Sea Scouting was implemented by adoption of Explorer program for older boys, 1935.

First National Jamboree held in Washington, D.C. Attended by 27,232, 1937.

National rededication to Constitution of the United States and Declaration of Independence. Philmont Scout Ranch, Cimarron, N. Mex., given by Waite Phillips to the National Council, 1938.

Total resources of the Boy Scouts of America placed at the disposal of U.S. Government for duration of the war. Services included distribution of defense bonds and stamp posters, collection of aluminum and wastepaper, cooperation with American Red Cross and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, 1941.

Boy Scout war service continued. More than 500,000 Scout victory gardens grown—20,000 earned the Gen. Douglas MacArthur medal for growing food, 1945.

Forty thousand Scouts and leaders attended the Second National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa. First Boy Scout stamp issued by U.S. Post Office Department, 1950.

Thirty-three percent gain in membership announced as result of the "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty" program launched in 1948. Boy membership at the close of the year was 2,579,515, 1951.

The National Council office moved to its new location near New Brunswick, N.J. Boys' Life circulation passed 1 million mark. Unprecedented membership growth continued to alltime high of 3,774,015, 1954.

Thirty-six million Liberty Bell doorknob hangers placed by Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers in get-out-the-vote campaign, 1956.

Fifteen millionth copy of Handbook for Boys presented at White House ceremony. Over 50,000 Scouts and leaders attended Fourth National Jamboree, 1957.

The new Explorer program launched, 1958. Scouting's golden jubilee year celebrated. Membership total over 5 million. Highlight was Fifth National Jamboree at Colorado Springs, Colo. Johnston Historical Museum dedicated at New Brunswick, N.J., 1960.

In Greece, 621 Scouts and leaders from the United States attended the 11th World Jamboree, 1963.

Strengthen America's Heritage program launched in cooperation with Freedom's Foundation. Sixth National Jamboree held at Valley Forge, Pa., 1964.

The program of emphasis breakthrough for youth inaugurated. Total Boys' Life subscriptions, 2.4 million. Five hundred thousandth Eagle Badge awarded. Membership at close of year was 5,732,708. Cumulative membership 1910-65 exceeded 40 million. Over 21 million Boy Scout Handbooks distributed since 1910, 1965.

Fiftieth anniversary of Federal charter from Congress. At the beginning of the charter year, the total number of chartered institutions exceeded 95,000—which is 10 times greater than the total chartered institutions in 1916. Number of units is 144,538, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the charter year breakfast launched a nationwide emphasis on the partnership with cooperating agencies as defined in the charter. Key leaders in the field of religion, education, civic and community life in every local council of the Boy Scouts of America will be invited to a special meeting of the executive board to consider ways and means of working together in bringing the Scouting program to more boys, especially in the congested inner-city and deprived rural areas. This will be followed by relationships conferences in every one of the 2,750 districts with heads of institutions that are present or prospective sponsors of Scout units.

In closing may I reiterate a conviction which is shared by all of us that Scouting is a vital force in strengthening the foundations of freedom in our beloved country and throughout the free world. For the boys themselves it is fun, adventure and activity that helps them to grow in personal and social development, gives them a sense of moral values, and motivates them to do their duty to God and country.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, New York Post Correspondent Pete Hamill, in his fifth article in the series from Vietnam observes:

The hard truth of the situation in this country is that most of the peasantry (that is, most of the people) support the Vietcong. The guerrillas simply could not have grown so large without them. And the Vietcong propagandists work hard at holding that support.

I urge my colleagues to read the article published in the New York Post on February 11, which describes the political strength of the Vietcong.

It follows:

Vietnam: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE V:
THE POLITICS OF WAR

(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—The most relentless adversary we face in the war in Vietnam is the mind of Vo Nguyen Giap. This round-faced, 54-year-old lawyer is the only man to have won a war in Indochina in this century. He attended no West Point, no St. Cyr. "His school," a friend once said, "was the bush." In that bitter school, Giap painfully, carefully, put together his theory of war. He destroyed the French with the great Vietminh army he constructed. And today in South Vietnam his admirers in the Vietcong are using his theories to fight the mightiest military power on earth to a frustrating, expensive, and bloody standstill.

The core of Giap's theory—derived from the writings of Mao Tse-tung—is that no modern revolution can be won unless the military arm is attached to a political body. If a concrete political base has been constructed, Giap says, defeat is impossible.

Giap himself is a Communist and much of his writing—which on military matters has a hard precision—is damaged by a kind of mindless Marxism. But Giap, and the political commissars who roam the countryside preaching on behalf of the Vietcong, are not naive enough to believe they can sell something as abstract as communism. They concentrate on more mundane matters.

"They go into a village the way we should," said one American political officer in the Mekong Delta. "They come in and search around and ask people about their gripes. When they find out what the people feel is unjust, they remedy the injustice. If the hamlet chief is corrupt, they shoot him. If a landlord is charging exorbitant rents, they kill him and burn down his house and make much ceremony of turning the land over to the peasants."

These so-called armed propaganda teams are the vanguard of the Vietcong. Following Giap's rules, they are like the rest of the Vietcong. They never enter a house without asking permission. They pay for everything they eat, and if there are food shortages, they go without. When they have convinced the majority of people of their honesty, integrity, and sense of justice, the terror begins.

Open dissenters are murdered. Those suspected of being lukewarm disappear. Graphic examples are made: leaders are beheaded and their heads left to dry on poles in the sun. Women are openly butchered. Those peasants who are not held by admiration for the Vietcong are held by terror. Most are held by admiration. And without those people in the countryside, Giap's theories about revolutionary war could never succeed.

"Without the support of the population," Giap has written, "we shall have no information. We shall be able neither to preserve secrecy, nor carry out rapid movements * * * The people suggests stratagems and acts as guide. It finds liaison officers, hides us, protects our activities, feeds us and tends our wounded." (This is a variation, of course, of Mao's theory that a guerrilla should move among the people "like a fish through water.")

February 14, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A72.

bruary 9, to attend the charter year breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, which was held at the International Inn in Washington, D.C. Purpose of the meeting was to observe the 50th anniversary of the Federal charter granted by the 64th Congress to the Boy Scouts of America and to celebrate the 56th birthday of the organization which was incorporated February 8, 1910.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, was scheduled to deliver an address, but was unable to be present because of a special assignment by the President to represent him at conferences in Vietnam.

Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio, who on that day was the newest Member of Congress to take office, was called by Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, retired, the master of ceremonies, to speak instead of the Vice President. He gave a very fine speech which contained some significant facts about the involvement of Members of Congress in Scouting. His cogent remarks were as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.,
CONGRESSMAN FROM OHIO, AT THE CHARTER
YEAR BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 9, 1966

General Clarke, Mr. Brunton, Senator HAYDEN, report to the Nation Scouts, my colleagues in Congress, fellow Scouts and Scouters, see how fast you can rise in the world in Washington. Just a couple of days ago I was the youngest Member of Congress, or the newest Member of Congress, and now I am substituting for the Vice President.

As a tenderfoot in this distinguished body to which I belong, I was a little bit strained to know what I could say about Scouting that would not already have been said by this time in this program and that some of my fellow colleagues and those of you here did not know. So I decided to lean on the newest device of people with problems, and that was research. I made a little survey of the membership of the U.S. Congress to try to answer the question of what Scouting has done for the Congress in view of the fact that we would be discussing this morning what Congress had done for Scouting 50 years ago. I was surprised, as I think you will be.

As a result of my effort to gather some statistics on Scouting in the Congress I found out that 249 of the 535 Members of the Congress of the United States today have been Scouts or Scouters. Now, as a member of one of the minorities in this country—the Republican Party—that impressive total in Congress is very encouraging to me. I know the Republicans would like to have that many Members in Congress. I will tell you a little bit about that later.

Two hundred and one Members of Congress have been Boy Scouts. One hundred and twenty-nine of them have been and are, and many of them still are—and this is a message for those of you who talk to people who say they are too busy. Many of them are still Scout leaders. Eighty-one Members of Congress have been Scouts and are Scout leaders today, and 48 of them have been leaders only. One hundred and twenty of them have been Scouts and have not continued their Scouting as volunteer Scouters. One hundred and thirty-four of the responses I got indicated that they had been neither Scouts nor were they Scout leaders and I hasten to point out to you, as was pointed out to me on a couple of these sheets that I got back, they were not Scouts because, in some instances, they were too old.

In other words, Scouting was not available when they were growing up and in a number of instances they were not Scouts because

in their area, geographically, or because they came from what now is being called disadvantaged areas, there was no Scout troop. I trust that we will cure that in the next 50 years as we have made great strides in curing it in the past 50 years.

The reason I could not get a total of 535 responses is because there are, or were when I took the survey, 3 vacancies in Congress and also because 12 of the seats in Congress are held by women. Two of these women, CATHERINE MAY, of Washington, and FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, ought to be in this survey, although I just could not bring myself to include them because Mrs. MAY, last year became an honorary Boy Scout through a council in her district and has confused her daughter, or at least made her daughter something unusual in school, because she goes to school now and tells people that she has the only mother in the country who is a Boy Scout. FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, says that she was not a Boy Scout but she sure worked like the dickens being a den mother.

To be a little more serious, I would like to give you just a moment of my background. I moved to Washington with my predecessor in this seat in Congress when I was 12 years old and soon after that joined Boy Scout Troop 5 at St. Alban's church, up near the Cathedral. In that troop I became a senior patrol leader and an Eagle Scout, and later out in Ohio served as an assistant scoutmaster and just this past summer have been involved in some work in Tecumseh Council in southwestern Ohio to encourage boys to respond to the motto, "Follow the Rugged Road." I would not have been a Scout, however, and I am sure I would not have been an Eagle Scout, and I am sure perhaps, too, that I would not be here today as a Member of Congress if it were not for the man who made my Scout troop and my Scouting experience possible, and he is here this morning and I would like for you to meet him. He is John Ballas. John, will you stand?

John was my Scoutmaster and was active in Scouting in the National Capital Area Council and in troop 5 for about 35 years. He is retired from Scouting now to devote his full time to trying to make a living and to make a cathedral. He is curator of the Washington National Cathedral up on the Hill. To him and to the other Scout leaders and to the Boy Scouts who are here representing the Scouts of the Nation, as a Member of Congress I would say that you have kept the trust expressed in you some 50 years ago by Senator HAYDEN and others very well. Congress presented you a charter and perhaps in many respects, you have given us back a Congress.

I would like to read for you the names of the Eagle Scouts in Congress and also to give you the names of some of the top Scouters in the U.S. Congress. The Eagles include Representatives GEORGE P. SENNER, JR., of Arizona; BURT TALCOTT, of California; CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida; CHARLES WELTNER, of Georgia; DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois; JOHN CULVER, of Iowa; HERVEY MACHEN, of Maryland; GERALD FORD, of Michigan; THOMAS CURTIS and DURWARD HALL, of Missouri; BARBER CONABLE and RICHARD OTTINGER, of New York; HORACE KORNEGAY, of North Carolina; MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota, and myself and BILL STANTON, of Ohio. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; DANIEL FLOOD and RICHARD SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; J. J. PICKLE, of Texas; JOHN MARSH, of Virginia; HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah. I don't trust myself to comment on the fact that there is only one Senator on the list.

The adult Scout leaders with special honors are Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona and GEORGE MURPHY, of California, both Silver Buffalo; Representative from Missouri, DURWARD HALL, Silver Antelope, and Silver

Beaver, and Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina, and Representatives TOM CURTIS, of Missouri and DEL CLAWSON, of California, Silver Beavers.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for what you have done with your charter.

Mr. Speaker, special guest of honor at the charter year breakfast was Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate and only living Member of the 64th Congress which granted the charter to the Boy Scouts of America. Chief Scout Executive J. A. Brunton, Jr., presented to Senator HAYDEN a beautiful plaque containing a mosaic tile inlay of the original charter and a statement of "affection, esteem, and gratitude" for the great contributions Senator HAYDEN has made to scouting as a Member of Congress.

Senator HAYDEN's response was contained in a letter which he had prepared and framed for the occasion:

Senator HAYDEN's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

To the Boy Scouts of America:

Fifty years ago, a bill H.R. 755 was introduced in the 64th Congress of the United States. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, and the Senate on May 31, 1916. It was duly signed by the then Speaker of the House, Hon. Champ Clark, and by the Honorable John H. Bankhead, the President pro tempore of the Senate. The bill became law upon approval of President Woodrow Wilson on June 15, 1916. Section 3 of the act states:

"The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organization, and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts."

As a Member of the 89th Congress, who was also a Member of the 64th Congress, I greet and commend you, the members of the Boy Scouts of America and leaders of your 95,000 local chartered institutions, on this 1966 Boy Scout Week, which features and recognizes the golden anniversary of the charter.

The magnificent accomplishments of the Boy Scouts of America over the years, under the Federal charter have fully justified the confidence of the Congress and the people of our Nation. As a further evidence of national appreciation several of my colleagues joined with me in introducing Senate Concurrent Resolution S. 68, on January 14, 1966, which states in part:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth."

I have every hope that the Senate will adopt and the House of Representatives will concur in this resolution.

The need for the Boy Scouts of America is as timely today as it was in 1916. I would remind you that the purpose for which the charter was granted remains, and urge you to continue to pursue diligently your objectives to make Scouting available to all boys in every community throughout our beloved America.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senator from Arizona.

February 14, 1966

A 729

In South Vietnam, this first stage in the Giap theory has been working well for years. The hard truth of the situation in this country is that most of the peasantry (that is, most of the people) support the Vietcong. The guerrillas simply could not have grown so large without them. And the Vietcong propagandists work hard at holding that support.)

In the province of Kien Hoa in the Mekong Delta, the Vietcong were telling the peasants that American Negro soldiers were really cannibals from Africa, with a taste for small children. They said that the armored personnel carriers—a kind of roofed LST—contained machinery which ground prisoners into gruel. In one small town I visited, Army engineers were building a fluoridated water system to replace the centuries-old practice of drinking river muck. The Vietcong told the villagers that the fluoridated water was all an American plot—which should surprise some of the homefront commandos who have been shouting for years now that fluoridated water is all some kind of Communist plot.

The more serious—and more effective—propaganda is that which attempts to make the Americans a mere extension of the French, and our involvement in this country just another kind of colonial war.

"They tell the people that we're coming to get the country back for the French," one American AID representative told me. "They tell them that we will make them pay back rent, back taxes, fines. And we have no way of saying that is not true. With the present government in Saigon, it is true."

The Americans are trying almost desperately to convince their Vietnamese allies here (the Vietcong call them "American valets") to really make an effort to enlist the people's support. "But they're just not interested," the AID representative told me. "They build an 'Open Arms' center for returning Vietcong, and they leave it a filthy mess. We've requested 17 times for the Saigon authorities to send us some small amenities: a typewriter, some tables, perhaps a phonograph. They don't even answer the letters. They fly over one day dropping tons of leaflets explaining how glorious their government is, and the next day they send over defoliation teams to poison the crops. It doesn't make any sense."

When Giap stresses that guerrillas should be scrupulously honest in dealings with villagers, it is because as a Vietnamese, he knows what a foul reputation soldiers have in his country. The French troops would take food and women the way some people pluck strawberries. Today, the ARVN soldiers enter a town and proceed to plunder it for such paltry items as chickens, pottery, and water. Gen. William C. Westmoreland is determined that American troops will not do such things and was even moved to prepare a leaflet explaining manners to the foot-soldiers.

One of the unfortunate things we have going against us is our color. It might be difficult to convince people that Marx, Engels, and Lenin are the keys to earthy salvation. It is not difficult to explain that the Vietcong are only fighting to get the foreigners out of the country. For some of the more politically conscious young men in Vietnam, it is as natural to join the Vietcong as it was for an Irish kid to join the IRA after 1916.

Until last year this was not a crucial problem. But there are over 200,000 American soldiers here now, and more coming, and their presence is highly visible. In Saigon alone there are 23,000 Americans and they dominate the face of the city. I can't believe that a Vietnamese youth will sing the praises of the Americans when any night of the week he can see GI's buying his women.

Giap's work constantly repeats the need for a well-defined enemy, and the Vietnamese Government is doing its best to help him. If the South Vietnamese were a revolutionary movement, instead of a group

of spokesmen for personal interests, they would rob the Vietcong of their only reason for existence: revolution.

"Why do the Communists have to have the patent on revolution?" that AID representative told me. "Why is our country always on the side of the anti: the anti-Communists, the antirevolutionaries? We seem to think that no revolution in this century can be non-Communist. And yet the great strength of the Vietcong, and of the old Vietminh, was the great masses of people who were stirred by nationalism and revolution. Not by communism."

In South Vietnam there was never much difficulty for the Vietcong in lining up the inhabitants of the countryside, specifically because all the necessary conditions for revolt were there. Giap's political base is there, as hard, and stubborn as he could desire. With that established, the Vietcong were free to act in more daring military fashion.

Giap breaks down the revolutionary army into three classes, and defines them this way: "The task of the regulars is to carry a war of movement over a wide theater of operation, in order to wipe out the enemy's main forces. The regional troops operate in their own localities and insure the coordination of tasks between the regulars and the guerrillas.

"The guerrillas defend their own villages, take a hand in production and join the regular and regional forces to prepare for and then engage in battle."

The army never attacks until it is sure of victory. When faced with overwhelming opposition, it flees to fight another day. When the American troops pile into deserted villages by the thousands, the Vietcong are usually gone. They are not fools.

Giap's theory also calls for a three-phase war, with no time limits. The first phase in South Vietnam is over. This is a defensive war, during which the population is split from the government, the roads are destroyed, and the enemy is isolated in large cities. The second phase is swift, mobile guerrilla warfare, which forces the enemy to divide and disperse his forces. The third phase is a general counteroffensive, destroying the enemy's main units, as the Vietminh did to the French at Dienbienphu. Most experts, American, French, and Vietnamese, say that the Vietcong are now in phase 2.

It is Giap's belief that no democracy can fight the kind of long, brutal, frustrating war that the Vietcong are now waging.

Giap knows that governments of democracies must answer to the people. In a war like this, if it lasts long enough, someone will begin shouting about bringing the boys home for Christmas. Someone will recognize that the war will mean endless casualties, loss of treasure, and a growing national disgust. At that point, Giap is known to believe, the Americans will sue for peace. This is why neither Hanoi nor the Vietcong are very interested in negotiations. They think they can win.

Giap is fortunate in that his admirers in the Vietcong have the perfect enemy to oppose. That awful 20th century phrase—the minds and hearts of the people—is really what this war is about, and the Saigon authorities really don't care very much about them.

But Giap, like most Communist theoreticians, reminds one of poor Ivan Karamazov who loved humanity and hated people. Giap was prepared, in the war against the French, to take as many casualties as were necessary.

"Hundreds of thousands of men die every minute on the earth," he once wrote. "Even if they are Vietnamese, the deaths of a hundred, a thousand, or tens of thousands of men amount to very little."

Th Vietcong believe the same, and there will be a lot of dead here in the next few years to underline it.

Textile Industry Supports Clean Water Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry is playing a leading role in the campaign to clean up our rivers and streams. Mr. Louis L. Jones, Jr., president of Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga., recently delivered an outstanding address to the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste.

I commend Mr. Jones' great and timely address to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the United States.

WATER POLLUTION; CHALLENGE TO INDUSTRIAL LEADERSHIP

We in the textile industry like to think that we started it all—the industrial revolution which swept first England and then this Nation. We like to hark back to our early beginning during the infancy of the United States. In 1790, Samuel Slater built the first textile mill to use mechanical methods successfully in Pawtucket, R.I. The mill still stands, now a museum. In 1793, Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin to make available for the first time an adequate supply of cheap lint cotton for use in the mass production of yarns and fabrics.

We of the textile industry like to think we have been a part of this Nation's progress and have kept pace with the needs of our country and our people. We call attention to the fact that a Georgia textile mill wove the duck for the covered wagons of our pioneer forefathers who pushed the Nation's frontier westward. That same company today manufactures the material which houses the tracking stations for Telstar. And the textile industry is a major contributor to the fabric of the space suits which protect our astronauts as they invade the vast new frontier of outer space.

We in the textile industry like to think we have always played an active role in the challenge of the times from those earliest days of our Nation's beginnings to the present.

During World War II the textile industry joined with many of our industrial brethren in a massive production effort which led ultimately to defeat of the Axis powers. To this day those men we fought against insist that it was not military force alone which overwhelmed them, but the fantastic capacity of the United States to produce the materials of war and supporting equipment used by our forces and our Allies.

It can be truly said that our great United States and its industries have walked hand in hand through peace and war. The Nation could not exist without industry, even as industry could not exist without Government.

It is difficult to imagine now how the first primitive industries, with their water-turned wheels, thrived in our young country. What did they face? What did they see—these hardy ancestors of ours who forged the path from the Atlantic to the Pacific? If only our children today might see a little of the great natural beauty of our Nation as it was in those days. If only we had been privileged to see it. But along with industry and progress came tragedy and waste. The forests were exploited and the land's topsoil treasury was washed down the rivers into the sea. The passenger pigeon was so ruthlessly slain for commercial use that the bird became ex-

inct. The buffalo, once numbering 40 million, was hunted so relentlessly that fewer than 300 survived by 1900.

These are but examples of the tragedies that accompanied the civilizing of this great Nation—tragedies of wastefulness, thoughtlessness, exploitation. But today there is an even sadder story to tell, because the very air we breathe is now jeopardized. Our once pure streams, rivers and national waters are a national disgrace. The pollution of our river basins and natural waters has reached such a serious stage that even an all-out effort now may not be enough to stem the tide of corruption with which 20th century man in the United States seems intent upon poisoning himself.

A famous philosopher once said, "No man steps into the same river twice." Today's thinking man might say judiciously, "In most of our rivers he would do better not to step at all." Potent fumes which rise from some of our Nation's polluted rivers have peeled paint from the walls of nearby buildings. The Public Health Service has isolated live polio, infectious hepatitis and more than 30 other viruses which may carry disease from treated sewage effluent. Because we must repeatedly reuse our water, the chances are 4 out of 10 that the water we drink was flushed out of someone's household plumbing or out of an industrial plant sewer.

National health experts tell us it is only because our water treatment plants are the best in the world that we have safe drinking water. Because chlorine and other chemicals kill bacteria we can take "safe" drinking water from some of the world's worst polluted streams. It may not taste or smell good, but it is safe.

However, the experts are now wondering how safe is safe. Even with the chlorine cocktail treatment, there are foreign, sometimes exotic substances which come into our drinking water supply. There are only traces, it is true, but scientists are concerned about their long-range effect upon man. Some of the complex wastes now entering our streams are difficult or impossible to detect in water.

As the Nation grows and increases its demands upon industry and upon sewage systems, the pollution problem could easily outgrow us. Our industries, which use some 160 billion gallons of water each day, will be using more than twice that amount by 1980, according to present estimates. This means that by 1980 industry will use 394 billion gallons of water a day—two-thirds of the water used by the Nation.

Although our problem is staggering, we know that pollution control can be achieved. In the densely populated, heavily industrial Ruhr Valley of Western Germany, pollution control is so effective that the river remains safe for swimming and recreation activities.

But what is the outlook for our country and the terrible problem which faces us? Some trends are definite and inescapable. The public is alarmed.

More and more the newspapers, television and radio stations around us are spreading the concern about pollution. There have been national alarms over hepatitis-bearing oysters taken from sewage-polluted waters. Increasingly we see signs on beaches which say "Unsafe for Swimming." Fishermen and wildlife authorities from most States have angrily denounced fish kills and caused widespread publicity about them. The public outcry and concern about pollution rivals even civil rights and Vietnam news for top billing by the Nation's press.

In the put-up-or-shut-up category, New Yorkers lead the national parade, having recently voted passage of a \$1 billion bond issue to begin an earnest pollution cleanup in that State.

The Federal Government is in the picture bigger than life with the signing into law of recent pollution control legislation.

Our Nation, because of public opinion, its most forceful mover, is ready to move. It takes no great prophet to foretell that. Every one of you here, by your very presence, indicates your feeling that something must be done. The question is—how much? The answer from this minor prophet is—a lot. And soon. The time is long past for saying, "Let's wait and see how much we'll be made to do." For industry and for growing cities which have too long put off treatment of their pollution problems, it is already late.

In my home State of Georgia, the textile industry has pledged its support to the aims of the Georgia Water Quality Control Board. It is only a step in the right direction. Estimates have it that total industry expenditure in the State over the next 10 years will cost \$100 million for waste control installations and pilot treatment plants. Communities and cities have an even greater responsibility. Forty communities with 300,000 people have no sewage treatment at all. One hundred Georgia towns and cities, among them Atlanta, must expand existing sewage treatment facilities to meet the needs of 1,300,000 people. The total costs of these city and community sewage projects will amount to more than \$150 million.

The Georgia textile industry's pledge "to obey the spirit as well as the letter of the State's water quality control law" is not an idle one. Nor is it a publicity seeking statement, although the industry has received wide attention and acclaim for taking the position. Our industry leaders have planned seminars to discuss some revolutionary textile processing projects now underway at Georgia Tech. These projects hold great promise for drastic reduction of waste effluents for some textile plants. Moreover, we feel that many of our industrial members can profit from discussing pollution cleanup problems which they face and which have already been met by others. Above all, we hope to convince all our fellow members that pollution control is an obligation of the good corporate citizen.

In 1960 our plant in Canton began operation of a pollution control system which included sewage waste from part of the city. We hope to expand our system soon, taking in even more municipal waste, which, incidentally, augments our own waste control problem. We hope that by taking the lead in solving a pollution control problem which became acute for our plant and for the city when a Federal dam was built downstream about 1950, we have provided a good example for the city to follow. The city has now scheduled the building of a waste treatment plant which will cost half a million dollars and should adequately control all municipal wastes.

Although I mention the efforts of the textile industry to clean up pollution in Georgia, I would like to point out that the textile industries in North and South Carolina have made significant inroads on the problem there. A lot still must be done in all our States. And while I speak for the textile industry, I know there are many other industries which have impressive waste control programs underway.

Finally, I would hope that all of us—brothers in industry—could join hands in leading the national water pollution fight. Let us begin by acknowledging our obligation to pass on to others water that is as clean as the water we received. If those upstream are polluters, let us pass on water that is cleaner than the water we receive. Let us begin by conquering our own problems in waste treatment. Then let us lend support wherever it is needed—to fellow industrialists, to our communities, to our Nation. Let us put forth that concerted effort, the unstinting, unselfish effort of which American industry is capable. Let us commit ourselves unflinchingly as industry always does in time of crisis.

For I submit to you that we are in a crisis. The crisis involves the strength of the Nation. It involves the well-being of the Nation, the health of the Nation, the beauty of the Nation. It involves our self-respect.

We in industry must lead the fight to return to our children their natural heritage in its pristine form.

General Westmoreland's Typical Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been in Vietnam realize the magnitude of the job Gen. William C. Westmoreland is doing there. He exemplifies the finest traditions of the U.S. military, serving his country with courage, skill, and devotion.

I was most impressed by the Associated Press story Thomas Reedy wrote in yesterday's Sunday Star. In the event that it may have been missed by some of my colleagues, I have permission to insert it in the body of the RECORD:

A TYPICAL DAY IN THE LIFE OF GENERAL WESTMORELAND

(By Thomas A. Reedy)

SAIGON.—The general used everything but a canoe, and he'd have used that too, if necessary.

Armed helicopters, a fixed-wing light airplane, sedans, and jeeps and plain old-fashioned footslogging carried the general around part of his theater of command on one normal, action-packed day.

Matching strides with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the 51-year-old commander of U.S. forces in the Vietnam war, calls for a giant. Pygmies need not apply.

This day opened as usual with light calisthenics and breakfast at 6:30 a.m., a quick check of reports, into combat fatigues, and the general was off to the teeming Tan Son Nhut Airbase for a look-see in the field. By 8 o'clock the blades of the armed helicopter were whirling, a gunner at each wide-open door in a frozen attitude of alert.

PRISONER OF CLOCK

Aboard came Westmoreland's aide, Capt. Tom Sherburne, of Pensacola, Fla., and the man who would stenograph whatever reports should be transmitted to the top channels of the Military Assistance Command Vietnam. He was Capt. Ken Kleypas, of Hobbs, N. Mex.

"I'm a captive of schedules," said the general, a lean 6-footer with a lantern jaw, the energy of a tank and the hands of a pianist. "I've got to be a prisoner of the clock or I would never get my work done."

The clock required landing at Phuoc Vinh, where the 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, was deployed. At 5 minutes to 9, on schedule, the helicopter sat down. The jeep convoy moved into the artillery perimeter, crews at attention behind their sandbags.

Westmoreland fired questions at the men who fire the guns and they fired back the answers. He seemed more interested in how they answered, their state of mind, than in which words they were using.

FAVORITE THEMES

He addressed the men by their names, here and there recognized soldiers who served with him in Korea, asked sometimes their hometowns, how long they had been in the field, or in the Army how they were feeling.

February 14, 1966

A731

By the time he got through with the outfit and headed in huge strides for the mess tent, he was able to say:

"Sergeant, I congratulate you. The men say the chow is good and when they say that, it must be so. So I won't bother to inspect."

Further into the woods the interrogation proceeded. How was the road opening work going? And then the general got on two of his favorite themes: What are the relationships with the South Vietnamese militia in the neighborhood, and what is the division doing in the way of civic actions—linking up to help the populace, cement friendship and with success and time be able to leave behind a lasting image?

An officer said the militia's "popular force" in the sector was wary at first. One man spoke only Vietnamese the first day and then on the second day spoke rather good English. His distrust had been broken down that quickly.

Another dart toward the dispensary tent, a spic and span layout which won a compliment for Capt. Albert Maggioni of Buffalo, N.Y. Westmoreland warned him to keep after the men's feet—the oldest advice in the infantry—and while he was on the subject turned to other officers and urged them to have plentiful supplies of socks.

"In the monsoon season these men are going to have wet feet for many hours," Westmoreland said.

KNOW ABOUT FEET

He knows about feet, at Kasserine Pass, the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine, and Korea.

A quick glance at the watch and the schedule and the helicopter was off again for a 40-minute ride to Xuan Loc and the 10th Army of the Republic of Vietnam Division.

Gen. Lu Lan, smiling and courteous, along with his top American adviser, Col. Charles Reiderbaugh, of Carlisle, Pa., did the honors. With a pointer and a map, General Lan told of some considerable success at clearing the Vietcong out of the "rice bowl." He said his division had secured the area with a population of 30,000 people loyal to the Government.

Westmoreland wanted to know something deeper: How do his troops get along with the countrymen? What are they doing to raise the prestige of the village and hamlet chiefs and elders?

At the time of Tet, the sacred lunar New Year holiday, did the people as well as the soldiers have all the food they needed for a happy celebration?

Lu Lan beamed as though he was on certain ground.

"Yes, we had everything for Tet," he said.

"And our men are getting along fine with the people. I have three fundamental orders to the troops when they go into populated places. They are: First, smile; second, salute the people, and third, when you see a chance to help somebody clear up his place or trying to do a chore too big for him, help him."

MAKING HISTORY

The American commander commended General Lan, knowing he was in fact making history. Armies in this part of the world have traditionally been overbearing, often cruel and the suffering populace has had little faith in the soldier.

The inexorable clock beckoned and it was off again by chopper due south to the South China seacoast hamlet of Ham Tan. It's a remote spot, Vietcong to the left, Vietcong to the right, Vietcong controlling the main highway whenever they choose to stop traffic and exact taxes. They had just blown a bridge and it could be seen from the air. That bridge had been rebuilt by Lan's men five times.

What would it take to control that highway, the American commander inquired.

The group of American advisers as well as the Vietnamese officers at Ham Tan broke into big smiles. They knew the general was half serious, half jesting. Colonel Reiderbaugh said, "give me four or five choppers and when they start their tax collecting we can do them in, but this way we can't get there quickly enough."

NEVER ENOUGH

The colonel knew that asking for that many choppers was asking for the moon. The whole theater is so enormous there never seems enough to go around—the plaint of the American soldier ever since Valley Forge.

Westmoreland wished them all a happy Tet and then, addressing the province chief and the Vietnamese officer, told them he knew the past Year of the Snake was an unhappy one for them.

"But this is the Year of the Horse," he declared. "You know the horse is a strong animal. He can gallop down the road and he can hurdle obstacles. I am confident this horse will gallop and will hurdle these obstacles and we can proceed to success. My country has reaffirmed our determination to stand behind you and help you bring peace to your land. I feel our American troops will be effective in your fight for your country."

"Never in all history have military men to two countries worked so closely together," he said. "We are making history. And after we succeed in helping you win peace in your land, then and only then, shall we return to our homeland."

It was after 1 o'clock and a brief hop to a forward air control field nearby enabled Westmoreland to chat with the pilots. Then he shifted from the helicopter, thanked the crew and got aboard his four-seater Beechcraft. It headed due north to Bao Loc, the capital of Lam Dong Province. Out came sandwiches and cold tea for lunch, taken literally on the fly.

BRIEFED IN ENGLISH

The twin-engine craft sat down on the dirt strip on the tea plantation with a bounce which elicited from the general the dry comment: "Not much margin there." And from his aide: "You've got to use every inch of this strip."

Lt. Col. Ngo Nhu Bich, the province chief, and his American military advisers were ready with a limousine bearing four stars. The briefing by the chief, in excellent English, was an uncomplaining recital of a province plagued with both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese at times, and too little equipment for too big a job.

Colonel Bich responded to the general's best wishes for Tet, saying:

"Tet is the time of pardon, of friendship, and of gratitude. Even the worst enemies (except Communists) are forgiven."

"One year has passed, through bad and good days. Some valiant soldiers have fallen, obscure heroes of freedom and democracy."

MEETS FAMILY

He referred to "we" in his message and then said: "This term includes, for sure, American pilots working day and night, American officers and NCO's crisscrossing the jungle with their Vietnamese friends, American civilian officials performing their job with nothing else but a desire to help. You are those valiant Americans. May our foreign friends who share our difficulties and fight our own fight know that they are in a part of our heart."

From there the group proceeded to the colonel's house where Westmoreland presented the colonel's wife with a spray of flowers and met the couple's seven children.

The demanding timepiece intruded again. Westmoreland had to be back in Saigon to see Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge by 4 p.m. And it was already after 3 o'clock.

The Beechcraft took off and the pilot really gunned it. At Tan Son Nhut there was the usual stackup. Four fighter-bombers were taking off. Two big cargo and troop-carrier planes were arriving. A half dozen helicopters were in the stream. On the ground the general's plane taxied carefully among a swirl of propellers. Westmoreland said goodbye before the wheels had stopped and leaped out to a waiting car and hurried off to his meeting with Lodge.

HUMAN COMPUTER

After the meeting with the Ambassador, Westmoreland visited his opposite numbers in the Vietnamese high command to wish them a happy New Year.

This was pushing the day into the night. What was he doing that night:

"I'm tired," said his aide, "but the general relieves me mostly of social functions. He goes generally alone. Then he works at home."

That's quite a day.

It would be quite a day even for a mechanical computer which lacked all emotion.

Come to think of it, the commanding general was doing a lot of computing for one human being in every one of the multiple roles he had played.

Vietnam: The Endless War—Article VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, the New York Post published the last of six articles written from Saigon by Reporter Pete Hamill. The articles have been informative as well as provocative. Pete Hamill has realistically appraised the situation and in the final article discusses the hard choices in Vietnam which confront us.

The author says:

The truth is that it is absurd to think of negotiating a solution to the war without making the Vietcong, and their political arm, the National Liberation Front, a party to the proceedings. They made the revolution—with the support of North Vietnam and China, to be sure—and they will have a say in how it ends.

I urge my colleagues to read the following:

VIETNAM: THE ENDLESS WAR—ARTICLE VI:
THE CHINESE PUZZLE
(By Pete Hamill)

SAIGON.—There is no way to discuss the bitter choices we face in Vietnam without considering the size, power, history, and ambitions of China.

China is there; it will not go away; and there has not been so much as a single sentence from Peiping in the years since 1949 to indicate that as a nation China is anything other than our enemy. Its 700 million inhabitants are ruled by hardfisted old men whose language is violent and inflexible. With its fledgling atomic weapons and huge land army, it stands unchallenged as the most powerful nation in Asia. Its variety of communism is single minded and ruthless, and its history as a nation is one marked by repeated attempts at territorial expansion.

"There is no doubt in my mind that you Americans are making a stand in Vietnam against China," one British military man