

desires and aspirations of President Johnson and develop guidelines that will extend the principles of higher education in the area of international education.

The presence of more than 80,000 foreign students on our campuses is only one indication of the readiness of American higher education to devote its resources to international education. More than 20,000 of these students receive financial support from the colleges and universities they attend. A majority of the students are the beneficiaries of special programs and services which are provided at considerable cost to our academic institutions.

Our Government must rely heavily on American colleges and universities in establishing programs for emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These faculty members must carry the burden of setting up appropriate educational systems in the developing nations, in advising ministries of education, in conducting research and evaluating studies, in interesting the host countries' teachers in the most effective methods of teaching their people.

THE FINAL THOUGHT

It is obvious that the American commitment to education now embraces undergraduate-level training for the maximum number of our citizens. We appear to have determined as a people that a college education is nearly, if not quite, indispensable to mankind's work and citizenship alike. For the great majority of our educated citizens, therefore, the prime opportunity for promoting literacy in other cultures and societies will be during the undergraduate years.

The several parts of President Johnson's program for international education, and, especially, the International Education Act of 1966, give great promise of changing the current state of affairs. The keynote of this change was sounded in the President's Smithsonian address in his declaration that "learning respects no geographic boundaries." The new approach to the new role for education was set forth unequivocally in his message to the Congress on international education. The principle cannot be stated more simply or forcefully than in one passage of that message: "Education lies in the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of international relations."

**Judge Thomas F. Meaney Retired
 After 24 Years**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1966, the Honorable Thomas F. Meaney, senior U.S. district court judge for the district of New Jersey, retired from active Federal service after over 24 years of distinguished service on the Federal bench.

I would like to relate the highlights of his outstanding legal career which spans over 50 years.

Judge Meaney, who was born in Jersey City, N.J., on September 6, 1888, was admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1911 and then became a counselor at law in 1914. He received an A.B. degree from St. Peter's College in 1908, a master's degree

from St. Peter's in 1909, and an LL.B. degree from Fordham Law School in 1911.

Judge Meaney served as first lieutenant of infantry with the 51st Pioneer Infantry, 1st Division in France in World War I.

Judge Meaney's road to Federal service began with his legal apprenticeship in the firm of Tumulty & Cutley in Jersey City. He also served as secretary to Mayor H. Otto Wittpenn of Jersey City.

Following 4 years of private practice, Judge Meaney began his judicial career in 1923 in the Hudson County Juvenile Court, having been offered an appointment by Gov. George S. Silzer. He was reappointed in 1928 and 1932.

Judge Meaney's work among juvenile offenders attracted wide attention, and he was chosen to represent the United States at the first International Conference of Juvenile Judges in Belgium.

In 1934, Judge Meaney was elevated to the Hudson County common pleas court by Gov. A. Harry Moore. He remained there until 1939, when he became counsel for the State banking and insurance commission. He was appointed to the Federal bench in 1942 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In February 1961, Judge Meaney was given a testimonial dinner by the Hudson County Bar Association in observance of his 50th year as a member of the New Jersey bar.

Judge Meaney has always had the reputation of being a hard-working member of the bench. Court statistics disclose he has been at the top or near the top in disposing of cases, and in having an excellent record of being upheld by appellate courts on cases taken from his court. Fortunately, the judge will continue to preside in special civil trials assigned to him and he promises to continue his association with members of the bar.

All of the foregoing accomplishments have recently led to a sincere tribute from the trustees of the Essex County Bar Association, which is proud to number Judge Meaney among its nearly 2,000 members.

Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the RECORD:

ESSEX COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION
 ADOPTED AT TRUSTEES' MEETING, APRIL 12, 1966

Whereas the Honorable Thomas F. Meaney has, since 1942, faithfully and efficiently served the bench and bar of the State of New Jersey as a judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey; and

Whereas Judge Meaney, particularly in his role as senior judge, has been called on daily for the exercise of wisdom, patience, firmness, restraint, humor, compassion, discretion, and all the other attributes which make for the complete jurist; and

Whereas effective May 1, 1966, Judge Meaney will retire from active Federal service; and

Whereas the trustees of the Essex County Bar Association wish to memorialize their feelings and sentiment concerning Judge Meaney as jurist, colleague, and friend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the trustees on behalf of the Essex County Bar Association express to the Honorable Thomas F. Meaney their thanks,

appreciation, respect and affection for his long, faithful and extremely efficient service as a Federal judge.

2. That the trustees of the Essex County Bar Association extend to the Honorable Thomas F. Meaney sincere wishes for good health, well-being, and contentment.

3. That the secretary of this association be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, Chief District Court Judge Thomas M. Madden, and Chief Judge Austin L. Staley of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. For the Trustees.

JAMES R. LACEY, *Trustee.*
 ERNEST F. KEER, Jr., *President.*

UN

Signs of Hope in Vietnam

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Johnson administration is dealing with the military and political situation in South Vietnam is a good one and the indications of a more widespread desire for political stability can only lead us to believe that our course was and is the correct one.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the comments of Robert G. Spivack on this matter as they appeared in his column in the April 21, 1966, edition of the New York Journal American.

The article follows:

SIGNS OF HOPE IN VIETNAM

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—In Vietnam about the only thing certain is that the unpredictable is sure to happen.

It takes pretty steady nerves to cope with these highly individualistic people and their undisciplined leaders. But the Johnson administration has demonstrated calm and good judgment under almost every conceivable circumstance.

From the time that U. Alexis Johnson, Ambassador Lodge's deputy, did not panic when the U.S. Embassy was bombed, right up to the latest political episode, our men in Saigon—Lodge, Westmoreland, Lonsdale—have all kept their heads.

Just because events are unpredictable does not always mean disaster. For example, there are aspects of the recent Buddhist uproar which are more hopeful than at first appeared, even assuming that there was a degree of Communist influence.

To begin with, the prospects of holding a free election next summer are fairly good. I think it is regrettable that we have not made this also an objective for the North Vietnamese. But if the South Vietnamese can carry the election off, it may make the North Vietnamese wonder why Hanoi's leaders do not test their own popularity.

The second development is that the Buddhists and the Catholics seem to have established communications. This could prove more important than negotiations with the Vietcong, because religious hostilities are often more rigid than political differences.

Third, the idea of civilian government is on the ascendancy, although where the free Vietnamese will find a strong, decisive leader remains to be seen. Perhaps out of the

May 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2539

Wash., Dr. Reuter spoke on the subject "International Education Must Be an Integrated Goal in American Life." Because of American concern for international education, I insert this address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION MUST BE AN
INTEGRATED GOAL IN AMERICAN LIFE

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Southern
Illinois University)

INTRODUCTION

Plato in "The Republic" envisaged an ideal society ruled by philosopher kings, whose formal education and life experiences were to qualify them to move society toward proper goals through the establishment of wise laws and prudent customs. Later Mr. Justice Brandeis noted: "A judge rarely performs his functions adequately unless the case before him is adequately presented." And recently, Archibald MacLeish stated: "the feel of America in the world's mind" has begun to change and faith in "the idea of America" has been shaken.

A coup d'oeil reveals that the original occupant of the pinnacle of leadership in the struggle to maintain ideological and secular paramountcy has been steadily losing ground to various interlopers. In international education, America can adopt the view of Walt Whitman in general or attempt to move forward in this area. Whitman suggested:

"Do I contradict myself?

Very well then I contradict myself.
I am large. I contain multitudes."

Education engenders a desire to know more. The establishment of courses in international education and the history of other peoples will bring us together in ways which cannot now be foreseen. We can turn toward the task of producing more Americans competent in leadership in this area. This program should have as the final goal the development of understandings with the less developed areas in lessening the gap in living standards between us and an developing mutual understanding and respect.

Desirous of strengthening our Nation's international educational commitment, American higher education cannot but welcome legislation which recognizes the necessity for long-range development of its capacity. Colleges and universities will continue to shoulder educational responsibility abroad in the public interest and they are expanding their efforts to increase this Nation's literacy in the cultures of others. Our ability to move forward effectively depends to no small measure upon Government's assistance in building up the necessary academic strengths.

It is essential that we integrate international education into the American ethic. To achieve this task, it will be difficult. We believe, for example, that the great majority of American citizens are dedicated, in various degrees, to instilling the virtues of Christianity in all mankind, but a minority disents. "One Blood"¹ offers a peaceful method of bridging the gap in this difficult area. This approach offers a giant step forward.

America must not stop with the Christian ethic, but we must support the Peace Corps, the Teachers Corps, and various forms of international educational programs around the world. Particular emphasis must be placed in helping the developing nations of the world. Let us then review the two important factors and suggest a meeting of the minds.

THE NECESSITY OF CHRISTIANITY

In our time, there are Americans who challenge God and Christianity and would like to

¹ George S. Reuter, Jr., August M. Hintz, and Helen H. Reuter, "One Blood" (Exposition Press: New York, 1964).

divorce political affairs from spiritual affairs. Often this lunatic fringe is insulting and void of inspiration or scholarship, yet a world without Christ is neither possible or desirable. The inspired Bible offers certain fundamental guarantees, and mankind must reflect this culture in any successful program of world understanding.

The love that God constantly gives to mankind is the reason for Christian life. Yes, it is on this that we stake our life's meaning. How trivial the question thus becomes, "Is God dead?" when placed alongside the certainty that God loves us. Once a living Christ is affirmed, the death of God is unthinkable. It reminds one of these words:

"I know not where God's islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care."

Nietzsche's thesis was that striving, self-centered man had killed God, and the tantalizing question of atheists still is whether God is dead. The revolt of Karl Marx against God was basically a revolt falsely conceived to be in behalf of the humanity of mankind. Marxist atheism left room for the Communists' worship of state, party, ideology, program, and future utopian goals. It was entirely wrong for Marx to attempt to relate theology to economics. There is no relationship between the two. In fact, it is desirable to be conservative in theology and liberal in economics, because this approach guarantees recognition of the inspired Bible, and, at the same time, shows concern for the economic welfare of all.

The God in the Bible is no respecter of tyranny; He respects the freedom of mankind. God is no despot, because He is patient with people. Surely there is a 2,000-year-old precedent for each Christian to go beyond good works to good deeds. No, God does not threaten humanity, but He promotes the best for the great masses. Marx was wrong in believing that the Christian churches were for the affluent only. Throughout his life, the Christian attempts to instill in others the devotion to Christianity and the sense of satisfaction. In fact, Christians are able to point with pride to several positive guideposts.

First, Christian America gave all its citizens the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the "Magna Carta" for collective bargaining. The Wagner Act, as it became known, included this sentence: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstruction to the free flow of commerce—by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing." This is a Christian principle.

Second, the century's greatest Christian theologian, Dr. John R. Rice, has consistently warned his fellow believers that God is very real and that faith in Christ and the Scripture are essential. Thus, any search for God that starts any other way is a vain quest that will fail.

Ancient Babylonia worshipped at least seven hundred deities. Church members sometimes look back nostalgically at the medieval world as the great age of faith, but we have Christian giants today too, and a major sin of America is the lack of recognition we give to the Christian statesmen.

Third, no Christian doctrine of God is possible without Jesus, because Calvary is fundamental to Christianity. Those theologians who believe that "God is dead" dramatize a crisis of belief for that group who have never been "born again." Many "modernist" theologians and writers have qualms about the quality and character of contemporary belief. In search for meaning many of these leaders have turned to psychiatry or drugs, but

neither is the answer. Only Christ is the answer.

Fourth, Christianity recognizes only first-class citizens. The Apartheid regime in South Africa, while primarily a tragedy for that country's nonwhite majority, also compromises the fundamental principles of Christianity. Protection of the physical safety of the lives and property of all mankind is a basic and primary purpose for which society was established and which Christians must support. It is thus a violation of Christian theology to have second-class citizens in any section of the world.

Fifth, though Christians have little sympathy with the "God is dead" thinking, they will grant a measure of freedom of dissent. Christians must, however, resist the attempts of some non-Christians to remove Christianity from public institutions. Those who seek to remove Bible reading, without comment; general prayers; religious services at graduation time, chaplains from government bodies and the armed services; and religious carols at Christmastime are out of step with the teaching of our Founding Fathers and are parties to efforts at destroying our beloved Nation.

THE NECESSITY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

With a fundamental foundation in Christian theology, all mankind must be given the benefits of quality education.² America's role in international education must be vast and growing to guarantee the principle. It is essential to win the lost to Christ, but it is also necessary to provide the educational opportunities that will result in building free and independent countries around the world that accept democracy as a way of life, because of reason, and that these peoples foster healthy economies.

The most efficacious way of helping countries that are currently in the development process is by aiding them in upgrading their human resources. Education is the key which opens most doors in this state of development. As more of their people become literate and skilled, these nations will be able to use their natural resources intelligently and efficiently, thereby, improving their economic well-being and gaining political stability.

One of the greatest threats to peace is the widening of the gap between standards of living in developed and in the less developed countries. The peace for which America is working is much more than the absence of war; it is a creative peace, marshaling resources to fight starvation and disease, ignorance and prejudice.

Several years ago Wendell L. Willkie talked and wrote of "One World," and a few years later Adlai E. Stevenson spoke of "Two Worlds." Just recently, U.S. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT spoke of some of the same issues, when he said: "There are two Americas. One is the America of Lincoln and Adlai Stevenson; the other is the America of Teddy Roosevelt and General MacArthur. One is generous and humane, the other narrowly egotistical; one is modest and self-critical, the other arrogant and self-righteous; one is sensible, the other romantic; one is good humored, the other solemn; one is inquiring, the other pontificating; one is moderate and restrained, the other filled with passionate intensity."

As we enter the second half of the sixties, it is my opinion that the ideal of international education can come closer to realization only if we stretch the capacity of professional education to its outer limits in nearly all directions. Applying the pressure of a probing mind, we should thus formulate a quality program that will execute the

² George S. Reuter, Jr. and Helen H. Reuter, "Democracy and Quality Education" (Educational Research Association of the U.S.A.: Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

May 10, 1966

A2541

election procedure someone will come forth. This is the big question mark because the Vietnamese "elite" are so much like the French they are likely to whittle away at anyone who gets out front, or shows much promise of leadership.

That's the reason, of course, that there is a military government in South Vietnam right now.

In forcing free elections, the Buddhist priests may, inadvertently, also have provided a way for the war to end. For the foreseeable future there will be two Vietnams, as there are two Germanys and two Chinas. But a freely elected government in Saigon may be able to talk to Hanoi and the Communists may not think they would be "losing face," as they seem to feel about the prospect of sitting down with the Americans.

The important point to bear in mind is that by our military action we have helped equalize the situation. Two years ago the Communists were on the verge of military victory. Now that eventuality is quite dim, if not impossible.

If through free elections a relatively stable, progressive government emerges, our military mission could be entering a phase somewhat like that in South Korea. We would be there, if needed, but not actively engaged.

Big Government Grows Bigger: Why Not Federal Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the concern of the taxpayers in my district in California is reflected in the editorials of the Burbank Daily Review of April 26, and 28, 1966. The President's recent request to housewives to cut their kitchen budgets becomes ridiculous when compared with the "fats and sweets" which adorn the Federal budget. Let the President cut the "high calorie" budget before he tells American families to buy cheap foods. Businessmen have felt the pinch of inflation; industrial workers find that their paychecks do not go as far; retired people and pensioners are being made into the "new poor" class by rising prices; building contractors are suffering the costs of a slump in construction caused by inflation; servicemen, already making a sacrifice for this country, are being undercut in essential housing for their families. And still the costs of big government go up, up, up. Is this the Great Society?

I commend these two editorials to your attention:

THE TAXPAYERS PAY: BIG GOVERNMENT GROWS BIGGER

Most citizens are probably aware that governments are not a source of wealth.

Every penny a government spends has to come from the producing sector of the economy—the people in private enterprise who pay the taxes.

In spite of this, many persons tend to look at Federal or State subsidies as a bonanza from some faraway place and avidly seek government participation in various projects that could better be accomplished at the local level.

The result has been a phenomenal growth in Government spending and disproportionate additions to Government payrolls. The catch is that the persons on the Government payrolls really are not a source of wealth either. Their sustenance depends on income from the private sectors.

If the trend continues, there is every likelihood that the point of no return will be reached—the level when the private producing citizens can no longer support the costs of Government.

The total public employment has reached a payroll of about 10 million persons today. It is increasing much faster than the payroll in private industry.

In 1950 there were 39 million workers in nonagricultural jobs paying taxes to support 6 million public employees. In other words, 10 persons on the public payroll spread their costs over 65 private workers.

In 1960 there were 45.8 million persons on private payrolls and 8.5 million people working for governments. It meant the proportion had gone down to 54 industrial workers for each 10 persons in government.

In 1964, the trend continued. There were 49.9 million private employees and 9.9 million public employees for a ratio of 50 tax-producing persons to 10 tax-consuming persons.

The figures are not in for 1965-66 fiscal year, but there is no doubt the additions to Government payrolls will show a large increase again because of the so-called Great Society programs.

Additionally, the broad expansion of the Federal social programs assures that the growth will continue in the years ahead, adding to Government payrolls through the creation of new agencies and satellite bureaucrates.

Not all of the blame can be laid on the Federal Government. State and local payrolls are among those growing most rapidly.

It is a genuine cause for concern. Unless each person constantly insists on government efficiency and only the minimum of services necessary, the trend and taxes will rise constantly.

MONEY PINCH HITS THE PUBLIC: WHY NOT FEDERAL ECONOMY?

The seeming determination of Congress to make substantial cuts in the President's request for \$3.4 billion in foreign aid next year is encouraging.

It also makes sense in our Nation which is constantly harassed in recent years with problems of budget deficits, loss of U.S. dollars to other nations, inflation, and a war in Vietnam.

Presidential cognizance of the domestic problem has come through tax reforms that will bring the Federal Government \$6 billion more in revenue in the year ahead.

Businessmen were touched by the problem when they were forced to curb spending for plant expansion abroad and decrease or eliminate justified price increases at home.

Families have been affected by the problem through the continuing inflation. The President has asked housewives to put on their glasses, take a pencil in hand and shop carefully to buy only the cheapest groceries.

Contractors have felt the squeeze through an announcement that up to \$1 billion in construction programs will be held in abeyance until the domestic financial problems mitigate.

U.S. servicemen, already making sacrifices for their country, also have felt the domestic cutbacks when the Defense Department postponed construction of essential housing.

On the broad canvas the Federal emphasis to strike at financial problems has touched every single person in the United States to a greater or lesser degree.

It makes sense, then, to cut back also on the programs abroad that the U.S. taxpayer

is subsidizing. Since 1948 that subsidy has totaled more than \$100 billion.

There is considerable evidence that substantial cuts—up to the \$1 billion proposed by Republicans—can be made without hurting the U.S. self-interest.

In the last 20 years the United States has spent millions on worthless foreign public works programs and spent even more on nations that are hostile to America and always will be. Equally questionable is the proposal to spend more than \$350 million in the next year to export so-called Great Society education and health programs abroad.

The broad purpose of foreign aid, which is to help friendly or neutral nations approach self-sufficiency, is sound. That purpose, however, is defeated when the aid is squandered on enemies, wasted, or if it creates a new dependency on the United States.

It is time for the administration to put on its spectacles, sharpen its pencil and like the housewife, start trimming. Hopefully, the stiffening resistance by Congress to foreign aid will force this action.

Motor Vehicle Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Adolph Fram, president of the Peoples Cab Co., of Pittsburgh, has made an important contribution to the testimony now being taken by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on motor vehicle safety. I think that Mr. Fram's experiences in this area will be of interest to all Members of the Congress. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his testimony at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MAY 5, 1966

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I am Adolph Fram, president of the Peoples Cab Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa. I am also owner of the company.

I appear before you not to criticize for the sake of criticizing. We believe that our qualifications to testify have foundation and are historic in the area. We have had an experience with motor vehicles and operations of 17 years of "severe-use" fleet service which no doubt would require many decades of "testing" by any institution not related to such "severe-use" fleet exposure.

We have urged for many years the need to create a National Traffic Safety Agency within the framework of a Cabinet-level Office of Transportation.

The function of this agency shall be the culling, evaluating, and disseminating of information to the public in an effort to reduce motor vehicle accidents, eliminate a percentage of them entirely, hence saving life, limb, and fortune.

The needless, mysterious, murderous, atrocities must end. It is incumbent upon us to initiate the most important issue to face the American people and its Congress in modern history. President Johnson, last week, revealed that more American servicemen are killed by motor vehicles in the United States than have been killed in Vietnam.

We must not leave to others or to our children the responsibility of performing this

task. Statistics point to a 30 million motorist involvement in this year. You are acquainted with the number killed and maimed each year. These figures are publicized and known by all.

With the ever-increasing percentages rising, at least one out of every three motorists will be involved in an auto accident this year. It is unfair to the public and our heirs to impose upon them the legacy of this growing, terrifying prospect.

We have witnessed countless accidents and have investigated thousands. It is true, undeniably, that auto and tire design and construction are woefully lacking.

In 1959 we purchased a fleet of 104 new vehicles. Within a short period of time these autos fell apart, literally disintegrated.

Seventy-nine rear axles sheared off. Wheels rolled down the street. The vehicles collapsed. The drivers, passengers, and the public were jeopardized.

Motor mounts shattered and the motor (engine) dropped onto the frame. This pulled the entire driveline out of shape. The auto would grind to a halt. Five hundred, and fifty such motor mounts shattered or cracked.

Headliners (inner lining of the roof) collapsed. Seat springs collapsed. Engines literally exploded. The metal was poor and thin. They could not be rebuilt and retained in service. Metal specifications did not meet the manufacturer's own requirement. This auto manufacturer recently expired, but the damage inflicted lives on.

Headliners (inner lining of the roof) collapsed. Seat springs collapsed. Engines literally exploded. The metal was poor and thin. They could not be rebuilt and retained in service. Metal specifications did not meet the manufacturer's own requirement. This auto manufacturer recently expired, but the damage inflicted lives on.

Is there a problem in auto design? Is there a problem in manufacture? The answer is unequivocally "Yes."

There have been charges at these hearings that the roads and drivers are chiefly responsible. A "heavyweight" witness stated that "75 percent of motorist's injuries were caused by car design." These percentages will dissipate when true causation is learned.

Design and manufacture are not the only problems. The spotlight here in Washington has been focused on the auto and tire people and the area of controversy has been so confined that the greatest danger to our national interest in these investigations has been completely overlooked.

We are talking about the small contact area which exists between the tires and the roadway. This "footpad" is just about the size of your two hands.

All of the designing, engineering, and manufacturing brains and skill of this Nation can add to naught if this area is ignored. Army tank construction, seat belts, harnesses, padded dashes, rollover bars, collapsible steering columns, recessed instruments, disc brakes, and any other additive will not remove the danger which kills and maims today, nor will it do so tomorrow, if the manufacturers and the public ignore or are unaware of these two tire-road contact danger areas.

Contact danger area No. 1 is hydroplaning. The mysterious, phenomenon of the front wheels of any auto raising off the roadway beginning at approximately 37 miles per hour, when that roadway is rain soaked or snow slushy, summer or winter, North or South. As the speed increases the front wheels leave the roadway entirely—now the auto is hydroplaning, just like a water tanker.

Do the public, auto, and tire people know this? Do they know that when brakes are applied that the back wheels dig into the roadway and that the auto must reduce its speed from the state of hydroplaning suspension and sink back to the roadway before steering or braking capabilities are effected?

Can you imagine the helpless floundering of the auto, and can you coin-toss or guess in which direction the vehicle will head? Will it crash into the medial strip (if there is one) oncoming traffic, a bridge abutment, adjoining lane of traffic? Will the auto straighten out and will the driver and his

passengers breathe with relief "that was close?" How much longer should the public remain in a stupor and complete ignorance of this terrifying situation?

Our "severe-use" fleet experience uncovered this monstrous mystery about 12 years ago on a rain-soaked Bigelow Boulevard in Pittsburgh.

The aircraft industry and the Armed Forces were plagued with this problem. They believed they "skidded on wet runways" when actually the aircraft was hydroplaning. The seriousness was apparent.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) tackled the problem. Their experiences and tests were astounding. They discovered that aircraft, including the glants, were suspended on a tough film of water and this enormous weight was actually hydroplaning in landing on wet runways.

Walter B. Horne and Upshar T. Joyner, aeronautical research scientists, of NASA, Langley Research Center, delivered a paper to the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE 970C) on "Pneumatic Tire Hydroplaning and Some Effects on Vehicle Performance."

A copy is available here for your perusal and study.

Hydroplaning is real. It is not theory or speculation. Coincidentally, while this paper was being presented in Detroit, we were testifying before the Federal Trade Commission here in Washington on the matter of tires on the same day, January 15, 1965, and a main portion of our presentation was relative to the same and identical—tire hydroplaning.

We were not acquainted with these scientists at NASA. Last month, April 6, 1966, we corresponded. Upshar Joyner heard our story and related it to his own experiences. He seemed impressed. He said he would come see us.

Wednesday, April 20, Upshar Joyner visited us at our Peoples Cab terminal in Pittsburgh. It was a memorable day for us. Our "way out" themes and experiences were confirmed.

We wish that the American public could have listened in on this heart-rendering analysis. An unknown, hideous monster responsible for unrecorded, incalculable tragedy was laid bare.

We discussed danger area No. 2:

The spacing between the ribs or treads of tires are known as gutters or channels and wash away the water from the roadway surface. This "drying process" is required and absolutely necessary to permit an auto to stop in a straight line with the vehicle under full driver control.

If there is a variance of tread depth in each of the four tires the washing away of water and the "drying" are not equivalent nor simultaneous, hence the auto will "pivot" around the tires with the most effective drying capability.

There are no statistics to indicate the havoc results here.

How many Americans know this?

Here is another case of mass poisoning:

So-called safety experts have discovered that heat generated by tires on dry roadway at high speeds is injurious to the tires and many things happen. Hence, if it is raining, or the roadway is wet the rubber tire remains relatively cool, therefore, it is reason that the motorist can really speed down the pike. This poisonous theory sows the seeds of its own destruction. The rubber tire remains cooler, but it is not on terra firma, it is hydroplaning.

The motoring public must halt. Stop. This information must be made available without delay. We are a party to unconscionable tragedy if we do not act now.

Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, in his address to the House on February 3, 1966, hit the nail squarely on the head. He spoke of "causation of accidents." Everyone knows the results of accidents. But how are they caused?

NASA, in the SAE paper, talks of "the viscous fluid separating the tire tread from the roadway." If this fluid (water, etc.) isn't properly dispersed, accidents are caused. (Water acts as lubricant, the same as oil placed on metal parts to prevent the parts from rubbing against each other.)

Here, therefore, is a prime example of two institutions in different leagues, possibly unknown to each other, but who can set forth clarity and understanding in an area so vital to each other and to the Nation.

Another important American institution remains "stepchild." There is no doubt that in certain auto negligence cases that the cause of justice is seriously impaired when these two danger areas remain mysterious and unknown.

We believe we have made the point. Auto design is a problem, but not the true causation of the overwhelming toll of highway accidents.

We have stumbled upon and uncovered a menace. We have also developed a cure. A program of illustration to condition the driver, and a physical application to tires, to speed the puncture of the viscous fluid and hold the vehicle under control, used by us in our Pittsburgh terminal, have reduced our accident frequency. Truck and various fleets also sing the praises of this program.

We strenuously urge the creation of a National Traffic Safety Agency. It will cull, evaluate, and disseminate such vital information and gain the experience of others, particularly "severe use" fleet operators.

Our Congress is faced with an unprecedented issue and it must resolve to act without delay to eliminate and reduce to the irreducible the carnage on the American road.

We know it will be done. The people seek it. We pray that the Congress responds affirmatively and without delay.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

areas of choice hardwood bottomland being drained and cleared in the South to produce soybeans and other annual crops. No, I don't think we should count too much in the long run on conversion of cropland to timber production to offset the loss of forest area we see going on all around us.

We need to try and relate this knowledge to the future overall timber supply and demand situation. All of you, I'm sure, share my pleasure with the improved timber situation and outlook that is revealed in the timber trends report. Yet, since this study was completed, events have caused me to become increasingly concerned about one of the most basic assumptions. Although the timber trends report did emphasize the importance of making allowances for non-timber uses of forest land in setting long-range timber growth goals, it was not possible to make a quantitative analysis of this factor.

In short, the timber trends projections of timber supply do not include an allowance for "leakage"—in any ownership class. They assume that about the same acreage of commercial forest land—amounting to 509 million acres in 1962—will continue to be available throughout the century. Yet we see evidence of leakage and we know that pressures and promotion of non-timber uses on forest land will continue, and probably increase dramatically.

I could spend quite a bit of time telling you of these growing pressures on national forest lands because we experience them everyday. Individuals and organizations are pushing hard on many fronts to tie up public lands and resources for uses and activities that would limit or even prevent timber harvesting. These pressures run the gamut from opposition to clearcutting, to modification of harvests in timbered landscapes, to setting aside forest areas through legislation. These same pressures apply to State and other public lands—even the industrial lands are not immune.

The point today, however, is that these pressures are also building fast on nonindustrial lands in private ownership. We don't have any good way to measure or forecast these impacts in terms of reduced timber yields, or acres set aside, or in any other units that would be useful to analysts. Yet we know that about 60 percent of our commercial forest land is in these farm and miscellaneous private ownerships. And we know that total demands for industrial timber are likely to double in the foreseeable future. But do we know for sure that timber production for industrial uses will double? And if not, what are we going to do about it?

As you look ahead to these next 25 years then, let me suggest that you give serious attention making certain that adequate timber supplies will continue to be available when and where and of the quality needed by the American forest industries. In New York last February I pointed out that probably less than half of the pulpwood harvests can be supplied from lands now owned by forest industries and public agencies. The same thing is generally true with regard to the total timber harvest. Right now about half the industrial woodcut comes from the miscellaneous and farm ownerships. In the future, industry must continue to rely heavily on this source of supply. The big question is just how near these lands will come to meeting their proportionate share of the timber needs of this country.

I believe that we all have a big job to do to get as much of this land as possible committed to management programs that will produce increasing amounts of good quality timber as well as producing the other benefits and uses that landowners want and expect. Among other things, the American tree farm system can and should aid in promoting a better understanding of how

timber production can be compatible with recreation, wildlife, natural beauty and so forth.

A good start has been made but 67 million acres in tree farms out of 367 million acres in private ownership is not enough. More tree farms are needed—little ones as well as big ones—the more the better. And as more and more are signed up, the job of making sure that they are well managed grows larger and more important.

Of course you do not have to do the job alone. Fortunately there is a fairly wide array of private, State and Federal efforts aimed in this direction. I am glad that industry leaders have spoken out recently in support of strong State forestry organizations. You can do much in giving substance to those words—especially in helping State foresters promote multiple-use management on private lands. I hope I have made it clear that we in Forest Service think there is more than enough for all of us to do in meeting the challenges that I have outlined here today.

Personally, I am optimistic that through teamwork and sustained effort we will be able to accomplish all that needs to be done.

The forest products industries of America have a decisive role to play in this next quarter century—not only in extending and strengthening the tree farm system and similar programs, but in supporting State forestry organizations, consulting foresters, and the cooperative forestry programs that have been established during this past 25 years. It is in this way that our efforts can be most effective in reaching toward our mutual objectives.

¹"Pulpwood Production—Agriculture or Industry" speech by George R. Armstrong, College of Forestry, State University of New York, American Pulpwood Association meeting, New York City, February 1966.

Long-Range Mass Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the May 9 New York Times editorial noting the successful development and operation of the urban mass transportation program.

This is important to the New York City area because it has enabled us to make some progress in meeting the growing transportation needs. Personally, I have watched with great interest the program's development because when I was first in Congress I introduced on February 10, 1960, a measure which was designed to found this needed program. The accomplishments of the urban mass transportation program during its 2 years of existence have been striking; we are now asking for its expansion. The New York Times editorial follows:

LONG-RANGE MASS TRANSIT

The success of the Federal urban mass transportation program these past 2 years is bringing justified demands that it be greatly expanded. Governor Rockefeller's suggestion to this effect won warm support from four other Governors of Middle Atlantic States at the recent Trenton meeting.

Similar tribute for the program has come from the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has voted to continue it on a long-range basis, with an appropriation almost double that requested by the President. The action accurately evaluates an investment that has proved timely and richly rewarding.

The program's most striking accomplishment is the contract just signed by the Federal Government and the Pennsylvania Railroad for the establishment next year of hourly train service between New York and Washington in new high-speed electric cars that will make the run in less than 3 hours. This will make the train trip competitive with air travel, when allowance is made for time spent between the business districts of the two cities and their airports. It will be faster than automobile travel.

If the result is a return to the rails of a major part of the traffic lost in recent years to planes and automobiles it will be a boon to travelers between this city and the Capital. Airways and highways between the two are badly overcrowded. A shift in traffic patterns might delay for several years the need for a costly new jet airport in the metropolitan area. The Government hopes to extend the high-speed rail program to Boston but the condition of the New Haven Railroad roadbed may force a go-slow policy on that innovation.

The New Haven's commuter service is also being carried on with financial help from the Federal mass-transit program. This help has now been extended until the end of the year; by then New York State and Connecticut should have worked out with the merged Pennsylvania-New York Central an agreement that will keep the commuter trains running permanently with new and improved equipment.

These are among the benefits already derived from a Federal program that has involved an expenditure of only \$90 million a year—a pittance compared with the more than \$4 billion it is spending in 1965 to build and maintain highways, and the nearly \$1 billion it is spending on airways and airports. The House committee's decision to increase the Federal expenditure for urban mass transit from the \$95 million requested by the administration to \$175 million—and to place it on a continuing basis—is in the right direction. The only question is whether it goes far enough even now.

Military Might Alone Cannot Win in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the continued crisis in Vietnam, and because the situation has only worsened during the past 6 months, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a special report which I sent to the newspapers on December 2, 1965, during the adjournment period. I believe that the course of events since that time only serve to emphasize the correctness of my position at that time—which has not changed.

The material follows:

MILITARY MIGHT ALONE CANNOT WIN IN VIETNAM

Because of the growing concern of the American people about the fighting in Viet-

May 10, 1966

In reviewing the significant progress made since 1941 in the evolution of forestry repairing and rehabilitation of our forests Mr. Cliff pointed out that this period was the most important in history but then he noted that the next quarter century, starting this year, will be of even greater importance because of the tremendous pressures on our open lands which will result for an exploding population.

His look into the future and his plea for cooperation from all concerned in meeting this tremendous challenge is of significant importance and I believe should be of interest and concern to each of us here. Accordingly, I insert at this point in the Record, Mr. Cliff's remarks:

It is good to be here to help celebrate this important milestone in American forestry. Twenty-five years may not be a long time in terms of the life of a tree or a forest—but the years 1941 to 1966 span a most significant period in the evolution of forestry.

These first years of the tree farm story have been marked by striking improvement in our national timber situation. Of equal importance, these years span a period of awakening public appreciation and interest in conservation matters. They have been years of progress as well as of change for the forest products industries. Looking back today from this vantage point in history, I think you leaders of industry should be well pleased with much of what you see. We, your colleagues in public life, congratulate you for your role in making it possible to base this 25th anniversary occasion on a solid foundation of achievement. I am pleased that the State forestry organizations have assisted in developing the American tree farm system through the cooperative forest management program.

Looking ahead to the next 25 years we might begin by asking ourselves if the job is essentially done now. Would the far-sighted originators of the tree farm movement be equally motivated—yes; even compelled—to renew and strengthen this program in 1966? Are the needs for forestry programs as urgent now as was the case a quarter of a century ago? What shape would the tree farm program take to be most effective in the next 25 years if it were to be formed anew today? These are valid questions I think—the type of questions that need to be pondered on silver anniversaries.

Fortunately, we have a lot more reliable basic information at hand to help us look ahead than was the case on the eve of the second World War. A torrent of facts and information is pouring out from thousands of machines and experts of all kinds. Much of it relates in some way to our work and to our mutual objectives. Today the challenge is not so much to find vital information as it is to sift out and use the most relevant items.

For example, we can be quite certain that dramatic population growth will continue in these next 25 years. Yet in the early years of the tree farm movement, prominent economists and demographers were forecasting a stable or even declining population as one of the problems to be faced in the United States.

We also can be quite sure that our gross national product and standard of living will continue their strong upward trends—in fact, a current problem is to “cool down” the economy enough to keep it under control.

We know a lot more about the shifting patterns of wood use in this country than we have ever known before. We have at our finger tips a wealth of information, including the report “Timber Trends in the

United States,” published last year. We know more about the specific problems we face—such as a general decline in timber quality and short supplies of prime logs of preferred species. Through our increasingly effective research programs we know more about how to attack our problems.

It would be interesting to know how many more people today are gathering and interpreting data which bear on forestry programs than was the case even a few years ago. From what I have seen of this work, I am confident that timber will continue to be a resource of basic importance to the national economy and that more and more people will be competing for forest resources to meet a widening variety of needs.

Time and again, our past experience has demonstrated that an abundant supply of wood is essential for industrial growth. We must bring this lesson to any discussion of what the future holds for American forest products industries. The spectacular growth of the southern pine plywood industry is only the most recent in the long sequence of examples which prove that industrial growth and strength flow from an adequate resource base. The booming pulp industry also leads me to think that our projections of future timber demands will be fully realized—that demands for industrial wood will about double the 1962 level by the end of the century. The unprecedented growth of the Nation's economy in these past 5 years or so now points to new heights of GNP—well above projected levels.

The main point that I want to make here today is that we cannot and must not complacently assume that abundant supplies of merchantable timber will automatically continue to be available when and where needed in these next 25 years. Nor can we assume that those timber supplies can always be acquired at reasonable costs in the species, size, quality, and quantities essential to wood-using industries which are faced by increasing competition for markets.

To answer my own question, Yes; there is a need for a tree farm movement today—fully as much as there was 25 years ago. I would go so far as to say there is a need for just about every such effort that we can find to strengthen and continue the upward trend in American forestry. This is true despite the accomplishments and encouraging progress in forestry such as we honor here today. There is indeed reason to celebrate in looking to the record of the past 25 years—but let me worry with you a little about the job that still lies ahead.

I'm sure that competition is a way of life for people in the forest industries. You accept and build upon the competition within your ranks whether it be mill against mill or lumber versus plywood; after all, this is the essence of a free enterprise system. Most of you have also faced up to the increasing competition from steel, aluminum, plastics, and all the other competing materials. This too is an economic fact of life that you recognize and deal with—incidentally, one I am sure will become increasingly important in the years ahead.

But there is another arena of competition that also deserves your special attention—more attention than is evident to me at this time. I am referring to the competition for land and resources; particularly forest land and forest resources. It is in this area, I think, that we will very likely see decided just how abundant industrial timber supplies will be 25 years from now and long after that.

In the past few years we have witnessed a dramatic upsurge of public interest in matters directly concerning the management and use of forest land. For example, outdoor recreation and natural beauty are two subjects that have captured the attention and enthusiasm of millions of Americans. Con-

versely, more and more of our people are growing up with less and less firsthand knowledge of how timber is grown, harvested, and milled to meet their needs. They are increasingly urban people—sincere people, many of whom are genuinely distressed and upset by timber cutting. This situation will grow in significance.

We should keep in mind that almost half of the people living in the United States today were born since the tree farm system was established. For many of them, it is much more logical to get excited about wilderness and wildlife, or natural beauty and wild rivers, or environmental pollution and outdoor recreation etc., than it is to wonder about where the wood needed by American industries will come from. With increasing leisure and education and disposable income, it is logical that many people would feel this way—even without strong organized efforts to capture and direct those interests and enthusiasms. And let us not forget that the political power wielded by these intelligent, young, urban Americans is going to be a most dominant force in the years ahead.

We don't need to strain our imaginations to picture what all of this will mean. All we have to do is look around because it has already begun. For example, at the American Pulpwood Association meeting last February in New York, many of us heard George Armstrong suggest that as marginal farmlands go out of agriculture, nontimber values will receive increasing attention.¹ This is happening as forest land is acquired for recreation, residences, hunting, esthetic values or other reasons. He also pointed out that as farms are combined into larger units, there will be a tendency for woodlots to be cleared. This would come about either in converting the land to pasture or crop use, or by the buyer or the seller cashing in the merchantable timber at the time of sale. These are especially important forecasts because about 30 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land is still in farm ownership—some 151 million acres.

Our research findings support the general idea that “timber supply inhibiting” ownership characteristics and land use trends can be expected to substantially reduce yields of timber from nonindustrial private lands. Numerous studies have disclosed the wide variety of purposes for which many tracts of timberlands are owned. Timber production is simply not the dominant purpose of many owners. Studies reveal rather conclusively that investment for forestry purposes is not taking place on the majority of small holdings. No doubt your knowledge and experience also bear this out. We must face the fact that on a substantial acreage in this type of ownership, timber production will not double, or even increase significantly, in the years ahead. Constraints on timber harvesting seem sure to increase on many small forest tracts.

Much productive forest land is being converted into urban or suburban residential or industrial areas, highway complexes, parks, reservoirs, and so forth. These uses permanently remove part of our resource base as a source of future timber supplies. This is especially true in the Midwest, New England, the Middle Atlantic States—very few parts of the country are unaffected by this trend.

There have been some offsetting trends. In some areas tree planting under the soil bank and other programs and reversion of abandoned farmland to tree cover have increased forest acreage. The cropland adjustment program authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1965 may stimulate some tree planting, although most of the land affected will probably lie in the great grain producing areas of the country and will not be put into trees. In the meantime we see substantial

¹Footnote at end of speech.

May 10, 1966

nam, I would like to make clear my own position as a citizen, and a Member of Congress, on this vital matter.

First, let me stress how important this problem is. A great and growing number of American young men, your sons and mine, are fighting and dying in Vietnam. There will be close to 200,000 there by January 1, 1966. In another year that number will probably be doubled. If the Chinese enter the fighting, as they did in Korea, then 500,000 to a million American soldiers will be involved in Vietnam. If we carry on a land war against China. There is no limit to the number of men we will need to send.

There is a chance, small now but growing every day, that this may become a nuclear war and that Russia will become involved. If this happens, then every citizen of this country—young and old—faces possible death in a nuclear finale to human progress.

At the present level of the fighting, we are spending close to \$10 billion a year on Vietnam—wiping out the tax cuts passed by this administration and making highly improbable the continuation of domestic efforts to improve the quality of life for the citizens of this country. At this spending level, a year from now we could face major tax increases, rationing of scarce commodities and major Government controls on production.

Every citizen should be deeply concerned about this. Every citizen should seek the best information available from his Government, and from every other source, on why we are engaged in Vietnam and what our goals are there. This is your war—your Government has ordered your sons to fight it. You will pay for it with your money and, possibly, your life.

I have made many speeches about Vietnam. My purpose has been not to force my view on anyone but to present the facts as I have observed them, to suggest courses of action that I think are reasonable, to encourage every person I can to think the problems through for himself and then to speak and act on his convictions. As long as this country is a democracy, this is the proper way for every citizen to exercise his rights.

Now, what are my own views on this problems? I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President—that we intend to resist and defeat any military solution by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), and that we are willing to unconditionally negotiate a solution to the conflict at the conference table. I do not advocate a unilateral withdrawal of American troops or a surrender of South Vietnam to North Vietnam by negotiation or in any other way.

I strongly support the President's announced willingness to accept the principles of the Geneva Conference of 1954 as a basis for a negotiated settlement. I strongly support his expressed desire to have the South Vietnamese people decide for themselves, through free elections, the form of government they wish and the policies which that government will follow in its relation with its neighbors.

I believe that if every American citizen understood what the Geneva agreements provided, and why they were not carried out, and was willing to support the President's efforts to comply with the spirit of these agreements, the problems in Vietnam could be swiftly solved.

As we have become more deeply involved militarily in Vietnam, I have sought to resist the emotional pressures which inevitably develop—pressures which stifle dissent, which reject the facts that do not conform to the popular views, which prevent us from seeing how we got to where we are, and what we need to do to achieve our real goals. I cannot act in any other way. For 25 years I have been deeply concerned about how to create

the conditions for peace and freedom in the world. The sacrifice of American lives, and the even greater suffering and sacrifice of the Vietnamese people, is an ever-present tragedy to me. I must, therefore, exert every power I have to help prevent an unthinking drift by this country into a course which does not strengthen America and does not expand freedom, but only threatens catastrophe. This has been my fear about Vietnam, and this is why I have spoken out as I have.

While I accept and support the basic objectives set forth by the President for our future course in Vietnam, I do not completely accept the official view as to the nature of this war. Nor do I agree with all of the steps being taken to achieve the basic objectives. Let me explain some of these differences briefly.

The official view of this war is that it is an invasion from the north—that is, from the Communist state of North Vietnam—to overthrow a democratic country (South Vietnam) friendly to the United States and institute a Communist rule from Hanoi. This view is only partially correct. It neglects the fact that most Vietnamese, north and south, see themselves as one people temporarily divided against their will. It neglects the fact that the South Vietnamese Government has been an extremely oppressive, totalitarian dictatorship throughout its existence and has never been freely elected or enjoyed wide popular support.

The official view also neglects the fact that the vast majority of the enemy we are fighting (probably 80 percent) are native South Vietnamese whose motive, as they understand it, is not to expand communism but to secure freedom for South Vietnam. These Vietnamese see the United States as a foreign aggressor (as they did the French before us), and the Saigon government as merely a creature of the United States—completely financed by the United States and unable to stand alone.

Another official view of this war is that it is really aimed at stopping Chinese communism from further expansion. This again is only partially true. North Vietnamese communism is strongly nationalistic and only partly under Chinese influence. It is also under Russian influence, and it seeks to maintain a role independent of both where possible, as well as balancing between them when necessary. Vietnamese for 2,000 years have fought the Chinese, and it is doubtful if any conceivable pressure could make them willingly accept Chinese domination. In South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front not only would resist Chinese Communist control, but does not wish control by North Vietnam or immediate reunification of the two parts of Vietnam. It seeks, instead, a cooperative relationship and possible reunification after 10 or 15 years.

A frequently voiced official view of our role in Vietnam is that we are there to assist and advise the South Vietnam Government—first, in defending itself against aggression and subversion, and, then, to institute democratic reforms, and win the support of the peasants who comprise the vast majority of the population. I have pointed out that we have been working at this for the past 12 years—even since we helped establish the Government in 1954—and in this effort we have failed dismally. The Government has accepted our money—in fact, could not exist for 1 day without it—but has not accepted our suggestions for reforms and has never been able to inspire any substantial support for itself.

As a consequence, we now have been forced to forget what we said so emphatically only a year or so ago—that this is a Vietnamese war, and one which must be fought and won by the Vietnamese. Today, it is basically an American war against one part of the Vietnamese people, with another part—the Saigon government—playing an unconvincing role as our supporter and sponsor.

It is because of the weakness of the Saigon government—its lack of popular support among the peasants—that I have voiced the opinion that all of our sacrifices in Vietnam may have been in vain. The only way that our country can lose this war—or any war—is to end up supporting a government the people do not want and will not accept. To sacrifice our soldiers and the Vietnamese people—and to bring the world to the brink of thermonuclear war—only to end up with this sad situation is, indeed, the height of tragedy.

Because of my reservations as to the complete accuracy of the official views of the war, I differ with the military recommendations on how to achieve our goals. I place far greater emphasis on the recommendations for strengthening the structure of democracy in Vietnam. I would allow, not forbid, the expression of political views and the development of political parties in Vietnam. I would do far more than has been done in helping the peasants improve their economic level. I would use the minimum amount of military force in Vietnam consistent with maintaining our forces there and resisting the takeover by the Vietcong. I would favor reducing or stopping the heavy bombing, rather than extending it. In addition, I would make far greater efforts to bring an end to the fighting, through a negotiated peace, in accordance with terms that would guarantee South Vietnam what it has never had—a government elected by and responsible to its own citizens. Once that has been achieved, I would leave Vietnam to determine its own future, with whatever economic and technical assistance we see fit to give.

This is a very brief summary of my views and of some of the points I have made in dozens of speeches. I have expressed these views because I have a deep concern for the welfare of our country and for the peace of the world. If my own political life must be jeopardized, so be it.

What Price the Great Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, "What Price the Great Society?" written by Charles Stevenson, appeared in the March issue of the Reader's Digest at a time when we are called to pass upon appropriations for fiscal 1967. The facts contained in this article are important for the purpose of decision-making on the part of every Congressman:

WHAT PRICE THE GREAT SOCIETY?

(By Charles Stevenson)

"A new chapter in greatness" is how President Lyndon B. Johnson describes the flood of Great Society legislation enacted by the last session of Congress. There's the appearance of something for everybody: poverty programs, rent subsidies, aid for farmers, cities, public schools, recreation, the arts. And the chapter has not ended: even now, as the 89th Congress settles into its second session amid belated realization that there's also a war to pay for, there are pressures for still more for everybody.

The President himself, ordering a stepping-up of his all-encompassing welfare proposals, makes plain that the war in Vietnam will not be allowed to interfere with "building a Great Society at home."

May 10, 1966

There is less enthusiasm from MIKE MANSFIELD, the dour Senate leader from Montana. Alarmed at the quality of the 321 Presidential requests that he guided through Congress, he has already called for not just a letup but a reappraisal. "We passed a lot of bills, some of them very hastily," says Senator MANSFIELD. "They stand in extreme need of going over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of cost."

What worries men of Senator MANSFIELD's stamp is this: By hiding costs—indeed, not even reckoning them—the administration steamrollered its program through without regard even for our peacetime capacity to pay. Now the economy bears the additional burden of a \$10 billion-a-year war. Political history indicates that so long as welfare laws are on the books, the expenditures they authorize will be made—if not openly in the Budget, then deviously through supplemental or deficit appropriations. No amount of budget juggling or rosy claims about future income can erase the certainty that non-defense expenditures and our cumulative national deficit, already at the highest level in history, will continue to go up.

The stated purposes of much Great Society legislation were worthy. But the bills were rammed through Congress with no concern for priorities, price tags, or the cancerous inflation that deficit spending is already causing.

FORGOTTEN REQUIREMENT

Public Law 801, passed in 1956, stipulates: Whenever any unit of the executive branch recommends expansion, costing more than a million dollars a year, of any function, it must set forth "for each of the first five fiscal years the estimated maximum expenditures for all purposes." The intent, as the late Senator Olin D. Johnston, Democrat of South Carolina, declared at the time, was to "enable Congress to consider proposed legislation with a full understanding of the cost involved." But, in a canvass of Congressional committees, I have been able to find among the 321 enacted Johnson legislative requests only three instances in which the administration fully complied with this statute.

Typically, when Chairman John L. Sweeney of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia went before the Senate Public Works Committee, he admitted that he could not provide even an informed guess concerning any long-range cost of his program. In pushing through its program for aid to elementary and secondary education, the Office of Education held its publicized figure on anticipated costs to \$6.66 billion—simply by not estimating the cost of subsidy payments for a fourth and fifth year of the heart of the plan. Had the agency included such estimates for those two years, the figure would have run to at least \$10.7 billion.

In defense of the administration's disregard of Public Law 801, the Budget Bureau baldly declares that the "cost projections for individual legislative proposals have seemed to us of little value in many, if not most, cases." Thus, the administration not only hid the costs from Congress and the public; it didn't even bother to figure them out beforehand for itself. Proof is contained in Budget Bureau "Bulletin 66-3," now being quietly circulated among Government agencies. Tardily it directs them to try to come up with some notion of how much we are going to have to pay for each of the new programs already under way.

Let's look at some of the spending projects—and where they lead.

EDUCATION

In World War II, Congress began appropriating small sums to school districts in "impacted areas" where untaxed Federal activity, mostly military installations, overloaded the schools. Once started, the pro-

gram burgeoned. In 1964 alone, there were handouts for 12,500,000 children in 50 States.

For example, Montgomery County, Md., is an "impacted area." Because many residents work at upper-bracket Government jobs in nearby Washington, it has the second highest median family income in the United States. Yet because they are Government workers, it gets assistance for its schools.

Now President Johnson has inverted the idea of impacted-area aid: school districts where military installations are due to shut down will receive funds to build schools which they had argued were needed to take care of the Government pupils they're now losing.

By a similar process, a \$474 million, 4-year subsidy to higher education—inaugurated in 1958 in response to Sputnik—evolved into an authorization to spend \$845,350,000 in a single year. The money goes for everything from college libraries to subsidies and guarantees for student loans, the latter despite the ready availability of privately financed, nonprofit student loans. (United Student Aid Funds, Inc., had already guaranteed 82,000 loans for a total of \$52 million to students in 685 colleges, and signed up 5,500 banks in 49 States to provide additional aid.)

The House Education and Labor Committee met, deliberated and reported this bill out in less than 20 minutes. "A mockery of the legislative process," declared Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois. In similar procedures, most of President Johnson's legislative requests dealing with education became law. Thus the Government's educational expenditures, which totaled \$291 million in 1945, and had soared to \$6.3 billion in 1965, will top \$8.7 billion this year.

And there's no end in sight, for, as a Housing minority report points out, "Experience proves that once an area or group, however wealthy and self-sufficient, acquires a vested interest in Federal school-aid funds, it will join a powerful lobby for the continuation of those funds."

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

All spending schemes are dwarfed by those dreamed up for cities—where the big votes are. One of the President's urban plums is the \$125 million community service program, through which university professors will tell city residents what to do. To provide for massive Federal intervention, the administration created a Department of Housing and Urban Development (DHUD), and rammed through a set of "Big Brother" programs for the agency to handle. Congress passed an \$8.2 million omnibus housing bill, after the House Banking and Currency Committee heard friendly witnesses in secret sessions from which all who disagreed were barred. In a cloud of confusion, Congress additionally authorized \$6 billion in long-term rent subsidies.

Before his retirement, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, calculated that if DHUD grows at the same rate as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has—a reasonable enough assumption—it will be dispensing an incredible \$225 billion annually within 13 years. Other estimates vary. But the real point is that no one, in Government or out, knows how much DHUD has already been committed to spend. Nor can anyone be sure as to what areas DHUD will barge into. In its very first press release as a unit of DHUD, the Public Housing Administration announced approval of a loan for construction of 50 low-rent houses in President Johnson's own Johnson City, Tex.—population 625. Urban development on that scale would mean new housing for 1 family in every 4.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The scheme to revive the economy of the 11-State Appalachian area got underway

last March with a \$1,092,400,000 authorization, nearly 80 percent of it for roads. The House Public Works Committee acknowledged that the program is so new that it is "still too early to be able to draw conclusions." Nevertheless, at the President's direction, Congress passed still another law to set up more "economic development regions"—for example, for northern New England, the northern Great Lakes, the Ozarks, a Deep South area, the Southwest's Indian reservation country, the Pacific Northwest mountains.

This new program is concurrent with a revival of the old Area Redevelopment Administration, which was established in 1961 with the hope of creating permanent jobs in a handful of economically depressed communities scattered around the country. However, by pork barrelers' intrusions, ARA soon was lading out grants for everything from street lights in Miami Beach, Fla., to county buildings in San Diego, Calif.

Congress refused in 1963 to breathe new life into ARA, and the agency was due to expire last June. But the administration had other ideas. A \$3.25 billion authorization—2½ times as much as ARA was ever allowed to spend—was pushed through Congress to carry on everything ARA did and more, only under a new agency name, the Economic Development Administration (same place, same phone number). The big difference is that an increase in flexibility makes the new law even more susceptible to abuse than the old one.

This new flexibility permitted the President to announce that not only were the 952 counties that qualified under ARA still eligible for aid, but also 116 other areas which under the earlier criteria had been declared ineligible, plus still another 212 needy areas. All these 1,280 counties—more than a third of the Nation's total, containing 50 million people—are to join the Nation's poor as wards of Washington. This, in addition to the big Appalachia-type regional-development organizations which will embrace who knows how many more millions.

The question: Can the remaining healthy communities of the country possibly continue to pay their own way and pay for the other communities too?

Totaling up. Some of Washington's leading economists, sharpening their pencils after the recent legislative binge, have come up with the following figures, fantastic, yet real: In 1955, Federal cash expenditures totaled \$70.5 billion. By last year the outlay had climbed to \$122.4 billion. This fiscal year it is expected to range between \$132.3 and \$135 billion. Even if the war in Vietnam is brought under control, the economists anticipate conservatively that by 1975—just 9 years hence—our spending will total around \$204 billion, with more money going into welfare-state activity than into any other function. Such activity will account for 53.6 percent of all Federal outlays. (In 1955 it totaled 18.9 percent.)

Furthermore, State and local governments will have to dig so deep for matching funds to meet Federal-aid requirements that their overall expenditures must also soar—from \$72.4 billion, in 1964, to \$179 billion by 1975.

Here, then, is the outline of the Great Society's reckless, emotional revolution. Bear in mind that the forecasts are based on extension of already established spending trends. Another projection, by Economist Leonard Lecht for the National Planning Association, shows that if we are to achieve all the national goals that our political mentors have declared desirable, the cost by 1975 will be \$150 billion more than the economy can produce.

Isn't it time for us to stop kidding ourselves that politicians' statements of noble purpose, combined with phony "gifts," constitute a substitute for achievement? Isn't it time for us to insist that the politicians

May 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9783

munications; the advances in medical science and public health techniques; the development of our natural resources and international trade. It will be a showcase of a free society at work.

Interama offers a great opportunity for the United States and the Latin American nations. At Interama we can demonstrate how our free enterprise system and our people—working together with the American Republics, can stimulate on a scale of the greatest magnitude—the trade and cultural programs—which will build a better hemisphere for all of us. Our representatives are now contacting and inviting the major companies, institutions and organizations to participate in Interama.

In closing, I would like to offer these suggestions. First, that the Inter-American Bar Association seriously consider the establishment of a permanent headquarters at Interama. From the standpoint of geographical location, compatible interests, and the special and versatile facilities offered, Interama is a logical choice as the home of the Inter-American Bar Association. Second, if you represent major companies or know leaders in industry, I hope you can carry our message to the heads of those companies to urge their participation in Interama.

PULITZER PRIZE GOES TO DON WRIGHT, MIAMI NEWS NEWSPAPERMAN

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Pulitzer Prize awards were announced. One of these awards went to the evening newspaper in my home city of Miami, the Miami News. Don Wright won the Pulitzer award for his work as a political cartoonist. This Pulitzer Prize which was awarded to the Miami News is the fourth such award given to this outstanding newspaper—no other newspaper in the South holds this distinguished record for this award.

The Miami News previously had won the top journalistic award in 1939 for its exposure of the Miami "Termite Administration"; in 1959 for uncovering miserable conditions under which migrants live at Immokalee; and in 1963 for revealing the Russian missile buildup in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD an article from the Miami News regarding Don Wright's award and giving some of the background about this fine young man. Also, I would like to add the editorial which appeared in the Miami News the same day regarding this Pulitzer.

Mr. Speaker, only last week did another Miami reporter, Miss Rose Allegato, of the Miami Herald, receive the award as one of this country's outstanding women of Italian descent. She is now joined by one of her colleagues, Jean Wardlow, who won an award for a series she wrote on automobile accidents. Miss Wardlow is the recipient of the annual Editorial Award of the National Foundation of Highway Safety in New Haven, Conn. I would also like to have incorporated this brief article about her award from the Miami Herald:

[From the Miami News]

DON WRIGHT TOOK JUST 4 YEARS TO WIN PULITZER

(By Haines Colbert, reporter of the Miami News)

Don Wright made it to the top as an editorial cartoonist in less than 4 years, but he'd been working toward it since a fellow second-grader drew a picture of an automobile.

"I think all kids draw pictures of cars and warplanes and stuff," Wright said yesterday after he'd been awarded the Pulitzer Prize. "The only difference is that most of them outgrow it and I didn't."

The prize carries with it a \$1,000 cash award.

Wright, 32, started doing editorial cartoons in his spare time while he was picture editor of the Miami News in 1961. He went into it full time a few months later, and the best way to stir him up is to tell him that it must be nice to earn a living by drawing one picture a day.

If he doesn't dream about it, Wright starts working on the day's cartoon when he gets up at about 7 a.m.

"I start groping for an idea while I'm having coffee, shaving, and getting dressed," he said. "I think about it while I'm driving to work and while I'm going over the mail and the newspapers."

"I'm in pretty good shape if an idea hits me by noon. That means I can finish the drawing by 6 or 7 p.m."

"If I don't have the idea by lunchtime, things start getting complicated. Then I'm not only trying to think of something to draw, but it has to be simple enough so the drawing won't take all night."

Wright's drawings infuriate some readers, delight others, and get the emotions of still others pretty well mixed up.

"A lot of readers complain that the cartoons are unfair and they're absolutely right," he said. "A cartoon has to be unfair because it's one sided."

"An editorial writer can present both sides of an argument and qualify what he says. The cartoonist can't do that. He strips an idea to the simplest form and uses it to hit the reader in the eye—whammo."

"The cartoonist is fair only in that he takes a swipe at anybody who seems to deserve it. Quite a few people have criticized me for being too liberal, but the liberals got all over me when I did a cartoon on the necessity for stopping communism short of California which won an award from the Freedom Foundation."

Wright was born in Los Angeles January 23, 1934, but was brought to Miami as a child by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles C. Wright.

He graduated from Miami Edison High School in 1952 and went to work as a copy boy for the News. Wright was a photographer for 6 years, with 2 years out for Army service, and then became picture editor.

"I was always drawing, though," he said. "When the kid drew the automobile on the blackboard in grade school, I got him to show me how, and I never quit fooling around with it."

"My wife (the former Rita Blondin) was the one who finally got me into fulltime drawing. She kept after me until I did a couple of political cartoons and showed them to the editor, Bill Baggs."

"I've looked at some of them recently, and I don't know how they ever got in the paper. They were terrible, but I think my style has improved. The drawings are simpler now, and they get the idea across better."

One of the first of Wright's cartoons to win national attention was drawn when Wally Butts, University of Georgia football

coach, won a libel suit from the Saturday Evening Post.

Wright drew a bust of Benjamin Franklin, founder of the Post, being knocked over by a football. The cartoon was reprinted in Time magazine and a number of other publications.

Other Wright drawings have been reproduced nationally since, and a collection of his work is on permanent display at the University of Syracuse.

Last year, he won the national award for the best cartoon used in the Catholic press.

The Wrights—Don, his wife and a 165-pound great dane named Baron—live at 11725 Southwest 88th Avenue.

[From the Miami News]

PULITZER PRIZE FOR DON WRIGHT

We have long thought the cartoons of Don Wright are the best to appear on any editorial page in the country.

Certainly, he is the best of the younger cartoonists, and has been so recognized by the number of publications which have regularly reprinted his cartoons since they began appearing here in 1962.

It is a source of great pride to his colleagues at the Miami News therefore that Wright yesterday was awarded journalism's highest honor, a Pulitzer Prize.

It is significant that Wright's prize came not for any single cartoon, but for the exceptional quality of all of his work. The News is proud of him.

[From the Miami Herald]

HERALD WRITER WINS AWARD FOR SERIES

Herald Writer Jean Wardlow has received the annual Editorial Award of the National Foundation for Highway Safety in New Haven, Conn.

The award, a \$100 U.S. savings bond, was given to Mrs. Wardlow for her series on mystery crashes that ran in the Herald last fall.

It was announced Monday by William H. Veale, president of the national group.

In her series, Mrs. Wardlow re-created some of the mystery crashes—one-car accidents that were never explained because the driver of the car was killed.

What happened to these drivers, she asked. "Did they fall asleep? Did they imagine an object in the road? What made them swerve, roll over, or speed headlong into a canal?"

In Dade County, 64 fatal one-car crashes in 1964 took 66 lives.

"The figures are laced with alcohol," she wrote.

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

[Mr. PEPPER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.] *WN*

FREEDOM FOR SOUTH VIETNAM STARTS IN SAIGON

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the United States is involved in the Vietnamese conflict because we believe that people should be free to choose the form of government they want.

The United States has made a commitment to the people of South Vietnam to see that they get that choice.

Reports from Saigon over the weekend are disquieting evidence that Premier Ky may not fully appreciate a basic tenet of democracy—that he governs only at the sufferance of the people.

The United States is in Vietnam not to support Ky but to back up the Vietnamese people in their struggle for the simple fight to be free from oppression.

This freedom of choice includes freedom from the terror and violence inflicted upon the Vietnamese by the Vietcong and it also means the freedom to chart their own course of action as the struggle goes on.

I believe that instead of offering explanations for Ky's procrastinations on holding elections and his acceptance of their results, Secretary Rusk should put Mr. Ky on notice that the United States will throw its full weight behind free elections in South Vietnam at the earliest practical date.

Premier Ky has made intemperate statements in the past.

It is now time for our Government to make it abundantly clear to the entire world that we will not stand idly by while one form of despotism is substituted for another.

Political freedom for South Vietnam starts in Saigon.

A NEW PROGRAM OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will authorize the Department of State through the Agency for International Development to encourage and assist colleges and universities in the establishing, strengthening, and maintaining programs of foreign development and for their provision of research, education, training, advisory and technical assistance, directly or in cooperation with foreign universities and in connection with programs of assistance to developing nations.

This proposed act is a product of a series of penetrating studies on the problem of university involvement in the field of the foreign development program. University presidents, foundation officers, AID officials and educators have been examining, for several years, the role of the university in foreign relations. American universities obviously must have a major part in this national effort and they do. Our centers of higher education have demonstrated a willingness to confront the problems of our time and for the most part, they have recognized that no challenge is greater or more meaningful than that of assisting to remove the barriers to the development of the emerging nations.

The goal of this legislation is to provide a new basis for college and university involvement in the technical assistance area. This bill is based upon the time-proven 79-year-old Hatch Act of 1887 under which the agricultural ex-

periment stations of the land-grant colleges were given annual grants by the Federal Government for agricultural research projects. As in the case of the Hatch Act, the universities would have a regular, continuing responsibility in providing technical assistance to underdeveloped nations. AID would be the administering agency for the Federal Government. The universities would be able to plan ahead, to assume greater responsibility, bring together more competent staff for the job and integrate this foreign work more smoothly into their other activities.

In operation today is the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 that was inspired by the principles of the Hatch Act. In this very successful Government-sponsored, university-operated research program, colleges and universities in each of our 50 States and in Puerto Rico are engaged in various water research programs and projects.

Our centers of higher education possess a unique combination of resources for development work. The universities contain resources of knowledge that are essential to the Nation and must be effectively employed in its behalf, both in domestic and foreign programs. Colleges contain specialized knowledge that, at times, is not immediately available within our governmental agencies. AID, for example, has recognized this tremendous reservoir of talent by calling upon the universities for research and other types of technical services for foreign aid programs.

But, the task of institution building for international service cannot be readily financed by any mechanism the universities now have before them. University budgets cannot afford to participate in such programs. According to a University of Wisconsin report:

Each time a university organizes for an overseas venture it must assemble personnel, equip them with language skills and other special local knowledge, acquire library materials and other necessary data, and set up an administrative structure to handle recruiting, budgets, finance, travel, shipping, clearance and customs, medical problems, and the host of other matters incident to overseas programs.

The report goes on to say:

When the project ends, there is no choice but to wastefully dismantle this structure or engage in a frantic effort to keep it in operation beyond its planned term and find other jobs to justify its continued existence.

With particular respect to the involvement by State universities in foreign programs, while we would all agree that they represent an indispensable reservoir of skills and goals, their ability to mobilize fully for those goals will depend on the willingness of the Federal Government, rather than that of the State, to build the institutional strength that will be required. State legislatures cannot justify commitments for such projects. It is always difficult to convince a State legislature that is faced with numerous tax issues to appropriate funds for the use of overseas development programs. AID, at present, cannot assure the future of such institutional facilities because of the short-term nature of its contracts. Pri-

vate foundations have only limited resources and cannot support sustained long-term commitments.

The United States is committed to participation in foreign development. As a statement by Indiana University declares:

The world is in an inexorable state of change. It is in the national interest of the United States to participate in the transformation of the underdeveloped countries so that the results are better for us, rather than worse. The unacceptable alternative is to allow others to determine the future conditions of the world in which we will have to defend our national interests.

But, the facilities to retain qualified people whose skills and competences had been developed in previous international assistance programs of the universities are not being maintained under existing support provisions to a level needed to meet our foreign policy objectives. Because most of the current programs are short-term commitments, it is difficult to obtain enough competent personnel. It is always difficult to convince people to enlist in a program with limited duration and no assurance of future work. The importance of the long-term contract is, that it will give the universities the assurance that their programs will not be ended just when they have built up staff and resources to do effective work.

We have learned from past experience that the technology of the Western World cannot be transferred to less developed nations without extensive adaptive research and training programs. The success of education in the United States can be attributed to the ability to bridge the gap between the laboratory and the field. Much of the effectiveness of, for example, applied science in agriculture has accrued because professors have had well-established roots in their local environments. This is also true whether we consider research or teaching. While the principles of science are the same everywhere, their application, however, differs with the environment. That is to say, it is one thing to enroll foreign students in courses in American universities, but it is quite another to train each student appropriately for useful careers in their home countries. Applying the relevance of an education obtained in the United States to the realities of the environment in the developing countries is, however, another story.

While large numbers of American professors have gone overseas on temporary leave to work on the problems of development in the poorer countries, they have done so only rarely as projections of their university. Upon their return, nearly all of these professors have felt impelled to lay aside and even to forget their foreign experience and to concentrate upon teaching and research at home in order to recoup "time lost."

Success in these overseas projects requires that adaptive research and training programs be carried on over a period of several years, and staffed by a team of experts. Experience has generally demonstrated that single experts have accomplished little in attempting to introduce a new technology in a foreign country. If our overseas development

Shelf, which is generally defined as 200 meters in depth, or, in other words, 655 feet. As such, this bill would adequately provide protection on our west coast off Oregon and Washington from the present encroachment of the Soviet trawler fleet, where the Russians are fishing 25 or 30 miles off the coast, but where the Continental Shelf is only about 40 fathoms or 240 feet deep.

Incidentally, the Soviets are one of several nations favoring a 12-mile limit and it is of interest that Japanese trawlers operating in the Japan Sea about 18 miles off the coast of Siberia were ordered by a Soviet patrol vessel in March of 1966, to leave the area. Similar incidents have occurred there before.

In order to assure that my legislation would not conflict with the jurisdiction of any foreign country, such as Mexico, I have included a provision whereby the President could set a boundary in substitution if he determined that part of the fishing zone boundary should be changed.

The bill further authorizes the State Department, in consultation with the Department of the Interior, to consult with foreign nations to ascertain the extent, manner, and annual average catch of their fishing boats in any of the affected area.

Under my bill, rights to fish in the fishing zone would be allowed to any foreign nation whose fishermen had established historic fishing rights within such zones during the 10 calendar years preceding the enactment of this law.

The provisions of this measure would conform to a considerable degree to existing uniform practice under international convention as to fishing, but in no way would traditional laws or regulations covering navigation be changed.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has procrastinated too long. By prompt action we have much to gain.

VN

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—VIETNAM

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish that every American had been watching ABC's "Issues and Answers" on Sunday, May 8. Secretary of State Dean Rusk did a masterful job in response to interrogation by news correspondents Bob Clark and John Scall.

For those of my colleagues who did not hear this outstanding radio-television program, I submit a transcript of last Sunday's broadcast:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS; SUNDAY, MAY 8, 1966; GUEST, THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, INTERVIEWED BY BOB CLARK, ABC NEWS CORRESPONDENT, AND JOHN SCALL, ABC STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENT

Mr. SCALL. Mr. Secretary, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

Secretary RUSK. Thank you very much, John, I am glad to be here.

Mr. SCALL. Premier Ky may have stirred up another political crisis in Saigon yesterday by saying that he expects to remain in power at least another year despite the plans for the free elections which are aimed at naming a civilian successor government.

Are you at all alarmed or disturbed by this reported stand?

Secretary RUSK. Well, in the first place, John, Prime Minister Ky didn't say according to the transcript of his press conference that I have in front of me, that he is going to stay in office another year. He did make reference to the elections for a national assembly to be conducted in 1967. He didn't say what time in 1967. I think what happened there was that—we had another instance that you and I are familiar with where reporters grabbed somebody on the fly and they pressed them with questions and kept boring in until they get something that they think makes news.

As I look at the transcript, Prime Minister Ky was very cautious and very moderate in his comments to a large number of questions.

For example, when he was asked whether some of the Buddhists were neutralists, he said this is not the right time to talk about the venerables.

Well, I have been given that kind of question many times myself. He was asked whether the labor unions were infiltrated by the Vietcong. He said there are many labor unions in South Vietnam and the majority of them are not Communists. Of course, there is some infiltration.

He was asked whether there would be further political difficulties between now and the elections. He said he didn't know. He was also asked about the so-called baby Turks, the young officers who might be creating some problems, and he called them micro-Turks and he said, of course, these men who are out on the frontlines fighting are distressed by some of the troubles that have occurred there and so when a soldier is upset and angry who knows what their reaction is going to be?

He was asked whether he felt an elected government would be more efficient than his government. He says, "As a man who promotes democracy and elections, of course, I say "Yes." As to whether he would resign as soon as the constituent assembly will be elected, he said no, their mission is to draft a constitution.

So they kept boring in and he did say—they asked him if he was going to run for the constituency and he said "No, that is not my job. I am the Prime Minister. I shouldn't be a member of the constituent assembly."

Whether he would run for election to the national assembly next year, he said, "I don't know."

Well, that is what most American politicians say before they have announced whether they are a candidate or not.

When you look at the schedule, the time factors here, there is now in session in Saigon a committee of some 35 people who are drafting an election law under which there would be elections for a constituent assembly. Now, those elections, as Prime Minister Ky said yesterday or the day before, would occur about September 15. When those elections occur and a constituent assembly convenes, that assembly will draft a constitution.

Now, that constitution will determine the basis on which elections for a National Assembly in the government would be held.

Now, there is the drafting process and then there is a period which precedes an election of that sort. So I don't anticipate that Prime Minister Ky is going to try to stand in the way of the constitutional and the electoral process which he himself and his fellow generals initiated last January 15, well before the Honolulu Conference.

Mr. SCALL. You see then, Mr. Secretary, no sign that Premier Ky, by whatever he has said, has interposed any new roadblock which will delay the process of a return to civilian government?

Secretary RUSK. No, I don't see that be-

cause what they have agreed to is that there would be elections for a Constituent Assembly. That Constituent Assembly would draft a constitution.

Now, what happens with respect to the government and the elections following that will be determined in the course—by the South Vietnamese themselves in the course of further discussions to be held.

I think this is a case where a particular remark was interpreted for more than it meant.

For example, on that particular question I understand that the reporters pressed him on the point and asked him if it was his understanding that his government would stay in power for another year. Well, he didn't say another year, but he said, "Until the National Assembly in 1967." This was a prediction as to when that National Assembly would come into being. But, as you and I know, sometimes a man's answer is taken to incorporate a question and I think it would have been helpful had we had in front of us the full transcript of the press conference. It would have shown that this was not a major change in this situation.

Mr. CLARK. I would take it then that you don't see any cause for concern at all that delays of some sort could provoke more trouble from the Buddhists?

Secretary RUSK. I think there are differences of view in South Vietnam among the different groups as to how this process should proceed. Many of them feel that the present government should stay in office until it can transfer its power to a freely elected government under a new constitution.

Now, there are some elements, and I don't believe these are a majority, who feel that somehow the present government ought to leave for some other arrangement before that occurs. But these are things the South Vietnamese can work out among themselves and these are matters that are still to be discussed.

You see, one thing the people sometimes overlook is that the initiative for moving toward a constitution and toward elections came from Prime Minister Ky and the directorate of the generals in January of this year, not through any stimulations or pressure from the United States, but for reasons of their own.

Now, they repeated this in Honolulu and President Johnson joined in saying that we thought this was a good idea. But it was the generals who said, "Let's move to a constitutional system here." They did that in January.

Now, I think that—and as Prime Minister Ky said in his press conference yesterday, an elected government could be more efficient than the present government. So I think we ought not to get too excited about these things and let the South Vietnamese work them out.

Mr. CLARK. Do you see any merit in the proposal made by Senator RUBINOFF this week that the United Nations take over supervision of the election by sending observers to the scene?

Secretary RUSK. Well, there are several points about that. First, President Johnson has urged on every possible occasion that the United Nations take more and full responsibility in the Vietnam situation. We have done that in speeches to the Assembly; we have talked about it in the committees of the Assembly; we have taken the matter to the Security Council, but you saw Secretary General U Thant's comment on this particular proposal.

He said it was not realistic, or common-sense indicated it couldn't go forward.

What I think is the situation is that Hanoi and Peiping have bitterly rejected any intrusion of the United Nations into the Vietnam problem, and in the last discussions in the Security Council the Soviet Union

May 10, 1966

strongly resisted any United Nations role in Vietnam on the grounds that the Geneva machinery was the appropriate machinery to use in this situation.

Well, Ambassador Goldberg immediately said, "Well, if that is true, let's use the Geneva machinery" but the Soviets were not prepared to go down that trail.

Now, many members of the United Nations feel—we may not agree with them, but nevertheless they feel—that because of the attitude of Hanoi and Peiping that the injection by the United Nations of itself into this situation would make the possibility of settlement more difficult.

Now, they feel that sincerely and genuinely. As I say, we don't necessarily agree with it because it is their feeling.

There is another element here too that we have to take into account. There was a British suggestion in the last day or two that the International Control Commission somehow supervise these elections for the Constituent Assembly. This created a very sharp reaction among all elements in South Vietnam—on the grounds that the South Vietnamese know all about how to run an election. They are living in a goldfish bowl. There are 25 diplomatic missions there who can look at the elections. There are hundreds of foreign newsmen there, many of them skeptical, who are going to look at these elections.

The South Vietnamese have had considerable experience overtime in elections. Historically the villages in South Vietnam have elected their own leaders and they in turn have elected their provincial leaders. This was true during the period of French colonialism.

Last May they had municipal and provincial elections. Seventy percent of the registered voters voted. About 65 percent of the eligible voters had been registered. These are figures that compare favorably with our own. So that the South Vietnamese, a proud, sensitive people, feel they need not be subjected to some sort of tutelage. The whole world can look to see whether these elections are free. So, given the reluctance of the United Nations on the one side to inject itself into South Vietnam, and the reluctance of Hanoi and Peiping to let anybody have free elections, and the reluctance of the South Vietnamese to be put in a position of tutelage, it doesn't appear that this particular suggestion can go forward. But I emphasize that as far as we are concerned, we would be delighted to see the United Nations take whatever role it can and is willing to take to bring the South Vietnamese problem to a peaceful settlement.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, Historian Arthur Schlesinger said today that President Johnson is too gullible in taking the State Department's advice on the Ky government. He says the State Department has been wrong in the past and the President shouldn't take this advice. What do you have to say about this?

Secretary RUSK. Very little. Mr. Schlesinger is not an expert on Asia. He took a very small role in Asian questions when he was in Government. I worked on Asia for 25 years and I don't think I am going to get into a discussion with Mr. Schlesinger on Asia.

Mr. SCALI. Well, what about the gullibility factor?

Secretary RUSK. No, the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense with the full backing of men who have spent their lives working on Asia, look at these matters with great depth, with great comprehension and try to make the best judgments that we can about the alternatives and what we ought to do in connection with particular situations.

Mr. SCALI. I don't wish to belabor this, Mr. Secretary, but Mr. Schlesinger also said that you personally have an erroneous inter-

pretation of the Vietcong in that you seem to judge it as speaking for a coordinated Communist effort. Do you have such a misinterpretation?

Secretary RUSK. It is not a misinterpretation. We have facts. We know that the Vietcong is speaking for Hanoi. The National Liberation Front was organized by Hanoi to seize South Vietnam. We know that their instructions come daily from Hanoi to the south. I am not talking about misinterpretation, I am talking about facts.

Mr. CLARK. Another of the strong critics of our policies in Vietnam and in Asia, Senator FULBRIGHT, has taken another tack recently as you know. In a series of lectures he has claimed to see signs that the American Government is falling victim to an arrogance of power. Do you see any such signs?

Secretary RUSK. Well, I have read those lectures. Senator FULBRIGHT has not been quite specific in just what it is he charges us with in this regard. One always has to be careful about the abuse of power. Lord Acton once said that power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

But I think it is a matter of the greatest historical importance that the almost unbelievable power of the United States since 1945 has not corrupted the American people. That power has been used to support the simple and decent purposes of the American people in world affairs.

Now let's look at the record since 1945 onward. We demobilized almost totally after World War II, to a point where in 1946 we did not have a single division ready for combat or a single air group ready for combat. We tried to eliminate nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the world by giving them up for ourselves under the Baruch proposals. We reduced our defense budgets to something like \$10 billion in 1947. We took the leadership in insisting upon a peaceful reconciliation with our enemies, Germany and Japan. We spent over a hundred billion dollars not only binding up the wounds of war, but trying to help other countries get on with their economic and social development. We put some \$14 billion in food assistance to other countries.

When crises have come up, upon occasion we have to act with firmness, but we have also acted with great prudence. We flew an airlift into West Berlin to help those people survive while we explored the possibilities of peaceful settlement rather than engaging our troops in combat.

In Korea we took enormous casualties to try to defend the ability of the South Koreans to live at peace without unleashing the Pandora's box of nuclear war. When the Cuban missile crisis came up, President Kennedy took extraordinary effort, as John Scali knows, to leave the door open to a peaceful settlement of that great crisis. We waited 4 years, through increased infiltration from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, before we struck at North Vietnam.

Now there may have been mistakes along this period, but they are not mistakes of arrogance. The United States has committed itself to trying to build a decent world order. Why? Because the tens of millions of casualties in World War II and the prospect of hundreds of millions of casualties in world war III make it a compelling necessity that we organize a peace, that we not leave these things just to hopes for peace, or we not leave them to the ideas of the 1930's that if you are not too rude to the aggressor, maybe he will be satisfied and leave you alone.

We have got to organize a peace. That is what the United States has been all about in this postwar period. And we don't go around looking for business in these matters. There have been dozens and dozens of crises in which we have not taken part. We are not the gendarmes of the universe. But it

has been necessary upon occasion for us to move to defend the possibility of an organized peace, particularly where we have specific commitments through alliances.

Now this is not arrogance. The attitude of the American people in this postwar period has not been one of arrogance despite the unbelievable character of the power which is available. But this power must not be used by ourselves, the Russians, or others, because the survival of the human race depends upon it.

These problems should be approached on one's knees. These problems make pygmies of us all and unless we approach them with humility we will never solve them.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, Senator FULBRIGHT in criticizing the administration's policy toward Vietnam said, among other things lately, that the influx of several hundred thousand American troops into Vietnam has turned South Vietnam into an American brothel. Do you know of any such problem?

Secretary RUSK. Well I don't want to engage here today with Senator FULBRIGHT in a personal discussion. We will have full opportunity tomorrow to take up any of these questions that he wishes to pursue. I must say I was disturbed by the characterization of a city of two and a half million people, a proud and sensitive people, as an American brothel. It just isn't true, as a matter of fact.

We all know that the world's oldest profession is present in every big city throughout the world and the world's oldest profession is supported by men and has been since the beginning of time, whether in uniform or in civilian clothes. But what also disturbs me is that this reflects unfairly and inaccurately upon what our men are doing out there. The overwhelming majority of our men are fighting, standing guard, patrolling, carrying rice to people who are hungry, running aid stations for those who are sick, teaching classes, building schools, and doing the things that are necessary to help the South Vietnamese people get on with the job.

Now the characterization of a city of two and a half million people as a brothel, and the implication that this is preoccupying the attention of our soldiers out there I think is not very helpful under present circumstances.

Mr. CLARK. Do you feel in making remarks like this that Senator FULBRIGHT is giving aid and comfort to the enemy?

Secretary RUSK. No, no. No, no; I would not say that at all.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, that was Barry Goldwater's phrase—

Secretary RUSK. No, no. Well, I don't want to inject myself—it would be presumptuous of me, perhaps even arrogant of me, to inject myself into the discourse between Senator FULBRIGHT and former Senator Goldwater but, no; I don't attribute that kind of motivation at all.

Mr. CLARK. You don't share at all the Goldwater sentiment that Senator FULBRIGHT should resign?

Secretary RUSK. No, I don't. This is beside the point as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY contends that the policy of no sanctuary for Communist planes which might attack from bases in Red China, that this policy amounts to a very dangerous escalation that would cause real trouble.

Do you see grave risks in this policy?

Secretary RUSK. Well, any decisions on that subject would be, of course, made by the President in the light of all the circumstances at the time. I think that we would not be building a peace if we should somehow establish the principle in international law that nations can conduct military operations against their neighbors and be themselves safe under a sanctuary of some sort. This would greatly distort the possibilities

of organizing a decent peace. But the source of a danger, if that issue should arise, would be from those who would inject themselves into a conflict which we are trying to settle.

Once again, and I have said this at least what, a hundred times, John? I would be in Geneva tomorrow afternoon if there was anybody there to talk with me about peace in southeast Asia. For 5 years we have gone to the ends of the earth to talk about peace in southeast Asia.

We went to the Laos Conference in Geneva. We accepted the Soviet nominee as the Prime Minister of Laos. We accepted the idea—produced by the Laotians themselves—that they should have a coalition government. We signed that agreement. So did Peiping and so did Hanoi. But from the very day of the signature, Hanoi refused to withdraw its troops from Laos, refused to cease sending its troops through Laos into South Vietnam.

Now, the question is, who is interested in peace, and who is insisting upon taking over somebody else by force?

Now, a lot of these things ought to be sorted out on the basis of those very simple things. It isn't necessary to confuse these with a great deal of speculation and all sorts of philosophy and all sorts of ambiguity and murkiness. At the heart of the matter is, how are we going to organize peace and who is prepared to join in doing that, and who is determined to gobble up their neighbors by force?

Mr. SCALI. Do you see any sign that the North Vietnamese or perhaps the Chinese Communists have softened their stand against negotiations lately?

Secretary RUSK. I have seen nothing on that in recent months. So far as we can tell, their attitude remains what it was toward the end of the 37-day bombing pause, that the National Liberation Front must be accepted as the sole spokesman for the South Vietnamese, that we must accept Hanoi's four points and we must get our troops out of South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Secretary, two Democratic Senators, Senator TED KENNEDY and Senator MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, this past week proposed that a panel of distinguished Americans be named to reappraise our whole China policy.

Does that idea appeal to you?

Secretary RUSK. Well, this is an intriguing idea, but we have in the executive branch, have had for a long time, more than a year, a very competent group that has been making an intensive study of these matters. They have been in touch with many experts outside; they have visited universities and they have searched the literature for possible new ideas.

As you know, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Zablocki subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have made a study in considerable depth of these matters.

Now, actually the President and I have discussed it recent weeks the desirability of systematizing outside advice in the general areas of the world, based largely on the organization of our Geographic Bureau in the Department of State; Africa, Western Europe, Latin America, the Far East, that sort of thing.

So I think it is very likely that we shall do this somewhat more systematically than we have done before.

We have very distinguished consultants whom we call on all the time so I think there is no great issue on this matter.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Secretary, do you see any sign that, as Senator McGovern suggested, the United States stop campaigning at the United Nations against Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations?

Secretary RUSK. Well, when all that comes up to the heart of the matter on this question, what do you do about Formosa? In

our bilateral relations with Peiping, they make it clear there is nothing to discuss unless we are prepared to surrender Formosa.

Now, the United Nations runs into the same thing. It will, the United Nations, reject or expel the Republic of China on Formosa. It has a population equal to more than half of the members of the U.N.; it was a charter member of the U.N. Peiping has made it very clear, not only that the Republic of China must be expelled, but that the U.N. must apologize and reorganize and do all sorts of other things.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Secretary, I am sorry to have to cut this off, but our time is up. Thank you for being our guest on "Issues and Answers."

Secretary RUSK. Thank you very much.

MEMBERS TO HEAR GALBRAITH

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, at 3 p.m., will be held another in a series of meetings open to the Members of the House to discuss our foreign aid program. Four Republican and four Democratic members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have joined in sponsoring these meetings in the belief that the aid program is of interest to the entire House.

Tomorrow, the guest speaker will be John Kenneth Galbraith, noted Harvard economist and former U.S. Ambassador of India. The subject will be "Foreign Aid: Some Recent Lessons." It should prove to be an interesting and stimulating session.

The meeting will be held in the Speaker's dining room at 3 o'clock to enable us to be near the floor if a rollcall should occur. I hope that my colleagues here in the House will join us to hear our distinguished guest.

A FRESH LOOK AT THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at a recent regional foreign policy conference at Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, delivered an address entitled, "A Fresh Look at the United Nations." The substance of Secretary Sisco's remarks is, I am certain, of great interest to all members concerned about the future of the United Nations and our role in that organization.

For this reason I wish to insert Mr. Sisco's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my commendation for the fine job which Secretary Sisco has been doing since he was appointed to his present office last year.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had ample opportunity to meet with Mr. Sisco, to discuss his views, and to review the actions which he has initiated on behalf of more effective U.S. participation in

the many international organizations to which we belong. I must say that in all of our contacts Mr. Sisco has been very frank and helpful to the subcommittee.

In addition, the review of the budgetary procedures of the various international organizations, undertaken within the Department of State under Mr. Sisco's supervision, can have serious and constructive implications for the future of our participation in their activities.

As I have already said, I believe that Secretary Sisco is doing an outstanding job for our Government and country, and I certainly wish him well in his endeavors.

Mr. Sisco's address follows:

A FRESH LOOK AT THE U.N.

(Address by the Honorable Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the Regional Foreign Policy Conference, Dinkler Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., Saturday, April 2, 1966)

It is a privilege to be here in Atlanta. The aim of these regional foreign policy conferences is an excellent one, embodying a basic democratic idea—a direct discussion of public policy between interested citizens and those charged with formulating it.

A generation or two ago most of the major problems of government could be understood by almost every citizen. Today, even many well-informed people do not feel fully competent to judge many public issues. Too many persons simply shy away from their consideration altogether. Let the expert, the man with specialized knowledge, decide them. Yet these decisions, the complex no less than the simple, determine the future of our Nation.

The need for an informed, educated citizenry is therefore greater than ever. And as the issues grow more intricate, our obligation to explain and discuss them becomes correspondingly more important.

The institution I want to talk with you about today—the United Nations—is as complex as any around—as complex, in fact, as the 117 widely varied nations comprising it.

We Americans are pragmatic in our approach to most institutions. We pride ourselves on our flexibility and lack of dogmatism. Yet for some reason our view of the United Nations has often been somewhat simplistic. We have tended to forget that the United Nations must inevitably reflect the great diversity of views, interests and goals of the members represented in the world body. We sometimes forget when we do not always get our way that the United States is not the only country developing the scenario in world affairs today. We have at times asked too much of the U.N., and on other occasions have expected too little.

Polls show that the American people strongly support the U.N.: 80 percent believe the U.N. important and want the U.S. Government to use it more. Of course, the U.N. is an important instrument of foreign policy, one way among others for advancing our causes and for cooperating with other countries in the myriad tasks of political conciliation, social progress, economic development, and technical cooperation.

But we must avoid extravagant expectations about the U.N. Those who start out by seeing the U.N. as a panacea for all our ills often end in disillusionment. And they sometimes go to the opposite extreme of pessimism—regarding the U.N. merely as a decorative feature on the international landscape. For example, a distinguished correspondent, concerned over some irresponsible actions by some members of the General Assembly, recently advised his readers that "the only way to preserve the organization so that in some distant future it may play

the role for which it was created is to spare it as much as possible." A few weeks later, another distinguished correspondent for a great U.S. newspaper entitled an article, "The U.N. Tries Hard, But."

Now, I have been engaged in wrestling with the sometimes exhilarating and sometimes frustrating problems that have faced us in the U.N. for the past 16 years. I try not to overexaggerate but—to quote a friend of mine—I try not to underexaggerate either. I believe the beginning of wisdom lies in being neither a pessimist nor an optimist—but in being a possibilist. I am a possibilist.

In fact, I would venture to say that all practitioners of foreign policy must be possibilists—for politics—whether in our own legislature or in an international forum—is the art of the possible.

How does a possibilist approach foreign policy problems, and more specifically how does he operate in the U.N.?

First, he keeps in mind the real options that are open to him. He is problem-oriented and does not grasp for utopian solutions.

In the words of Winston Churchill: "Do not let spacious plans for a new world divert your energies from saving what is left of the old."

He knows, in the words of President Franklin Roosevelt, that the structure of world peace "cannot be a peace of large nations or of small nations, [but] * * * a peace which rests on the cooperative efforts of the whole world."

He knows he must deal with factional disputes in Cyprus and disorder in the Congo and the effect of the price of cocoa on Ghana's future—not about some amorphous scheme for world order.

He knows that when weighing the question of Red China's admission to the U.N. or recognition that not only is our view relevant but also the adversaries' continued insistence that the Republic of China be eliminated or cast aside.

He is concerned with how to recruit observers for Kashmir, as well as how to achieve a more fundamental and lasting political solution.

Second, he adapts to changing circumstances. One of the clichés about practitioners of foreign policy is that we are unaware that the world is changing. We are either asleep like Rip Van Winkle or are romantically playing the old familiar tunes from our boyhood. I assure you that if you sat at my desk in Washington for 1 day you would soon be disabused of this cliché. In dealing with U.N. affairs we are constantly aware that we cannot escape the dramatic changes of the 20 years since the charter was signed, and especially the changes in the composition and pressures in the U.N. during the decade of the sixties. It is a commonplace that change is taking place at a revolutionary and ever-accelerating pace. The tough assignment is to know how to design and adapt machinery to provide for peaceful change while preserving the underlying values—justice, economic and social advancement, human rights—for which the U.N. was created and to which our foreign policy is devoted.

Third, a possibilist does not start out with extravagant expectations. He is not disillusioned when he encounters setbacks. He seeks limited goals. He is patient. He keeps probing for possibilities. The history of our efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem illustrates this dramatically.

The task of the United Nations has been encumbered almost from the start by great-power conflicts. Its efforts to promote social progress have been hampered by discord and strife. It has been called upon to keep peace where there has been no peace in the hearts of men. It has been buffeted by the winds of racism and nationalism as the peoples of colonial lands have moved to rule themselves

in freedom and to assert their right to speak, and vote, as equals in the forum of the nations.

But through it all the U.N. has survived and continues to serve the cause of peace. That the United Nations has come this far is a tribute to the vision of those who drew the founding plans, a testimonial to the resiliency and relevance of the charter itself. The measure of the importance which President Johnson attaches to the U.N. is demonstrated by the fact that for the first time in our history, a Supreme Court Justice was asked to leave the Bench to lead us in the U.N. forum. Justice Arthur Goldberg has done this brilliantly.

CHANGE IN THE U.N. ITSELF

One question being asked is where is the U.N. going? This issue concerns us not only because of the present financial and constitutional difficulties the U.N. faces. In deeper perspective, we are grappling with the question of how to make sure that the U.N. structure keeps up with the times. For in the words of Lord Halifax at the concluding session of the San Francisco conference: "We cannot claim that our work is perfect or that we have created an unbreakable guarantee of peace. For ours is no enchanted palace to 'spring into sight at once' by magic touch or hidden power. But we have, I am convinced, forged an instrument by which, if men are serious in wanting peace and are ready to make sacrifices for it, they may find means to win it."

Changes in the world are inevitably reflected in changes in the U.N. To be sure, the U.N. must be representative of the new membership, as it tried to do by enlarging the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The U.N. is based on the one-nation, one-vote principle. Of the present 117 members, nearly half did not exist as independent states when the U.N. was formed. Of the 67 new members to enter the organization since 1945, 34 are African states, most small and with limited resources. A significant shift in relative voting strength to small members has occurred in most important U.N. organs.

If the U.N. is to be vital and viable, it must reflect not only the "sovereign equality" of states but the realities of power and responsibility as they exist in the real world today. For if it does not do so, the U.N. will speak but no one will listen, and its findings will lose their value.

The 20th General Assembly witnessed several examples of excesses by the majority, in some cases overriding the charter provision for a two-thirds vote on an important question on issues affecting peace and security. As Ambassador Goldberg stated at the close of the 20th Assembly: Where action is taken by the assembly in derogation of the charter requirement for a two-thirds vote on important questions "that action is a complete nullity. It is null and void." The discrepancies between voting power and real power will not be solved by formal abandonment of the one-nation, one-vote system. The charter on this subject is unlikely to be changed, and an agreement on a formula for weighting votes is unlikely. Rather, informal influence, mutual adjustment procedures, composition of subgroups, and the weight of political and financial contributions should help redress the balance. Above all, patience and understanding will be required, particularly by the advanced countries with greater experience in international affairs. It is our hope that all members will see that in the long run orderly procedures will serve their interests and help move all of us toward a more stable world order in which the rule of law prevails.

A HARD LOOK AT U.N. PROGRAMS AND BUDGETS

We have also been taking a hard look at programs and budgets throughout the entire U.N. system. We supported the establish-

ment of a General Assembly Committee to review budgetary problems in the U.N. system. The United States has been the main supporter of these programs in the past, and we can expect to do our full share in the future. We have supported U.N. programs because they help the developing countries to help themselves, because they sometimes avoid some of the political difficulties which are involved in bilateral aid, they help share the burden, and they provide a worldwide pool of technical help which is not available to any single country. But our support cannot and must not be taken for granted.

We realize the needs are great, and the developing countries understandably want to better their lot today—not in the distant future.

But we are convinced that more of the needs can be met by assuring that the U.N. and its family of agencies are operating at maximum efficiency, that sound and systematic budgetary procedures are followed, that program priorities are clearly established, marginal and duplicative activities eliminated, that undue increases in staff are avoided, and that reasonable and not excessive budget target levels are established.

We are working hard to this end. As President Johnson stated in a memorandum of March 15 to the Secretary of State directing him to undertake certain measures to improve our participation in international organizations: "No nation has been a greater supporter of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international organizations than the United States. * * * The United States shall continue to meet its fair share of the financial requirements of these organizations. If we are to be a constructive influence in helping to strengthen the international agencies so that they can meet essential new needs, we must apply to them the same rigorous standards of program performance and budget review that we do to our own Federal programs." Ambassador Goldberg and I have just returned from Geneva where we met with the other major contributors to the U.N. in an effort to give reality to this directive.

PEACEKEEPING

We consider U.N. peacekeeping an important security option in U.S. foreign policy. The U.N. has undertaken some dozen peacekeeping operations—all of which have served the national interests of the United States and the cause of peace. We would like to see the U.N. capacity to keep the peace strengthened. A U.N. committee of 33 is examining various facets of this problem—including whether new arrangements are needed regarding authorization of peacekeeping and their management, and how these should be financed in the most equitable and reliable manner.

However, as long as there are fundamental differences between the U.S.S.R. and the United States about the role of the U.N. in the peacekeeping field, it will be difficult to make real progress toward a more reliable system of financing or authorizing future peacekeeping operations.

The Soviets still want to subject all future peacekeeping operations to their total veto. We favor the Security Council playing the primary role provided in the charter. But subjecting peacekeeping operations entirely to the Soviet veto is a prescription for future total paralysis.

For our part, we will support desirable future peacekeeping operations. We recognize that where a major power has fundamental objections, those who favor a particular peacekeeping operation may have to carry a heavier financial burden. We recognize that the unwillingness of the General Assembly to apply the loss of vote sanction against those who refused to pay their peacekeeping assessments has weakened the principle of collective financing. But we will

May 10, 1966

9675

Located near each elementary school will be a neighborhood center with a nursery to free the housewife for errands or for coffee with neighbors.

The junior high and senior high schools will be placed next to one another in the village center, so they may share a gymnasium, auditorium and library.

These are some of the ways Rouse and his staff devised to eliminate duplication and waste. Another is to lay all sewer lines at the start rather than tear up the earth and lay them as the community grows.

And this leads to Rouse's main concern: Profit. And he puts it: "This was no residual goal. It was our prime objective."

THE WARSAW CONVENTION— SENATE RESOLUTION 256

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent New York Times newspaper articles, relating to Senate Resolution 256, be inserted at this point in the Record.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
May 7, 1966]

ATTACK SPURRED ON WARSAW PACT—AIRLINE GROUP ACCUSED IN LIABILITY CONTRO- VERSY

(By Tania Long)

The dispute over the U.S. continued participation in the Warsaw Convention reached a new intensity yesterday in an atmosphere that grew increasingly bitter.

An important group of lawyers who oppose the withdrawal of this country's denunciation of the treaty, which sets international air liability, virtually accused the International Air Transport Association of misleading the State Department by misrepresenting the position of some of the airlines.

And two leading pilots who are also lawyers, announced they would urge the pilots' organizations they represent to refuse to fly in the event the United States does rejoin a convention it denounced last November on the ground that it provided insufficient liability coverage for international airline passengers.

Both groups have charged that the proposals under which the United States intends to reenter the convention would lead to sabotage of aircraft and the murder of hundreds of innocent passengers. The proposals call for an increased liability limit of \$75,000 and the establishment of an absolute liability principle under which the airmen reached in Montreal earlier this week.

CLAUSE CAUSES TROUBLE

It is the absolute liability clause that has drawn most of the fire and led to the rejection by five American air carriers—including United, National and Delta airlines—of the terms of the new liability agreement reached in Montreal earlier this week.

The charges against Air Transport Group were made in a telegram to Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann, with a copy sent to Knut Hammarskjold, director general of the association, which represents 100 airlines. It said:

"Reports reaching us indicate major foreign airlines, including British Overseas Airways Corp., attached important reservations to absolute liability \$75,000 plan. Reservations not made known by IATA to State Department at Montreal meeting. Further understand that BOAC requested that reservations be made known to other airlines, which IATA did not do. BOAC reservations included exclusion of all acts of third parties, including sabotage BOAC position and

perhaps others being misrepresented in IATA communications to airlines and to State Department.

CALLED NONSENSE

"Further illustrates need for public hearing demanded by Senate resolution signed by 26 outstanding Senators. Urge State Department demand IATA produce all communications between IATA and airlines on this subject in last 3 weeks for State Department and Senate hearing."

The telegram was signed by Lee S. Kreindler, chairman of the aviation law section of the American Trial Lawyers Association and a leading legal authority on air liability.

The lawyers' charges were described as "absolute nonsense" by Julian Gazdik, general counsel to the airline association, in a telephone interview from the Montreal headquarters of the air transport association.

"We are always careful never to misrepresent anything," he said, "especially in such a delicate assignment as this has been."

He asserted that BOAC was the first carrier to signify its assent to the new terms. He had just received a cable from London stating: "BOAC has compiled your cable. Signed agreement in post." According to another source in transport group, acceptances have also come in from Varig, Irish International and Sabena.

Mr. Gazdik said that when BOAC was first sounded out on the liability terms proposed by the State Department, the airline expressed a reservation regarding the absolute liability coverage in cases of sabotage.

But he pointed out that the new terms purposely exclude saboteurs or their heirs from claiming damages resulting from accidents due to bombings.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9,
1966]

AIRLINES CLARIFY LIABILITY ACCORD—ATA SAYS FACTS HAVEN'T KEPT UP WITH RUMORS

(By Tania Long)

The Air Transport Association of America will issue a memorandum today that it hopes will clarify some of the complex issues involved in the proposed new liability agreement under the Warsaw Convention.

The United States and the airlines serving on international routes are negotiating for an updated convention that would raise the carriers' liability limit from the \$8,300 set in Warsaw in 1929 to a more realistic \$75,000.

The decision as to whether the United States goes along with the new terms will be made this week, and there is considerable pressure on the administration from both advocates and opponents.

The proposed agreement is strenuously opposed by a group of lawyers for whom Lee S. Kreindler, chairman of the aviation law section of the American Trial Lawyers Association, is chief spokesman. It is also opposed by some of the pilots.

SABOTAGE FEARED

The groups have said that the plan calling for absolute liability of up to \$75,000 a passenger is an invitation to sabotage.

The lawyers assert, furthermore, that an artificial limit for death or injury goes against the American principle of justice. No limit exists on domestic routes and each case is judged on its merit, they point out.

The controversy has reached the floor of the Senate. GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, supported by a 25 cosponsors, introduced a resolution urging the administration to hold full public hearing before withdrawing its denunciation of the Warsaw Convention.

The denunciation is due to take effect next Sunday. The administration announced its withdrawal from the convention when the airlines refused to increase the liability limit to \$100,000. It has since agreed to remain

within the convention with a \$75,000 limit, provided certain conditions are met.

ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION

The memorandum of the Air Transport Association, the trade organization of the Nation's scheduled airlines, sets out the new terms in detail because, a spokesman said, things have moved so fast that inevitable errors of interpretation have been made and the actual facts have not kept up with the rumors.

It makes the point that the agreement is a most unusual one, since the carriers have undertaken to pay up to \$75,000 for each passenger without being proved guilty of negligence. Under U.S. law, the memorandum says, liability is imposed on a carrier only if a passenger can prove that the carrier was at fault.

Then, in countering various statements that have been made about what the new terms would or would not do, the memorandum says:

"The agreement does not provide for an 'automatic' award of \$75,000 for each victim. A claimant will recover only damages proved in court. Thus, he could collect anywhere from nothing to an unlimited amount.

"A carrier must be proved guilty of willful misconduct—i.e., reckless or intentionally harmful conduct—for damages above \$75,000 to be recovered.

"The agreement does not provide an inducement to saboteurs. Claims benefiting saboteurs are expressly excluded. (Opponents reply that it is not always possible to identify a saboteur.)"

The State Department last week issued a 6-page memorandum on the new agreement.

MEDICAL CARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a Senator from West Virginia, I am frequently the recipient of mail from relatives of servicemen serving in Vietnam. I am sure that the other Members of the Senate are similarly contacted by the wives, mothers, and other family members of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen serving in southeast Asia. Often concern is expressed over the health and medical care being accorded these fighting men.

In an effort to be of service in providing general information on this subject, I discussed it in a special radio interview with Lt. Gen. D. Heaton, the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, who is, incidentally, a native West Virginian, having been born in Parkersburg, Wood County. General Heaton's remarks on the subject of medical care for American fighting men in southeast Asia were impressive, both because of the dedicated spirit revealed when he spoke of the tasks which he and his medical people are performing and because of the encouraging report which he relayed.

I ask unanimous consent that my radio interview with General Heaton be printed, in transcript form, in the Record at this point.

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

Today I have as my guest, Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Surgeon General, Department of the Army. General Heaton is a distinguished medical officer; and, while serving as commander at Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in Washington, he personally operated on such famous patients as President

Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. More recently, he was responsible for the care and treatment of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur while he was a patient at Walter Reed.

General Heaton has been decorated by our Government a number of times, including the occasion when he was honored for his able handling of mass casualties during the surprise Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor at the beginning of World War II.

Question. Speaking of mass casualties, General Heaton, how do our American casualties so far during the hostilities in Vietnam compare with those experienced during World War II and the Korean conflict?

Answer. Well, Senator BYRD, first, I am very honored to be here with you today; and, in answer to your question, I must say at the outset, we are meeting today not the full range of weaponry in Vietnam that we did in World War II and in Korea. Therefore, we can say that our wounds aren't quite, in some instances, as devastating as those in the past two wars. Moreover, our casualties who enter hospitals have a far less mortality rate than in World War II and in Korea. I will give you figures such as 4.5-percent casualty rate in World War II; 2.6-percent casualty rate in Korea; and, in Vietnam today, it is running between 1 and 1.2 percent.

Question. How do you account for this improvement, General?

Answer. We account for it, first, reminding you again of the lack of the overall range of weaponry, and, No. 2, the very speedy evacuation of our casualties upon receipt of the injury to our forward hospitals by way of the medical ambulance helicopters. I think that that coupled with the fact we have placed in the front hospitals very, very competent surgeons more than explains the tremendous reductions in the casualty rate.

Question. Are there any shortages of materiel or personnel necessary for the accomplishment of your medical mission?

Answer. I am very pleased to tell you, sir, that we have encountered no shortages of important materiel, and, certainly, we are extremely well staffed with personnel.

Question. Well, now, how do the medical problems of this war differ from those in Korea or during World War II? You have already mentioned one aspect of the difference.

Answer. Our problems in Vietnam today are a little different than in World War II and Korea. If based only on the malarial situation. You have heard, I am sure, and everybody, about our problem with malaria. It is the falciparum malaria, we call it. It does not respond to our weekly tablet which we thought would prevent all malaria and still does with the vivax type malaria. However, we are doing a lot of research on this and I am happy to tell you that we believe that we are coming up soon with a drug to not only prevent the falciparum malaria, and also, if the malaria does develop, it will considerably ameliorate the disease.

Question. Are we helping the civilian population with their medical problems?

Answer. We are doing a great deal with the civilians. You remember President Johnson is quite concerned with this. We have established what we call a Milphap team—doctors and nurses to work in civilian hospitals in the 43 Provinces. We, also, you will remember, have medical members of the special forces team and such as that.

Question. Well, General Heaton, you would say then that the overall medical situation concerning our troops in South Vietnam today is very much improved over what it has been in past wars?

Answer. Senator BYRD, it is tremendously improved, and I would like every mother and father and wife to know that we left no avenue overlooked or unattended. They can be

sure that their boys are receiving the best possible care.

Senator BYRD. Well, General Heaton, our people are appreciative of this, and I am very grateful for your presence today and for your message to my constituents, because I feel that it is a message that is encouraging.

IS THERE NEW HOPE FOR OUR INDIANS, ESKIMOS, AND ALEUTS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in an interview with William Steif in yesterday's Daily News, Secretary Udall confessed that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has "in the main been a failure," despite the expenditure of \$1.5 billion over the last 10 years. I could not agree more. What has transpired in the past, under the guise of benevolence and paternalism, regardless of how well intended, is a disgrace which can no longer be ignored.

Mr. Udall plans to remedy this failure by suggesting legislation for the next Congress. I know I can speak for other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as for myself, when I say we have had enough of the empty promises of the past, and are in no mood for further procrastination.

Apparently, the Secretary is finally contemplating action to improve the position and the opportunities of these original Americans who have so long been kept in a semiprimitive condition by Federal bureaucracy and misguided policies conceived at the top of the Bureau.

The plight of the natives of interior Alaska calls for a new policy which will enable them to enter the mainstream of American life in the third quarter of the 20th century. To this new approach by the Secretary, for which I am grateful, I pledge my complete cooperation and wholehearted support. But prompt and thoroughgoing reform and corresponding action are imperative. While we are spending billions of dollars abroad to help the underprivileged of other lands it is high time we made similar efforts in behalf of an important segment of our own people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Steif's interview be printed in the Record.

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

UDALL'S SOLUTION—PRIVATE INVESTMENT COULD AID INDIANS (By William Steif)

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall thinks the "big new money" to bring the Nation's 380,000 reservation Indians out of poverty must come from private investors, not Uncle Sam.

Mr. Udall, in an interview, offered ideas on how he expects to carry out President Johnson's order to "ramrod" solutions to the Indian problem.

First he confessed the Bureau of Indian Affairs has "in the main been a failure" despite spending more than \$1.5 billion in the past decade.

BIA failed, he said, because of "the old, rigid concept" under which it regarded itself as trustee for the Indians, and gave them no responsibility.

Mr. Udall summed up his task as "upgrading Indian leadership and putting it in a position to make more decisions."

Mr. Udall said educated Indians could hardly wait to get off the reservations, thus draining off leaders. But if investments developed opportunity of the 50 million reservation acres, educated Indians would stay, or have reason to return.

Specifically, the Secretary said he would concentrate first on housing.

Ninety percent of all reservation housing is substandard, and Mr. Udall said Federal housing people "traditionally haven't been interested because of their urban focus."

Another major focus will be persuading industry to invest on the reservations.

The Secretary is skittish on termination of BIA aid to the Indians.

He said every tribe and reservation should be dealt with on an individual basis; some tribes may have to be lured off their unproductive lands into towns, while other tribes' rich lands would be developed.

LEGISLATION

Mr. Udall is trying to pull together a legislative package which the administration would introduce early in 1967. It could include—

An heirship bill which would solve the dilemma of thousands of Indians owning tiny slivers of land.

Basic law on what Indians would be eligible to share in claims payments and how Indian tribal rolls would be closed.

A special law to let individual Indians be terminated from BIA dependency by tribal purchase of their rights.

Loan guarantee laws and alternate kinds of nonprofit corporations distinct from tribal councils; the nonprofit firms would be able to mortgage land, issue tax-free bonds, and take part in normal business ventures.

Mr. Udall is looking to closer ties with Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity and Eugene Foley's Economic Development Administration, since the average Indian family's income is \$1,500 a year—lowest of any group of poor in the Nation.

But Mr. Udall also recognizes Indian education must be upgraded, and hopes to shift much of this work to the States.

BOUTIN, AN EXCELLENT CHOICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the President has made an excellent choice in the appointment of Bernard Boutin as Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

This is an important post. The Small Business Administration brings help, assistance and encouragement to the Nation's small businessmen who must compete in the marketplace with the giants of industry. Over the years the businessmen of Alaska have benefited greatly from the guidance and the cooperation of Small Business Administration officials.

The Small Business Administration offers low-interest, long-term loans to the victims of natural disaster. We of Alaska have good reason to know how valuable this help can be. Alaska's recovery from the March 27, 1964, earthquake was rapid and sure. Without the dedicated and able help of the Small Business Administration this recovery would have been less rapid and much less sure.

Now with the appointment of Mr. Boutin the Administration has an able, experienced director who will continue the agency's tradition of efficient service to the Nation's businessmen. Mr. Boutin with his experience as Administrator of the General Services Administration and in private enterprise is well qualified for the post.

May 10, 1966

of Philadelphia, the Sons of Delaware, the Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington Club, the Wilmington Country Club, Wilmington Lodge, No. 307, B.P.O.E., the University Club, Maryland Society of Delaware, the Westchester-Biltmore Country Club, the Bedford Club, Armstrong Lodge, No. 26, A.F. & A.M.; Delaware Consistory, Eden Lodge, No. 84, I.O.O.F.; Cherokee Tribe, No. 4, I.O.R.M.; Modern Woodmen of America; Ancient Order of United Workmen; the Bankers of New York, the Burning Tree Golf Club of Washington, D.C., the Metropolitan and other clubs.

He was a member of the Methodist Church. Survivors are his widow, his son of Greenville and his daughter of Glencoe, Ill., five grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

VIETNAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Wilmington Morning News of May 7, there was published an article by Mr. Henry J. Taylor entitled "Viet War Will Be Lost in Washington."

This article makes some interesting comments on the background of our becoming involved in southeast Asia, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

VIET WAR WILL BE LOST IN WASHINGTON (By Henry J. Taylor)

By every conceivable measure of relative power, mighty America's war in Vietnam should have been over and done with long ago.

A few dates tell a great deal about its conduct. They are more reliable than Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's Alice-in-Wonderland publicity handouts.

President Kennedy was inaugurated January 20, 1961. On that day, only 77 U.S. military men were in South Vietnam, and all were serving only as advisers. The Pentagon confirms this.

The Bay of Pigs invasion occurred April 18, 1961. Ninety days later, President Kennedy sent 12,000 troops to Vietnam, reportedly to show, after the Cuba debacle, that the United States was not a paper tiger.

It was a fateful decision, and it was the beginning of the war commitment—now 5 years old.

Today we have 255,000 men in Vietnam, not including the great 7th Fleet. The absolute cream of the U.S. Army is there. The Marine Corps elite regiments are there along with the very best of the U.S. Navy and Air Force. Even our vast Strategic Air Command, not designed for such missions, is employed nearly around the clock.

Nevertheless, on January 13, 1964, heavy Communist units stood 35 miles from Saigon, and they remain where they were 2 years ago.

On February 5, 1962, Secretary McNamara stated: "By every quantitative measure, we are winning the war in Vietnam."

On December 2, 1962, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Arthur Sylvester said to the Sigma Delta Chi journalistic fraternity's Deadline Club in New York City: "It's the inherent right of the Government to lie to save itself."

On June 21, 1963, Mr. McNamara made his "winning the war" statement of the previous year all over again.

On June 22, 1964, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, returning from command in Vietnam, stated: "I think the military situation is coming along fine now." This was an apostasy, tragic to observe, General Harkins was peddling that pap under McNamara's censoring eye.

On October 3, 1964, after going to Vietnam four times, each time "to review the situation," Mr. McNamara announced: "The major part of the U.S. military task in Vietnam can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of training personnel."

On February 3, 1965, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said: "If we were as successful in the civil-political area as we are in the military situation in Vietnam, we'd be on our way now."

On August 1, 1965, we staged our first Vietnam engagement. This was at Chu Lai—9 months ago. It spread to the first bloody encounters in the Ia Drang Valley. Today we still control neither Chu Lai nor the Ia Drang Valley.

On August 5, 1965, President Johnson retaliated for attacks against our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin by bombing North Vietnam. Nearly a year later we're still hearing how successful our bombings are—and we're still bombing, bombing, bombing.

On December 1, 1965, Mr. McNamara announced: "It will be a long war."

Every one of Mr. McNamara's successive troop estimates throughout the years was as wrong as the next one. First he said 12,000 would do the job, then 24,000, then 40,000, then 75,000, then 150,000.

On March 3, 1966, at an angry press conference, Mr. McNamara ticked off a figure of 235,000 as needed. Then on April 20 he announced that 255,000 are there. And is there any end in sight?

The heroism and morale of our troops and fliers who are fighting and dying is nearly incredible, God bless them. And let me give you, for the first time in print, an added slant on fine Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

At the request of an important midwestern publisher, President Johnson and Secretary McNamara secretly called General Westmoreland home to brief the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention in New York the week of April 25. General Westmoreland replied: "Sorry, but I can't leave the job."

It was commonly agreed in Algeria that if the French lost that war it would be lost in Paris, not Algiers. If we lost the Vietnam war it will be lost in Washington.

RED CHINA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many articles have been written and much has been made on the floor of the Senate concerning the advisability of changing our policy with respect to Red China.

I came across a newspaper article the other day, published in the Washington Post of April 28, written by a British novelist, Frank Tuohy, who has been teaching in Japan and who recently made a trip through Communist China. The article is entitled "China's Hate of United States Traced to Need for Suitable Target."

Mr. President, this is worthwhile reading, not only because it indicates a firsthand observation after travel in that country, but also because it gives some idea of the problems that we in the Western World are facing with regard to trying to put over our conception of morality and ethics in an oriental frame as evidenced by the Red Chinese.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have just referred printed in the RECORD.

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

CHINA'S HATE OF UNITED STATES TRACED TO NEED FOR SUITABLE TARGET

(NOTE.—The author of this article is a British novelist teaching in Japan, who recently made a trip through Communist China.)

(By Frank Tuohy)

PEKING.—Signs of anti-American feeling are everywhere in China, yet I feel there is something fishy about it all. If the Americans did not exist, the Chinese Communist Party would have to invent them.

Take the following scene, for example: An old man is lying on the ground, and an officer with a stock whip is flogging him. A young woman dashes forward to help, but is seized by two soldiers. The officer turns with a fiendish snarl and snatches her baby from her. The woman breaks free, but two more soldiers cross their rifles with fixed bayonets in front of her. Raising the child, the officer hurls it down onto the crossed bayonets. The woman shrieks. Grinning, the officer draws a revolver and shoots her.

The officer is American, the mother and baby Vietnamese. This gruesome scene starts off the Chinese film "Victory Is Just Ahead," which I saw in Canton. The American officer, called J. Waston, is played by a Chinese in a false nose.

REASONS BEHIND HATE

Why do the Americans have to be presented like this?

First, the Chinese believe that they have been especially marked out for American devastation since 1949. One of the "remolded capitalists" of Shanghai, used to turning on his opinions for foreigners, was quite definite about it:

"The Americans have bullied us too much * * *. In 1950 they bombed plants in Shanghai and have made more than 400 intrusions. Why should we Chinese have aggressive designs on other countries when there is so much to be done here?"

Further embellishments are added to this general picture every day: China's sudden loss of friends in Ghana and Indonesia is due to CIA plotting; all American moves for peace in Vietnam are a hoax.

Secondly, in spite of diplomatic setbacks, China still wishes to appear the leader of revolutionary movements against imperialism and neocolonialism all over the world.

The breakdown of the relationship with Cuba is still a traumatic experience which has not been adjusted to. Deprived of the Cubans, China looks elsewhere for oppressed peoples to lead. Flagged maps of the United States show spots of "student-worker" protest as though these were Chinese outposts in a battle.

My objection that many of the protesting American students were Christians and pacifists was brushed aside.

Thirdly, the Americans play an important role in the thoughts of Chairman Mao Tse-tung. "The struggle of opposites is ceaseless." Thus there will always be a struggle between the party and the reactionaries. This struggle will never come to an end, socialism will never be transformed, and communism may be postponed forever.

Thus the devil will always be with us and, at present at any rate, the Americans fit the role better than anyone else. Why? Because they are the most powerful nation in the world, they are unrepentantly capitalist, their military bases still encircle China; and in Vietnam they are fighting an "antipeople's" war.

U.S. COWARDS AND SADISTS

In films, in plays and operas, the Americans are represented as long-nose, knock-kneed, whip-cracking cowards and sadists. They date back to Uncle Tom's Cabin. The technological nightmare of modern warfare is almost completely ignored, Hiroshima and

May 10, 1966

which he was appointed an associate justice of the State supreme court. Senator Hastings served as city solicitor in Wilmington from 1911 until 1917 and as a judge on the Wilmington municipal court from 1920 until 1929.

On December 10, 1928, he was appointed as a Republican Member of the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator T. Coleman du Pont. Two years later he was elected to complete the unexpired term and was reelected to a new 6-year term which ended on January 3, 1937.

Senator Hastings, who celebrated his 92d birthday on March 5, was one of the best known and well-loved political figures in Delaware.

In a political career which spanned half a century, Senator Hastings contributed greatly to the growth of his adopted State and the Nation. The people of Delaware have lost a distinguished statesman, and those of us who were fortunate enough to know him have lost a valued friend.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I join my colleague in expressing my deep sorrow on the passing of former U.S. Senator Daniel O. Hastings, of Delaware.

Senator Hastings lived a long and active life, and most of his life was involved in the governmental affairs of his community, State, and Nation. He is best remembered for his service in the U.S. Senate from December 10, 1928, to January 3, 1937, but before that and after that he contributed greatly of his judgment and energy to the affairs of Wilmington and the State of Delaware.

I knew him as a friendly, sincere man whose whole interest in Government and his fellow citizens continued even in his advanced age. He was remarkable for the activity he displayed even when he reached the age of 90.

We are fortunate that Senator Hastings took time in his later years to write a brief history of Delaware politics from 1904 to 1954.

In the conclusion to this book, Senator Hastings writes:

With the experience I have had in politics, and the age I have reached, I am wondering whether General MacArthur's statement about the "soldier" might not apply to the man who has been active in politics, to wit: "The old politician never dies, he just fades away."

In Senator Hastings' case I would like to emphasize that his interest and activity never flagged, and he always remained a valued counselor.

Mrs. Boggs and I express our deepest sympathy to members of Senator Hastings' family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from today's Wilmington Morning News on the death of Senator Hastings printed in the RECORD.

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

FORMER DELAWARE SENATOR HASTINGS DIES AT 92—CAREER SPANNED 60 YEARS

Former U.S. Senator Daniel O. Hastings, 92, died last night at 8:30 in Foulk Manor on Foulk Road where he had been a guest since March 13.

Senator Hastings lived at the Plaza Apartments, 1303 Delaware Avenue.

His career spanned more than 60 years in public office and private law practice. But a country schoolteacher was credited for helping to build the foundation for his success.

His life was full of paradoxes. Senator Hastings wanted a legal career but a role in politics was pressed upon him.

Reared a Democrat, he became a Republican. Up to 1930, he held public office 25 years, but had never been a candidate in an election. He was a justice in the State's highest court before he was a Wilmington court judge.

He was born in Somerset County, Md., March 5, 1874, son of Daniel H. and Amelia Ellen (Parsons) Hastings.

Senator Hastings went through a grade school in the county, but decided against further education when he reached high school at Crisfield, Md.

However, his teacher, Miss Estella Marshall, persuaded him to continue with his schooling, explaining the opportunities open to a trained mind. The Senator often credited Miss Marshall for starting him off in the proper direction.

A private tutor, Prof. Charles F. Eastman, was responsible for his precollege education.

In 1892, Senator Hastings went to Washington to clerk in a railway office for \$25 a month. His hours were arranged so he could prepare for a law course. Within 16 months he had mastered a preparatory course to enter Columbian University (now George Washington University).

To help defray his college expenses, he worked as a stenographer in a law office and as a clerk in the office of the chief engineer of the War Department.

At 24, he married Garrie L. Saxton of Dover.

He was admitted to the Delaware bar in 1902.

Senator Hastings formed a law partnership with Henry C. Conrad, and after practicing for only 2 years, he won appointment as deputy attorney general of Delaware.

The appointment came largely as a result of his performance as defense counsel in a number of murder trials. He filled the deputy attorney general post for 4 years.

Gov. Simeon S. Pennewill appointed Senator Hastings as Delaware's secretary of state on January 19, 1909, for a term of 4 years. He resigned, however, on June 16 of the same year, to accept an appointment as associate judge of the superior court, resident in New Castle County for a 12-year term. As an associate judge he also sat as a member of the then State supreme court.

Previous to the present Delaware supreme court, established in 1951, the highest court in any particular case consisted of those judges of the superior court and the court of chancery who had not sat upon that case at the trial level. The present supreme court is composed of the chief justice and two associate justices.

On January 17, 1911, Judge Hastings resigned from the judiciary and took over as special counsel for the Delaware General Assembly.

From July 1, 1911, to July 1, 1917, he served as city solicitor of Wilmington.

Upon the death of Wilmington Judge Phillip Q. Churchman, Gov. John G. Townsend, Jr., urged Senator Hastings to accept the judgeship of municipal court. He accepted and served until 1928.

Some friends were chagrined because he became a city judge after sitting as an associate justice of the State's highest court at 35, the youngest justice in Delaware history. Judge Hastings, however, declared it the creed of his public career never to refuse a

position simply because a better post might be in prospect.

On December 10, 1928, he was appointed by Gov. Robert P. Robinson to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of U.S. Senator T. Coleman du Pont. In 1930 he was elected a U.S. Senator, defeating Thomas F. Bayard, his Democratic opponent.

Senator Hastings was one of the first and most persistent critics of the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In 1936, he was defeated in a bid for reelection by James H. Hughes. During the campaign, Senator Hastings attacked the Roosevelt family and the President's proposals to enlarge the U.S. Supreme Court.

At a rally of Brandywine Hundred Republicans during the campaign, Senator Hastings declared the Federal Social Security Act discriminated against the young man in favor of the older man and pledged if reelected "to get rid of the iniquitous law."

After his defeat, he returned to the practice of law in Wilmington. He was senior partner of the firm of Hastings, Taylor, and Willard when he died.

He became counsel for stockholders of Pennroad Corp. in suit against the Pennsylvania Railroad for \$95 million damages, a suit in which others joined, but he was senior of the many attorneys and took the leading part in the trial of the case. They won a verdict for \$22,100,000. Both sides appealed, leading to a compromise settlement of \$15 million.

In 1960, he assailed the city towaway law claiming the towing away of cars when the drivers were about to drive them away as a "distressing and disgraceful situation" and needed correction.

He told the Sons of the American Revolution in 1951 there were no hopes of peace through the United Nations nor through peace talks with Russia. He charged that the U.N. was just as helpless as had been the League of Nations.

Senator Hastings continued to take an active interest in political life until his final illness, and wrote frequent letters to the editor of the News-Journal papers.

In October 1964 he urged the appointment of Associate Justice Daniel F. Wolcott as chief justice of Delaware (this was later done) and the appointment of Chancellor Collins J. Seitz, to the State's highest court.

More than a year later he pressed for the appointment of Seitz to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (President Johnson subsequently made the appointment) and took Pennsylvania's two Senators to task for favoring a Pennsylvania lawyer for the post.

When he was 90, Senator Hastings wrote a book including reminiscences of 50 years of State politics. Entitled "Delaware Politics, 1904, 1954," the 67-page book contained many anecdotes and numerous stories about political leaders of both parties during that time.

Mrs. Hastings died February 1, 1930, leaving two children, Elizabeth Ellen (Hastings) Fletcher, and Daniel Jr. On October 17, 1931, Senator Hastings remarried. His second wife is Elsie Saxton, a sister of his first wife. She survives.

His private business interests embraced the Interstate Amiesite Co. of which he was president, General Precision Corp., 20th Century Fox, and Pennroad Corp.

At one time he owned Woodburn, the celebrated haunted house of Dover, now the Governor's House, occupied by Gov. Charles L. Terry, Jr.

His hobbies included golf, horses, and hunting dogs. He once played 90 holes of golf in 2½ days. He was also interested in raising purebred Holstein cattle on the farm he had owned near Dover.

He was a member of the Young Men's Republican Club of Wilmington, Union League