

June 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3099

Meantime, the U.S. Army, on the retreat in the Pacific, got to hear of the *Kaiulani*. Needing vessels, the Army promptly seized the ship, towed it back to Sydney, took out the masts and unceremoniously converted the bark into a coal barge.

The Navy towed *Kaiulani* to New Guinea and for the rest of the war the ship tagged along with the fleet until the Philippines was recaptured and the war ended.

A Manila shipping company bought *Kaiulani* in 1948 and for the next 17 years the ship was used as a lumber barge between Manila and the southern Philippine island of Mindanao.

GIFT TO UNITED STATES

But history-minded sailing buffs like Jim Kleinschmidt got to hear of *Kaiulani*'s fate and were preparing to purchase the vessel when President Macapagal gave it to the United States.

"When I first saw her lying in in Manila Bay I just gulped," said Kleinschmidt. "She was covered with rust, the woodwork was rotten and she was infested with rats, cockroaches and almost every other kind of pest you could imagine.

"We managed to get her cleaned up first, then we started strengthening the hull and replacing some of the damaged hull plates.

"We've got beautiful pictures of the ship taken almost from the day she was laid down and with the original plans it won't be hard to rebuild her exactly as she was—provided we get money.

"We found the masts in the Sydney dockyard where she was stripped and converted in 1941 and they are now in the United States.

"We estimate that it will take about \$250,000 to rebuild her here. But the way we are going and the facilities we have make it doubtful that the project can ever be finished here.

"In a commercial yard which I think is essential, the cost would be about \$500,000.

"If we had to get it done in the States, it would cost a million dollars."

Kleinschmidt, a soft-spoken laconic sailor, admits he had been bitten by the sailing ship bug.

"Let's face it, I'm an old ship fanatic. I want to see her sailing again under her own canvas," he said wistfully.

jm

Brig. Gen. Schiltz Discusses Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to take part in Armed Forces Day celebrations in Dubuque, Iowa.

At a luncheon meeting that day, Brig. Gen. Howard F. Schiltz delivered an interesting and informative speech on the role of the U.S. Army in Vietnam.

General Schiltz is the commanding general of the U.S. Army Aviation Materiel Command in St. Louis, and is therefore well qualified to discuss supply and logistical problems in Vietnam, and the importance of maximum mobility in the execution of our military operations there.

A particularly intriguing point which the general discussed was the use of advanced computer technology for the

rapid filling of supply requirements for the American soldier in Vietnam.

I would like to bring this excellent address to the attention of my colleagues, as an example of the means by which we are combining our past experience and modern capabilities in the defense of freedom and insert General Schiltz' remarks at this point in the Record:

POWER FOR PEACE

(Speech by Brig. Gen. Howard F. Schiltz, commanding general, U.S. Army Aviation Materiel Command, St. Louis, Mo., at the Armed Forces Day luncheon meeting, Dubuque, Iowa, May 19, 1966)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, let me say what a real thrill it is to be here today. I am honored that you would invite me to address you. But honor is also due all of you—for your presence is a tribute to your interest in and support of our Armed Forces.

It is appropriate that we have set aside this time to honor those who are, in the President's words, the "guardians at the gate" in the defense of freedom. Our men and women serving in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard rightly deserve recognition for their many sacrifices at home and abroad.

I will talk more about the Army than the other services because the Army is the service I know best, not that I don't fully realize all services are indispensable members of the national defense team. Although each of the services has a distinct mission, each is dependent on the other. Together their actions have become the slogan for Armed Forces Day, "Power for Peace". This day—and this slogan—again remind us that the strength of our Armed Forces plays a vital part not only in providing for the security of our nation but also for seeking world peace.

The past year has been a significant one for our Armed Forces especially (a) their role in Vietnam, (b) their world-wide commitments, and (c) their expansion.

This afternoon I will discuss one phase of these changes, the role played in Vietnam's struggle for freedom.

Why is it so important that we take a stand in Vietnam? President Johnson and other Government officials have answered the "Why Vietnam" question a number of times. The President's basic statement is still applicable: "Our power . . . is a very vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise, or in American protection. . . . In each land the forces of independence would be considerably weakened and an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would certainly imperil the security of the United States itself. . . . We do not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

To those who might challenge this stand in Vietnam, we reiterate the broad objective assigned our Armed Forces.

First, to prevent, if possible, total nuclear war; if one does occur, to make certain that we bring it to the most favorable conclusion possible.

Second, to dispel any illusion of aggressors that they can successfully engage in local military adventures at the expense of the Free World nations.

Third, to prevent the Communists from gaining control of independent nations through subversion, coercion, assassination, terror or guerrilla warfare. These are realities under the cloak the Communists cynically call a "war of national liberation" or, "a people's war."

In an 18,000 word manifesto, "Long Live the Victory of People's War!" published last September, Communist China's defense minister emphasized that Vietnam is only the current example of a "people's war".

The Communists see such a war in three phases: Guerrilla Harassment; battles of annihilation by enlarged and better-equipped guerrilla units against isolated units; and finally, massive attacks by powerful guerrilla armies. This is the kind of enemy we face in Vietnam—tough, determined, and ruthless.

Right about now I think a little background information about the country of South Vietnam would be in order. South Vietnam contains roughly 65,000 square miles, slightly larger than the State of Iowa. It's approximately 585 miles long—and its width varies from 50 to 150 miles. The northern area is dominated by rugged mountains, with flat, fertile stretches along the east coast. The central area is a large plateau. The south is mostly the rice-rich Mekong Delta.

The country has a monsoon climate—rainy and hot during one period, dry and hot during the other. The north is dry while the south is rainy, and vice versa.

The population of South Vietnam numbers around 16 million. About 85% are Mongoloid in origin. The remaining 15% is comprised of various groups, including the mountain tribesmen—or Montagnards.

North of the 17th parallel lies North Vietnam, a bit smaller in size—some 56 thousand square miles and roughly the same population as its neighbor to the South. North Vietnam has its mountains and its plateaus as does the South. The people are essentially of the same stock as those in South Vietnam. In other words—North and South Vietnam are pretty much alike as far as geographical features and people are concerned.

Logically, this leads to another question. Since the background and the people are the same—why are they fighting against each other?

This seems an appropriate time to dispel a misconception held by many people. If you have two different segments of people from the same basic group—fighting between themselves, this really constitutes a civil war. This is the misconception. The fighting in Vietnam is not a civil war. It is not a rebellion. It is naked, cold-blooded aggression from North Vietnam. President Johnson stated last year, "It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of Communism."

The Vietnamese have asked our help in their struggle for freedom against Communist domination. We have promised assistance and are fulfilling the pledge given by three American Presidents since 1954. As earlier moral support and economic aid proved insufficient, in the early '60's we committed large numbers of military advisers and huge amounts of equipment to strengthen Vietnam militarily.

From May '65 through January '66, the Army deployed two combat divisions and four brigades to the Republic. The 173d Airborne Brigade on Okinawa deployed to Vietnam in May. It was followed by the 2d Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division in July. The same month, the 1st Brigade of the 101st Airborne Division reached Vietnam. And in September, the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) arrived, followed by the rest of the 1st Infantry Division in October. In the closing days of last year and the start of this year, two brigades of the 25th Infantry Division were dispatched from Hawaii to Vietnam. Concurrently, the Marines deployed two divisions and the Air Force sent several tactical air command squadrons. The Navy increased its fleet size with the addition of the atomic carrier *Enterprise* and the Coast Guard sent a flotilla of patrol vessels to help prevent infiltration by sea. A third brigade of the 25th Division is now in Vietnam. Substantial forces from Korea, Australia, and New Zealand continue

A3100

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 8, 1966

to give a good account of themselves against the Viet Cong. And the valiant South Vietnamese armed forces have improved in effectiveness as they wage their long fight against the enemy.

I would like to go into detail about the deployment of one of the divisions to Vietnam—the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile)—I think that probably the most striking development in the Vietnam conflict is the acceptance of the helicopter in carrying out the concept of maximum mobility.

The importance of mobility—and constant search of military commanders for greater mobility—has been recognized since earliest times. Julius Caesar, before embarking for Greece and the final battle which defeated Pompey—said this to his troops: "Fellow soldiers; neither winter nor the delay of our comrades shall check my onset. I consider speed the best substitute—the most potent thing in war is the unexpected." And you remember that famous saying attributed to the brilliant Confederate cavalry general Nathan Forrest, "Get there fustest with the mostest."

Army aviation has brought the ground soldier a degree of mobility unknown in the past. He can almost be here—there—everywhere at the same time.

After three years of study, tests, and evaluation by the Army, the 1st Cavalry Division was deployed to Vietnam in just over a month from the date of its activation on 1 July 1965. The major innovation of this division is the use, where practicable, of aircraft—mostly helicopters—instead of trucks, tanks, and personnel carriers, to speed up the movement of troops and supplies.

The airmobile division is authorized 434 aircraft, all but six of which are helicopters, compared with only 101 aircraft in the standard division. The new division has only 1,600 ground vehicles, mostly jeeps, compared with 3,200 in the infantry division.

The special advantages of the airmobile division are summed up in this statement by Major General Harry W. O. Kinnard, the first commander of the 1st Cavalry Division: "In brief these include the use of air vehicles to move over difficult terrain—to operate over wider areas with an enhanced surveillance capability; and use of the helicopter to permit combat units to be introduced near their objective, not fatigued by marching, and in tactical formations—. The division already has proven it has a very rapid speed of reaction inherent in our massed assault supported by either tube or rocket artillery as well as tactical air strikes. Finally, because of its inherent mobility, the division, even more than the insurgent, has the ability to choose its own time and place either to fight or not as is most logical."

With the buildup I have mentioned, there came supply and logistical problems. Before we get into the subject of these problems, let me give you some information about the general conditions the American servicemen must cope with. The heat—the leeches—the diseases—the less rain—dampness—wind—sand—dust, and I could go on and on. Let me make these conditions a bit more concrete. There's the sand—for one thing. Fine—white—shifting sand. It gets into your eyes and burns your face. Its companion is red, clay-like dust. These take their toll not only of men but also of equipment. For instance—we have some rotor blades for helicopters which normally have a service life of some 2,500 hours. In Vietnam—in some instances, the life is much less—thanks to the sand and dust.

Then there's the rain and the dampness. Again, these are felt by men and machines. When I visited the headquarters of the 1st Cavalry Division last October and November, it was raining when we landed. We learned it had been raining for eight straight days. Clothes never really dry—mildew establishes itself on leather and metal and everything

else. To say the least—it's unpleasant and uncomfortable. These few words are just to supplement what you already know about the conditions in Vietnam. And conditions—especially when we get into the area of equipment—naturally lead to another question. Are our men getting the equipment they need—in the quantities they need—at the time they need it?

I'll only speak specifically of Army aviation—for again, that is the area with which I am most familiar. Our men are getting what they need—when they need it. Right now we—along with the other services—use Red Ball express—which I'm sure will stir some of your World War II memories.

For those who don't recollect and for the younger group, the original "Red Ball Express" was created during the Allied sweep through France in the closing stages of World War II.

The momentum of the drive was threatened and fears were raised that the advance would even grind to a halt because bomb-damaged railroads couldn't handle the vast amounts of supplies needed at the front lines.

To avert such a disastrous possibility, a huge fleet of trucks was assembled, a RED BALL signifying priority over other traffic was painted on the bumper, and essential supplies were carried to the front over shell-pocked highways as fast as the trucks could roll. As a result, the drive was sustained without critical shortages.

This same approach, with some streamlining and modification, is now being used again. This time the roads are air lanes stretching from depots in the United States to Vietnam and the trucks are four-engine jet aircraft.

All of our equipment is being affected by the conditions I mentioned previously. Also, around the clock use of the equipment leaves little or no time for preventive maintenance. This then increases the requirement for repair parts. For the armada of U.S. equipment in Vietnam—fighter aircraft, helicopters, tanks, bulldozers, trucks, materiel handling equipment, and others—the essentials they must have to keep them operating are replacement repair parts. To cope with this problem, the jet age "RED BALL Express" was organized with a fleet of jet transports carrying priority repair parts and equipment, all marked with the RED BALL. The system is designed to have the required part in the hands of the mechanic in Vietnam within a maximum of seven days from the time the requisition reaches CONUS.

Let me briefly explain how the supply system for emergency requirements other than Red Ball Express works. I will confine my explanation solely to the Aviation Materiel Command in St. Louis.

Our system is built around a computer which sits in our head-quarters down in St. Louis. This computer is bulging with information about Army aviation materiel. In fact—there are some two billion pieces of pertinent information stored in our master file.

Each part of each of our aircraft has an identification number. This number—along with other information about the part—is punched into a card. In fact—we punch whole decks—as they are called—of such cards. And we send these decks out to field installations.

When the man in Saigon finds he needs a part—he pulls the appropriate card from his files and drop it into a transceiver. This is a machine somewhat like a teletypewriter—except that it transmits punched information—rather than words. The transceiver transmits the information to a major overseas supply depot. The information is then run through their computer, which determines whether or not the depot has the desired item in stock. If it has, the computer directs shipment to the requester.

If the part is not in stock in the overseas depot the information is relayed into our computer. Our machine ascertains—that Sharpe Army Depot in California is the closest to the requester in Saigon. The machine then checks the inventory of Sharpe. If the part is on hand there—the computer automatically punches out a shipping order to the depot.

If, however, the computer discovers that Sharpe doesn't have the desired part—it automatically then goes to the next closest Army Depot and repeats the same process. It continues this until it locates and orders shipment of the part. Finally, the computer makes an automatic adjustment of the inventory for that particular part in the particular depot—as well as making an adjustment in our master inventory records in St. Louis.

Sometimes the machine doesn't stop there. It may find that—after filling the requisition—our total stock has dropped to a point where we must order more parts. This sets off another chain reaction—the upshot of which is that a contract for re-order is sent to the manufacturer. This contract naturally has a delivery date specified. The computer quietly sits back and does nothing more. But if information is not fed into the machine saying that the order has been filled and delivered to the various depots as directed—the machine kicks out a letter to the contractor telling him he's behind schedule. And here a man finally gets into the act. He gets a copy of this letter—and he then seeks to determine the cause for the delay and resolve any problems which may have arisen.

The result? As I said—high priority requisitions for Vietnam are filled within seven days after the man in Saigon sets the wheels in motion. This computerized operation—plus the superb support provided by the Military Airlift Command of the Air Force—makes it possible to give our men over there what they want when they want it.

In conclusion, these are exciting times in the Army. Much has been done in the past year, but much more remains to be done. I assure you that the United States Armed Forces are fully aware of the trying days that lie ahead, in Vietnam and elsewhere, and are determined that these days will give way to a bright future for peace and freedom for mankind. As the late President Kennedy proclaimed on his first day in office, "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Today, I ask all of you to join with me in praying for our men who are fighting to keep free all countries from oppression. We should do our utmost to show to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free. Thank you!

Support for Headstart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have felt that one of the most successful antipovertry programs and the one with perhaps the greatest potential is Project Headstart. I think my impressions, based in large

June 8, 1966

Mr. Speaker, I wish to also congratulate the other recipients of the 1966 Nie-man fellowship. I would like to compliment their newspapers or news services for developing such able men.

The list of the recipients follows:

Dana R. Bullen II, 34, Supreme Court reporter for the Washington Star.
 Ken W. Clawson, 31, labor reporter for the Toledo (Ohio) Blade.
 Anthony Day, 33, of the Washington bureau of the Philadelphia Bulletin.
 David H. Hoffman, 33, Washington correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune.
 Leamon D. James, Jr., 34, city editor of the Florence (S.C.) Morning News.
 Walter W. Meek, 31, assistant city editor of the Arizona Republic, Phoenix.
 Phillip E. Meyer, 35, reporter in the Washington bureau of the Knight newspapers.
 Joseph Mohbat, 28, member of the Washington bureau of the Associated Press.
 Alvin Shuster, 36, assistant news editor of the Washington bureau of the New York Times.
 Richard H. Stewart, 35, city editor of the morning Boston Globe.
 Remer H. Tyson, 31, Washington reporter for the Atlanta Constitution.
 James R. Whelan, 32, United Press International manager for Venezuela.
 William F. Woo, 29, feature writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

1964. He announced that Viet Nam was "the model of 'national liberation movements' of our time * * *. If the special warfare that the U.S. 'imperialists' are testing in South Viet Nam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world." Nothing could make it clearer that in Viet Nam a world war is now being fought.

Mr. Steibel points out three possible results if we leave Viet Nam. These are:

(1) To continue to fight the global war in other places with nothing actually having been solved by leaving Viet Nam but much having been lost.

(2) For the United States to retrench its world position and revert to the isolationism that ended in the United States just before World War II. He does not propose this, but cites it as one of the roads open to us if we leave Viet Nam.

(3) He sees a third possibility. Our leaving Viet Nam could prove such a disaster that it might awaken the rest of the free world to more unified and more militant stands against Communist ambitions. The risk in this case would be a world-wide showdown versus a limited confrontation as presently in Viet Nam. Global showdowns were disastrous in 1914 and 1939 and resulted in World War I and II. "Viet Nam has seemed as something like our own 'Munich' where the penalties for backing out could be worse than for standing fast," he points out.

FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY, and Schlesinger all seem to feel that if the United States shows a more conciliatory attitude toward the Communist that all of our problems will eventually be solved. They point out that Communist Aggressionists would take a facesaving out if the United States would make the first conciliatory move. They say that if we should be big enough to back off in some way that would show that we are not interested in conquest. Apparently, these men have not looked at history very thoroughly or they could hardly recognize that weakness at any time in respect to the Communists has ever resulted in a solution to a problem.

The National Commander of the American Legion pointed out in an editorial in this month's issue of the American Legion magazine that our government attempted to conciliate Red China after the 1949 takeover when Chiang Kai-shek was driven to Formosa. Our diplomatic corps stayed on mainland China and we did everything to attempt to establish a relationship with the Red Chinese government. The plain fact is that China threw the book at the United States from the very beginning and forced us to take action in supporting Chiang Kai-shek simply by driving our diplomats out.

Again in Korea, we attempted to conciliate the Communists and it ended in the Korean War and a disaster. However, the Korean War was a shock to the Soviet because it discovered that the United States would fight and that is something that they had not believed possible. Out of this experience came what today is referred to as Russian "peaceful coexistence." Commander James says that although it is still practiced with nasty belligerence, it is an improvement over Soviet dreams of armed conquest of an unarmed world that preceded 1950 and led to the Russian role in Korea.

Red China today scorns "peaceful coexistence" and is openly split with Communist Russia on this very issue. We cannot see where giving ground would result in anything but another disaster for the free world.

Vice President HUMPHREY pointed out recently: "Aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed. If we have not learned that in the last 25 years we have learned nothing in this century."

Steibel, in his article says, that if we leave Viet Nam the results could be catastrophic. He feels that present countries in Southeast Asia such as Laos, Cambodia, Thailand,

would immediately be seriously affected and forced into an accommodation with the Communists. He follows this up with the opinion that Burma, India, Pakistan, nations a little further out, would feel the strength of the Communist success and their freedom would be threatened more seriously as the Communists increased their power.

The third action that he sees from a pull-out would result in a gradual moving away from the west by Japan, Formosa, Korea and a weakening of Australia and some of the other friendly countries in the South Pacific.

Finally, Steibel notes in his article that the largely hidden world-wide reliance on the United States by free nations does not require that we destroy the Communist power in North Viet Nam, China or in the Soviet Union but if we fail to turn back the "war of liberation" aggression against South Viet Nam, it will leave the lesser nations of the world in the position of a child who suddenly loses his parents and it literally will force them to mend their fences with the Communists. Starting in Thailand it would shake our position around the globe.

It is for this reason that it is our firm belief that the United States must and should stay in South Viet Nam. That our own freedom, in a way, will depend on our firmness. We do not see success in Viet Nam soon, or without great cost, but then someone has fought for freedom for generations to give us what we have today and perhaps this is the price this generation must pay to sustain freedom as we know it.

W The Real War in Vietnam
 EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
 HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
 OF TENNESSEE
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the Record an editorial from the Monday, June 6, 1966, issue of the Newport, Tenn., Plain Talk.

This is a thoughtful article on what we are fighting in Vietnam, and I take this opportunity to bring these comments to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the Record.

VIET NAM IS PART OF GLOBAL CONFLICT WITH COMMUNISM—IT IS NOT JUST A "LOCAL WAR"

Those who subscribe to the Fulbright, Schlesinger, Kennedy views on Viet Nam that the conflict is not critically important, that we could pull out without disaster, that other areas of conflict in the world are more important, ignore basic and fundamental facts.

Viet Nam is not a local war. It is a part of the global conflict between Communism and the free countries of the world.

In the current issue of the American Legion magazine an article by Gerald L. Steibel entitled "If We Leave Viet Nam * * * Then What?" is most interesting.

Mr. Steibel points out that three American Presidents since 1954 have had to face the truth in Viet Nam, while many home-front critics, including some in Congress, have simply avoided it or tried to put it aside. The responsibility is not basically on their shoulders.

Steibel says, "To the Communists, Viet Nam was never a local war. In 1961, Soviet boss Khrushchev publicly spelled out that the 'war of liberation' in Viet Nam 'must not be identified with local wars' and that all Communists everywhere are in the 'front rank' of this 'sacred war.'"

Steibel points out that General Glap, the North Vietnamese Defense Minister himself, made the bluntest proclamation of all in

Draft Changes Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
 HON. HASTINGS KEITH
 OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as more and more of our young men are called to serve in Vietnam, it becomes imperative that we take a sharp look at our system for selecting those who will go to defend this country.

Nor only do gross inequities exist between the practices of draft boards in one State and another—but even among the draft boards within each State. Further, present priorities discriminate heavily against certain groups of young men—in a way that far surpasses what recent civil rights laws were passed to prevent.

A recent editorial in the Old Colony Memorial in the town of Plymouth, Mass., presents a concise picture of the present system and its defects and would merit reading by a wide audience:

REVAMPING THE DRAFT LAW

The present draft law favors the college student and penalizes those who lack the money, brains or initiative to seek a higher education. There is a growing feeling throughout the country, in which we share with strong conviction, that this inequity, as far as possible, should be eliminated. Too often going to college is being used as a way of saving one's own neck at the other's fellow's expense.

We say correct inequity "as far as possible" for the reason that even before a finger has been lifted in this direction we know that perfect justice is impossible. Human nature and the social structure make absolute equity a goal beyond reach.

A3098

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 8, 1966

No form of conscription, however stringent, can be entirely stripped of special privilege. Nor does favoritism end when a man puts on a uniform. If the draftee has the right connections or a gift for ingratiating and seizing the main chance, he can always find a safe niche in which to ride out the perils of military service.

And if a man is really determined not to expose his carcass to shot and shell, by mere persistent display of ineptitude he can create an impression of unfitness and that way quite possibly get himself relegated to some backwash of military life.

Such considerations lead to what its proponents would call a "realistic" view of the present draft system. People who hold this view contend, in effect, that to be an effective, professional kind of soldier you have to be limited in intelligence, at home in a rigid command-and-obey situation and find fun in killing whatever enemy is handy. Cannon fodder, from this point of view, should be rough-grained, not overly bright and latently sadistic.

Well, it is true, up to a point, that a good soldier has to be a man of action, capable of deciding first and talking afterwards. It is also true that military life often does attract young men unable or unwilling to get along in civilian pursuits.

But even allowing for all inherent defects, real or imagined, of the military situation, the fact remains, so we deeply believe, that merely going to college should not be used as an excuse for escaping a soldier's obligations, as some sort of trick.

To permit this sort of thing to continue makes for great bitterness among those who take the rap for the smart boys. This bitterness all but invites political exploitation of an authoritarian nature. From the standpoint of the national wellbeing, favoritism in the draft over the long run is very bad indeed.

Moreover, if it is true that the bulk of American college students have a superior intelligence, this intelligence is badly needed as leaven, above all in the "policy" type of small wars and pacifications common these days. After all, restraint and understanding are of the essence in this limited kind of conflict, quite different from the case in all-out wars of survival.

Finally, it is unjust to favor one group to another's gross disadvantage. There is no dodging this moral issue.

No draft law can be 100 per cent equitable. But the one we have now is clearly in need of improvement.

Financial Aid Needed To Restore Famous Bark "Kaiulani," Named After Hawaiian Princess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the history of our maritime industry is one in which we can all take pride. The American-built square riggers of the 19th century were the envy of their times. These ships played an active part in the early growth of our maritime industry.

One of the most famous of these ships is the *Kaiulani*, named after a Hawaiian princess. This ship, the biggest three-masted bark ever built in the United

States, is currently lying in a dilapidated shipyard near Manila. It was given to the United States by former President Diosdado Macapagal as a good-will gesture from the people of the Philippines.

Charged with getting the old ship sailing again, Capt. James Kleinschmidt—a director of the National Maritime Historical Society—is doing a commendable job. Unfortunately, Captain Kleinschmidt is not getting adequate material and financial support to make much progress in getting the *Kaiulani* back into sailing condition.

I insert the following article from the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, May 24, 1966, with the hope that more people will take an interest in and come to the aid of restoring the *Kaiulani* as a floating museum to be put on display in Washington, D.C.:

PROJECT IN FINANCIAL TROUBLE: REBUILDING OF BARK "KAIULANI" LAGS

(By Peter O'Loughlin)

MANILA.—In a dilapidated shipyard near Manila, a gaunt American sea captain is fighting a losing battle to restore the rusty hulk of the three masted bark *Kaiulani*, last of 17,000 American-built square riggers.

"If we don't get some money soon, the whole project will come to a stop," said Captain James Kleinschmidt, a director of the National Maritime Historical Society and the man charged with getting the old ship sailing again.

"We can't go on the way we are."

The project to restore the vessel to its former glory is foundering in a sea of financial troubles.

If it sinks without trace, the result will be an embarrassing blow to American prestige in the Philippines—the ship was given to the United States by former President Diosdado Macapagal as a goodwill gesture from the people of the Philippines.

President Johnson accepted it at a White House ceremony in 1964 and directed the Maritime Historical Society to restore it and get it back to America.

This was easier said than done, considering the ship had not sailed since 1942, was riddled with rust, had no sails, masts, rigging or spars.

COST \$200,000

The society, hard up for funds, estimated the restoration costs at about \$200,000 and that it would take some two or three years to get the *Kaiulani* shipshape.

So far considerably less than \$100,000 has been raised by public appeals in the U.S. and despite moral support from the U.S. Embassy in Manila, the project, according to Captain Kleinschmidt is way behind.

"We are in a bad way," said the 43-year-old former Merchant Marine skipper. "It would be a tremendous loss of face for us to back out now.

"Not only that, it would be a great blow to the United States—*Kaiulani* is a priceless relic of our maritime past."

The only help on the horizon is a resolution presented recently in Congress by Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat-Maryland, which calls for public and Merchant Marine support to get *Kaiulani* restored.

For the tanned and leathery Kleinschmidt, who has been working on the ship for ten solid months, any help is welcome.

MARITIME HISTORIAN

Kleinschmidt, well known in the U.S. as a maritime historian, quit his job as assistant curator of the famous Marine Historical Association in Mystic, Connecticut, to come to the Philippines and rebuild the *Kaiulani*.

"Before we came, we went into the project

carefully and decided to build the ship here and sail her back to the States, where she was to be put on display in Washington as a floating museum," he said.

"But the project is bigger than we thought and I am now convinced we can never do the job here in the Philippines. The facilities are not suitable and it is extremely difficult to get the things we need.

"I am going to Hong Kong to get a quote from a commercial yard there. I think that would be one way to get it done.

"As a last resort, I would recommend that she be towed back to the West Coast where we could take our time working on her."

Work on the *Kaiulani* would have stopped some time ago if it were not for the help of local businessmen whom Kleinschmidt has been able to interest in the project.

Kleinschmidt, who has been returned to the active Navy rank of lieutenant while he is working on the project, operates from a cubby hole office in a wartime quonset hut in the Philippine Navy yard at Cavite.

He has a staff of 28 Filipino workmen and a secretary.

PHOTOGRAPHS

His office is decorated with photographs of the *Kaiulani* under full sail taken in the days when it was one of the fastest sailing vessels afloat.

The photographs are a marked contrast to the patched and grimy hull moored a few yards away.

"The hull is basically sound despite all the years of neglect," said Kleinschmidt, kicking a large chunk of rust across the deck.

"Some of it will have to be replaced to make her seaworthy. The whole upperdeck will have to be renewed as well. It's in a hopeless condition."

The fact that *Kaiulani* is still afloat at all is a tribute to its builders.

BUILT IN 1899

The ship was designed and built in 1899 by Arthur Sewall and Company, of Bath, Maine, as a fast sugar packet for the Hawaiian trading firm of H. Hackfield and Company.

It was named after an Hawaiian princess who died the year the ship was launched. Two hundred and 25-feet long, displacing 1500 tons and with a cargo capacity of 2,400 tons, *Kaiulani* was the biggest three-masted bark ever built in the United States.

In 1907 *Kaiulani* visited Newcastle, the big port on the east coast of Australia to pick up a load of coal and got involved in a strike that kept 130 windjammers tied up in port, probably the last great collection of sailing ships ever seen.

Thirty-five years later *Kaiulani* went back to Australia, a final voyage that led to the Philippines.

By 1910 steam ships had driven the old "downeasters" off the Honolulu sugar trade and *Kaiulani* was sold to the Alaska Packers' Association.

Renamed the *Star of Finland*, she ran supplies to the isolated Alaskan canneries for many years until finally her owners put her into mothballs.

In 1940 a San Francisco group bought the ship, restored its original name and loaded it with timber. On September 25, 1941 *Kaiulani* set sail for Durban under the command of a cantankerous Swede named Hjalmar Wigsten.

After discharging cargo at Durban, the vessel picked up a load of explosives and sailed for Sydney. But the captain heard by radio that Japanese submarines had attacked the Australian seaport on May 7, 1942 and after a stormy meeting with the crew, decided to put in to Hobart, Tasmania.

In Hobart, Wigsten charged the crew with mutiny and had most of them thrown in the local jail. They were released by the Tasmanian authorities and rejoined the ship.

June 8, 1966

A3091

when Pittsburgh was at home and Cleveland was on the road.

Moreover, additional competition to the UHF television stations is being developed from CATV systems. These CATV systems would be able to bring into local areas sports programs which are eliminated on UHF television broadcasts because of the blackout rules.

THE GROWTH OF UHF

The proposed legislation is in accord with the established congressional intent to foster the development of UHF television broadcasting as a means for creating a truly nationwide and competitive

broadcasting system. By Public Law 87-529, the Congress amended the Communications Act of 1934 to grant to the Federal Communications Commission the authority to require that all television sets shipped in interstate commerce contain all available television channels including both UHF and VHF. The aim of this legislation was designed to improve the competitive position of UHF television stations so that there could be an effective intermixed system of both UHF and VHF within the United States—Senate Report No. 1526, May 24, 1962, title 1, United States Code, Con-

gressional & Administration News, 1962, page 1879.

Moreover, this proposed legislation would support the Federal Communications Commission action in recently revising the UHF-TV assignment table. The FCC stated:

Revision paves the way for more and wider dispersion of TV service over UHF channels—now the only avenue for TV broadcast expansion. (Public Notice 79741 as released by the FCC on February 9, 1966.)

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of the UHF channels that are affected by this proposed legislation:

UHF channels in areas between 40 and 75 miles of major league cities (football, baseball, basketball, and hockey)

City and State	UHF channels allocated	CP's or licenses	City and State	UHF channels allocated	CP's or licenses	
Los Angeles:			Buffalo:			
San Bernardino, Calif.....	18	1 CP (KITR) and 1 application pending for San Bernardino.	Jamestown, N.Y.....	26	2 applications pending for Jamestown.	
Ventura, Calif.....	30		Rochester, N.Y.....	31		
San Francisco-Oakland:	16		New York City:			
Modesto, Calif.....	17	KLOC-TV (CP).	Bridgeport, Conn.....	43	2 applications pending for New Haven. WATR-TV (license).	
Sacramento, Calif.....	15	2 applications pending for Sacramento.	New Haven, Conn.....	59		
Santa Rosa, Calif.....	40		Waterbury, Conn.....	20		
Stockton, Calif.....	50	KIUCD (CP).	Patchogue, N.Y.....	67		
Denver:	19		Riverhead, N.Y.....	56		
Colorado Springs, Colo.....	21		Cleveland:			
Fort Collins, Colo.....	22		Ashtabula, Ohio.....	15	WICA-TV (CP).	
Atlanta:			Canton, Ohio.....	17	WJAN (CP).	
Athens, Ga.....	34	1 application pending for Macon.	Sandusky, Ohio.....	23	1 application pending for Canton.	
Macon, Ga.....	24			Youngstown, Ohio.....	51	WFMJ-TV (license).
Rome, Ga.....	41				27	WBKN-TV (license).
Chicago:				33	WYTV (license).	
South Bend, Ind.....	16	WNDU-TV (license).		45	Application, Dynamic Broadcasting Co.	
	22	WSBT-TV (license).	Cincinnati:			
Racine, Wis.....	46		Dayton, Ohio.....	16		
Boston:	49			22	WKBF-TV (license).	
New Bedford, Mass.....	28		Springfield, Ohio.....	26	WSWO-TV (CP).	
Concord, N.H.....	21		Philadelphia:			
Manchester, N.H.....	50		Atlantic City, N.J.....	53	WHTO-TV (quit air in 1954).	
Portsmouth, N.H.....	60		Wildwood, N.J.....	40	WCMC-TV (license).	
Providence, R.I.....	17	WNET (quit air in 1956).	Allentown, Pa.....	69	WLEV-TV (quit air in 1957).	
Detroit:	64		Bethlehem, Pa.....	60		
Jackson, Mich.....	18	1 application pending for Jackson.	Lancaster.....	15	WLYH-TV (license).	
Port Huron, Mich.....	44		Lebanon, Pa.....	59		
Toledo, Ohio.....	24	WDHO-TV (CP).	Reading, Pa.....	51		
	54	Application, Rustcraft Broadcasting Co.	York, Pa.....	43	WSBA-TV (license).	
Minneapolis: St. Cloud, Minn.....	60		Pittsburgh:	49		
	19		Johnstown, Pa.....	19	WARD-TV (license).	
Kansas City:	41		Fairmont, W. Va.....	66		
St. Joseph, Mo.....	16		Wheeling, W. Va.....	14		
Topeka, Kans.....	22	2 applications pending for Topeka.		41		
	29		Dallas: Sherman, Tex.....	20		
	58		Houston: Beaumont, Tex.....	21		
			Green Bay:			
			Fond du Lac, Wis.....	34		
			Sheboygan, Wis.....	78		

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I include the text of H.R. 15424 and H.R. 15460 in my remarks, as follows:

H.R. 15424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 1292), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any joint agreement described in section 1 of this Act which prohibits any person to whom such rights are sold or transferred from televising any games within any area, except within the home territory of a member club of the league on a day when such club is playing a game at home: *Provided, however,* That the last exception shall not apply in the case of an ultrahigh frequency television broadcasting station the transmitter of which is located more than

forty miles from the main post office of the city of the game site."

H.R. 15460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 1292), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any joint agreement described in section 1 of this Act which prohibits any person to whom such rights are sold or transferred from televising any games within any area, except within the home territory of a member club of the league on a day when such club is playing a game at home: *Provided, however,* That the last exception shall not apply in the case of an ultrahigh frequency television broadcasting station the transmitter of which is located more than forty miles from the main post office of the city of the game site."

UN Supplies to the Vietcong
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence of the importance of Cambodia in funneling supplies to the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

It has already been pointed out that ships are reaching Cambodia's capital city of Pnompenh by traveling on the Mekong River directly across South Vietnam itself.

Supplies can also be off-loaded at the port city of Sihanoukville from where they can travel inland on a road built with heavy investments of American aid.

A3092

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 8, 1966

Now comes news that 100 supply trucks a month are moving through Cambodia with materials to support the Vietcong. The article as it appears in the Christian Science Monitor for June 1 follows:

LAOTIAN SAYS REDS USE TRAIL TO SUPPLY
VIETCONG
(By Reuters)

VIETIANNE, LAOS.—Gen. Thao Ma, Lao, Air Force commander, asserts 100 supply trucks a month are passing along what he calls "the Sihanouk Trail" through northern Cambodia to the Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam.

Traffic on this reported new route—named after Cambodian Chief of State Prince Norodom Sihanouk—is expected by Lao military sources to increase, with the so-called Ho Chi Minh Trail through southern Laos under frequent attack.

Neutral Cambodia has strongly denied allegations that its territory is being used by North Vietnam for aggression against the south. Cambodia has told Britain and the Soviet Union—cochairmen of the 1954 Geneva conference on Indochina—that it will defend its frontiers against any violation and may ask for the help of friendly countries.

Cambodia also reserved the right to appeal to the United Nations General Assembly or any other international organization against a reported United States decision to authorize American forces in South Vietnam to fire across the Cambodian border in self-defense.

The State Department protested this month to Cambodia that Viet Cong troops were using Cambodian territory to launch attacks against United States forces in South Vietnam.

General Ma said the Communists are bringing supplies into Cambodia by sea, then sending them by barge and truck up the Se Kong River into Laos.

Fruits of the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Canberra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1966

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, while in Canberra attending a conference of the Interparliamentary Union last month, it was my privilege to meet and greet one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Omelio Osias, once Resident Commissioner from the Philippines to the U.S. Congress. Those of us who knew him remember him as a great and a forceful patriot. Today he is a senator of the Republic of the Philippines. As such, he represented his country at the Canberra conference.

During the years, Senator Osias has lost none of his fervor, his logic, or his patriotism. He delivered one of the great speeches of the conference in support of the American position. More recently, he spoke to his own people on the floor of the Philippine Senate in the course of debate on a bill to expand the Philippine aid in Vietnam. This speech was so cogent and so forceful that I ask unanimous consent to include excerpts therefrom at this time:

Mr. President, what I am about to say may be rather controversial. It may invite criti-

cism of my humble person. I will say bluntly and without reserve that one reason that moves me to support the Vietnam aid is my will and desire to lend cooperation to the United States of America. It will be said that I am one of the puppets of America. I am past the age when I am onion-skinned. I have been toughened by obstacles, difficulties, sufferings. I know that from the Communists circles I may be cited by the statement I am about to make as a stooge of the United States. Over and above possible adverse criticisms directed against me I follow the dictates of my conscience and express my gratitude to the American government and people of the United States. I do not want the Filipinos to be ungrateful to America. And I regret that there are some demonstrators who have given the wrong impression that the Filipinos may be anti-American. I deny that there is anti-Americanism on the part of the Filipino people. There is pro-Filipinism, yes. I am of that persuasion.

One placard carried by some misguided demonstrators had this slogan: "America Destroyer of Human Liberty." That is not an expression emanating from the hearts of thinking Filipinos. The correct slogan should be "America Defender of Human Liberty." That is borne out by the facts of history.

The young people who demonstrated in Manila for or against the Vietnam Bill merit praise and respect because no group resorted to violence. The opponents were not unduly influenced by foreign Communist agitators who slipped into the city to organize leftists and demonstrators. They only managed to inject some indecorous, denunciatory utterances and arouse some hatred against America and its supposed imperialistic designs. I am constrained to say to the youth that they are not in the right direction when they develop hate toward men and nations who are sympathetic and helpful to our people. It is disservice to weaken and not strengthen amity among nations that cherish ideals and aspirations identical with ours.

Mr. President, I just came back from participation in the Inter-Parliamentary meeting at Canberra, Australia. I was impressed and I was also distressed by the concerted attacks of the Communist Delegates led by those from the Soviet Union attacking America and her allies as imperialists. As long as the attacks were concentrated upon America, I did not feel called upon to reply because the American Delegates were there to defend themselves. But when they accused America and her allies as being imperialistic, I felt the Philippines was alluded to and I thought I would be remiss in my duty if I did not take up the cudgels. Silence may be interpreted as assent.

I spoke before the parliamentarians of many countries in Canberra, Australia, as a Philippine Delegate in defense of the common stand of the Republic of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines on the Vietnam conflict. The charge of imperialism against "America and her allies" clearly included the Philippines. I repeated the Spanish adage, "Dime con quien andas y te dire quien eres." Tell me with whom you associate and I will tell you who you are. I made no secret of my friendship and respect for the United States of America with which the Philippines is associated on the most friendly and intimate terms. I said it is ridiculous for the Communist group to consider the Philippines, a country relatively small, weak, and poor, a country operating under a Constitution committed to peace, a country whose greatest hero and martyr, Rizal, was a man of peace, as imperialistic.

I likewise said then and there and I say here and now that America by her record in the Philippines can not be said to be imperialistic. She is to be admired for sending over 200,000 of the consummate flower of her

manhood to fight in a war in the Oriental theater. She is after no conquest of territory. She is not spending millions for self-aggrandizement. She is in an undertaking in the defense of a cause, in the pursuit of an ideal more precious than property or life. We were critical of American policy that was primarily Europe oriented. We ought to commend her now that America's policy is Asia oriented.

On the eve of our making a fateful decision I desire to emphasize friendship and cooperation with the United States of America as a vital part of my stand in favor of the Vietnam Bill which provides for our sending an engineering construction team with security support. Permit me to touch on some points which are pertinent to our deliberation based upon experience and matters that spring from knowledge of the facts which I positively know.

In the United States there are a great many foreign students. One university student in New York City coming from a Communist Country one day wanted to go across the Hudson River to visit a friend. Accustomed to the practices in her totalitarian native land she went to a police officer and said, "I wish to ask a permit to go to New Jersey."

The police officer said, "What for?"

"Well," she said, "that is what we have to do in my country."

The officer very good naturedly said, "Go right ahead, my dear young lady. You do not need any such permit in this country."

This incident is brought to the fore at this juncture to underscore contrasting conditions in a totalitarian country and a free democracy. I was one of the early *pen-sionados* or government students sent to the United States during America's administration of Philippine affairs under Hon. William H. Taft, then Governor-General of the Philippines. I believe the Filipino students sent to America at the expense of our government will testify that all of us were given absolute freedom. There was no regulation of our movement; there was no effort to regiment our minds; there was no attempt to exercise thought control. We could go where we wanted to go; we could take courses or subjects we wanted to take; we could express verbally or in writing the sentiments that we pleased. And yet that was an investment of America because by the grant and observance of freedom, the students came back better Filipinos and at the same time admirers of America, her people, and her institutions.

Then I had the good fortune of being elected Philippine Resident Commissioner to fight for our rights, for our interests, for our freedom and independence in the Congress of the United States. My first week in the United States House of Representatives witnessed my participating in a rough-and-tumble debate because the distinguished Congressman from Colorado, Mr. Timberlake, was defending a bill to exclude Philippine sugar from the American market. I arose and fought that bill. I said that was not in keeping with democratic justice—the author was a Democrat—that was not in keeping with republican justice. I think the majority at that time were Republicans, and that was not in keeping with American justice.

I fought the plan of excluding Philippine sugar because, I said, Americans cannot do that justly and fairly, for that would be discriminating against Philippine products while all American products go free of duty and without limitation to my country. I was fighting on the floor of the House of Representatives consisting of 450 members or thereabouts against a Congressman who was an American protecting American interests.

The majority of the members of Congress saw the justice of the Philippine stand and

June 8, 1966

He eats everything, sleeps like a baby and his only concession to the years is to have weeded down "slightly" a pipe collection that once numbered 138. The hundred or so left still permit application to tobacco during all waking moments.

A lifetime devoted to the impossible art of making people get along with each other, a lifetime in which he became America's most famous, skillful and esteemed mediator of disputes between labor and management, has left Cy Ching with few illusions about either. He is not cynical, but neither is he romantic.

Ching tends to agree with the current lament that the labor movement is no longer the source of the scintillating new social and economic philosophy and theory that it was in the New Deal, 30 years ago.

The reason, he suspects, is that labor leaders now have such vested interest in their jobs, and members are so exclusively concerned with a monetary quid pro quo for their dues—a "nickel-in-the-slot mentality," Ching calls it—that dedication to a cause has become a thing of the past. As a result, unions do not enjoy the public esteem they once had.

"I'm afraid the labor movement doesn't have the impact on society it used to," Ching observes. "When the AFL and the CIO were in competition, it led to some effervescent thought. Their merger was a good thing, but now that they go along the same line, something has been lost."

For the future, Ching sees a hard row for unions to hoe. The number of factory production workers tends to decline even as production itself increases with more mechanical and technological improvements. Where the labor force grows is in the service trades, which are much more difficult to organize.

"Somehow management has taken better care of the white-collar workers," Ching argues. "It's therefore harder to organize them. Besides, they don't seem to want to jeopardize that monthly pay check by having a fight. The blue-collar workers were more courageous."

Not that Ching is in favor of strikes. Far from it; he thinks there are too many today, even though there are fewer than there used to be. As Ching sees it, this is what has happened:

Modern institutions much improved over the past, are able to cope with what used to be the difficult problems—fights over basic economic issues, such as wages and hours. Moreover, the plaguing question of union security is largely solved; union fear that management will destroy their organizations has virtually disappeared.

Testimony to the efficacy of unions and management acceptance of them, comes from the relative ease of labor relations in the new industries that have developed in the atomic age since the war.

"It's pretty terrifying to visualize what might have happened if there hadn't been the stabilizing influence of the unions," Ching says.

But today's problems are different and are not being very skillfully dealt with either by labor or by management. The issue is job security under the pressure of technological labor-saving developments—automation, cybernetics, what-have-you.

"The idea of forcing industry to freeze people on the job regardless of company investment in improved production machinery is shortsighted on the part of labor. But management's unwillingness to face the problem that, in the short run, new machinery is going to cost the jobs of a certain number of employees—and that something has to be done for those who are hurt—is equally shortsighted.

"What's needed a realization on the part of both labor and management that they have to live together.

STILL SOME ANACHRONISMS

"Sure, big industry is dealing with labor in a much more civilized way and unions are smarter in not pulling off every strike that they threaten. But you still have a lot of labor unions that preach enmity; you still have a lot of hard-nosed people on the management side who want to punish somebody for something.

"Trouble is, if you had them swap places—labor for management and management for labor—each would act just like the other does. Human nature hasn't changed in 3000 years, and I don't see any problems now that weren't present 50 years ago."

So how to work toward a solution? Ching's answer, not unnaturally, takes the form of a commercial for the institution of the mediator.

"A lot of unions have lost prestige in feeling that every time they have a dispute, they have to strike. But in modern days, the strike method is often outdated.

"Mind you, I wouldn't have strikes outlawed. But there are other ways of solving disputes. For instance, contracts should be written to provide arbitration as a terminal point to disagreement.

"And more and more, the parties should bring in mediators during the dispute. The parties should select two or three impartial outsiders to come in and give them advice and counsel while the dispute is going on, before the bitter end, when tempers are boiling and positions are frozen.

"A lot of marriages have been saved by the marriage counselor."

THE 1912 SALVAGE JOB

In principle, Ching should have hung up his hat long years ago and devoted the rest of his life to salmon fishing, which he adores. Heaven knows he plowed in the vineyards for a long time.

It began in 1912, after the disastrous Boston Elevated Railway strike, when the defeated company promoted Ching to labor adviser in the hope that he could salvage something from the ruins. He did, and went on to do the same for United States Rubber, and in the process became the Nation's most highly esteemed management-labor relations counselor.

Still representing management, he went on the National Defense Mediation Board in 1941 and then to the War Labor Board. But after the war, he graduated to being not management's man but the public's man, and became the director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. That labor accepted a former management man in that position was testimony enough to his reputation for impartiality.

He left the job in 1952, but he was back in harness the next year as the impartial director of a Government board to handle disputes in the atomic energy industry. As late as 1961, he pulled off a sensational settlement of a dispute at the Hanford, Wash., atomic plant.

He is still on the job. With his apartment as office, he works anywhere from a few hours to a full day, five days a week, as labor relations consultant. His clients are from management.

"I'm mostly in disagreement with them," Ching grows amiably, "but you'd better not say that."

HARD DECISIONS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I want to call attention to an editorial in the Washington Daily News which emphasizes this certainty about our stand in Vietnam: We cannot finch.

The News cites President Johnson's

statement that our job, and the job of the South Vietnamese, is hard and frustrating. It agrees with him that there can be no easy or instant solutions. Dissension among elements of the South Vietnamese make the fact more obvious.

Yet, the newspaper tells us, there have been recent signs that the situation may not be as difficult as it has seemed. And the editorial reminds us that the problems that would result if we dared to withdraw from Vietnam would be far more dangerous than the risks posed by our presence.

We did not finch when the Japanese swept across the Pacific, the newspaper declares. And we cannot finch now, because the stakes are the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the Daily News editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, May 23, 1966]

HARD, HARD DECISIONS

President Johnson Saturday said this:

"The South Vietnamese are trying to build a nation. They have to do this in the teeth of communist efforts to take the country over by force. It is a hard and frustrating job and there is no easy answer, no instant solution, to any of the problems they face."

Mr. Johnson easily could have paraphrased that statement from our own point of view:

We are trying to help the South Vietnamese build a nation in the teeth of communist aggression, terrorism and all-out war. That, in itself, is hard and frustrating, for us and for the South Vietnamese. It is much harder and much more frustrating because of the riotous dissension among the South Vietnamese themselves.

Obviously, there are no easy answers, no instant solutions, either to the problem of communist aggression or to the turmoil among the South Vietnamese.

This means infinitely hard decisions to be made in Washington—and in Saigon.

The natural reaction to recent developments in Viet Nam is to think: Well, if the Vietnamese, who have the most at stake, can't unite in fighting their own war, why should we not come home; withdraw our troops?

The Buddhist rebellion evidently has hampered the war. Surrender of the Da Nang Buddhists may end the rebellion, at least for a while. If it should go on to become a full-scale conflict, it could be suicidal. The United States and other allies might have no choice except to pull out.

But the time for that decision is not yet. Already there are signs—small ones, yes, but reported by competent newsmen—that the situation may not be quite as impossible as it has seemed. Bluster and foment may be evidence of the ambition of the Buddhist trouble-makers, but not necessarily of their lasting strength.

The risks of continued U.S. presence in Viet Nam patently are hazardous. But the problems which would follow withdrawal would be far more dangerous. We cannot desert Thailand, or Malaysia. The price of yielding to communist aggression is either more yielding or a greater war.

It is hard, frustrating, and costly. So it was when the Japanese swept the Pacific. We did not finch then. We cannot finch now, because the stakes, in the long run, are the same.

12044

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 8, 1966

THE CHURCH VERSUS POLLUTION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, an editorial in the June 7 issue of the *Morning News* of Wilmington, Del., makes the point that churches have found pollution of our air and water relevant to the 1,500-year-old tradition of praying for a bountiful harvest.

The comment which the editorial cites indicates how widespread is the national concern for cleaning up air and water pollution.

This national concern is also reflected in the sincere efforts of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution to provide the best possible tools to deal with the problem.

Because of its relevance, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Church Versus Pollution" be inserted at this point in the *Record*.

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

[From the *Wilmington Morning News*, June 7, 1966]

THE CHURCH VERSUS POLLUTION

One of the favorite words in religious circles nowadays is "relevant." Churchmen are constantly telling each other that if they want anybody to listen, they must make the church's message relevant to modern times.

Now there has come to our desk a church pronouncement that seems about as relevant as a church announcement can get.

It comes from *Fortress Press* and it was designed for use as the back page of congregational bulletins on Rogate Sunday about three weeks ago.

First it tells how that particular Sunday became an occasion of prayers for a bountiful harvest, a tradition that dates back to the year 452. Then it proceeds to make the 1,500-year-old tradition relevant:

"Since that time, man has improved his stewardship of the soil, and we stand blessed today with abundant harvests. But what of the rest of man's God-given environment—land, air, water and their natural beauty?"

"Across the nation, wells are running dry, reservoirs are depleted, fish are dying, beaches are unsafe for bathing and communities ration water. Yet man heedlessly dumps over a million gallons of waste every second into the nation's waterways.

"This irresponsible stewardship has succeeded in polluting every major river system and earned the caricature of 'a man worried about water, standing knee-deep in sewage and shooting rockets at the moon.' As the crisis intensifies, let us heed the call to prayer, join the effort to remove waste and restore to natural purity the abundance of water God wishes to provide for all."

Some people who believe the church should stay out of political issues may react unfavorably, but others will be happy to see a moral issue drawn on a subject where communities too often drag their feet.

We happen to believe the word-picture of modern man standing knee-deep in sewage is overdrawn, and that it is an over-simplification to describe every imperfect sewage system as irresponsible stewardship. But we share the desire for unpolluted water systems as a national goal and welcome the interest of religious leaders in this national problem.

OMBUDSMAN FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for several months, the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure has been studying the opera-

tion of a most fascinating office: the ombudsman. As I have informed my colleagues on many occasions, the ombudsman is a form of citizens' defender; he is the man who fights city hall. Often, the cases and complaints which come to the ombudsman are trivial, but justice is never a trivial matter.

Several weeks ago, I complimented the *Evening Star's* "Action Line" column and said that this column is today the nearest thing the District has to an ombudsman. I also stated that I intend to propose a bill which would create an official ombudsman for the District of Columbia. This bill is very near completion.

WTOP radio and television has recently run a number of editorials urging the creation of an ombudsman here in the District of Columbia. Jack Jurey, speaking for WTOP, calls the ombudsman a "public protector." I support and shall introduce a bill to create such an ombudsman, the public protector that WTOP refers to. It should be made perfectly clear, however, that an ombudsman is not a substitute for local self-government for the District of Columbia. I voted for the Senate-passed home rule bill and will continue to support principles of local self-government.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the *Record* the editorials referred to.

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

[This editorial was broadcast on June 2 and 3, 1966, over WTOP radio and television]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC PROTECTOR—I

This is a WTOP Editorial.

Since about two out of three people who live in the District weren't born here, the residents of this community need all the help they can get in dealing with their municipal authorities. Even a native-born Washingtonian has trouble understanding how this city runs.

What we have, of course, is a board of over lords appointed by the President; a federal judiciary with many independent ideas; a school board which apparently is responsible to no one; an astounding proliferation of boards, agencies and commissions, many of which never meet; various and sundry congressmen who are enmeshed in District affairs for one reason or another; and, helping support the whole structure, a DC bureaucracy consisting of thousands of employees who have come to understand that, under the present scheme of things, what the ordinary Washington citizen may want has very low priority.

It is asking entirely too much to expect that ordinary citizen to grapple with the mechanism of local DC government. Too many officials don't really care about his problems; too many functionaries are out to lunch; too much paper is shuffled too rapidly for any constructive assistance. The only solution we can see—short of an elected local government under which the individual would mean something—is a Public Protector. This would be a man, paid from public funds, who would have the authority to receive and act on citizen complaints of official abuses and transgressions. The Public Protector idea is nothing new—there have been such individuals in Scandinavia since about the beginning of the nineteenth century. Because Washington, D.C., has a local government with a nineteenth century flavor, now seems a good time to adopt the Public Protector concept.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

[This editorial was broadcast on June 3 and 4, 1966, over WTOP radio and television]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC PROTECTOR—II

This is a WTOP Editorial.

Question: Who speaks for the citizens of the District of Columbia?

Answer: Nobody. Not really and officially.

The resident of this beleaguered enclave of authoritarianism quickly learns several lessons if he attempts to deal directly with District of Columbia government. First, that it is always difficult and sometimes virtually impossible to reach the official directly involved in a citizen's complaint. Second, that the official, if he is finally located, is too often unresponsive to some of the normal pressures of public office.

In any other American city, a taxpayer may call his mayor or councilman and place a detailed, specific complaint about some error of commission or omission. That taxpayer may be sure that his complaint will receive attention because there is a vote involved. Nothing moves a politician quite so quickly as the prospect of gaining or losing a vote.

In the District there are the District of Columbia Commissioners, two civilians, one military. These gentlemen are estimable, no doubt, but are not chosen by Washington citizens. They are appointed by the President, not elected by the people. Consequently the District Building's response time to the wishes of Washingtonians is lethargic. Indeed, one of the Commissioners' prime functions is to close their doors and lower their window shades so as to make basic decisions concerning this city well away from the scrutiny of the inhabitants most directly concerned.

At the White House, the President's District of Columbia adviser has an office, but is only fleetingly in touch with day-by-day operations of District government. On the Hill, the congressional panjandrums are, for the most part, aloof from run-of-the-mill District of Columbia problems.

Meantime, the District of Columbia bureaucracy grinds along—making decisions and issuing orders, shielded by platoons of secretaries and assistants.

There is little help for Washington residents there—which is why this city, perhaps more than any other on the North American continent, needs a Public Protector to help safeguard the little guy from a big city, non-representative government.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

[This editorial was broadcast on June 5 and 6, 1966, over WTOP radio and television]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC PROTECTOR—III

This is a WTOP Editorial.

We've been talking the last several days about the need to establish a Public Protector's office in the District of Columbia.

What is a Public Protector? In those countries where the concept has been tested—including Sweden and New Zealand—a Public Protector (or Ombudsman) has various definitions. He is a "guardian of the rights of citizens in their relation with the public authorities." He has "a healthy preventive influence upon officials who might tend to be high-handed, arrogant, negligent or forgetful of the limits of their powers."

Each public protectorship must be tailored to circumstances and Washington, D.C., with a unique lack of self-determination, would have to establish its own ground rules.

To our way of thinking, the District of Columbia Public Protector ought to have a broad grant of authority.

He should have an office in some central location, probably the District Building.

He should have a staff adequate to handle the load of complaints and investigations.

He should be a free agent. He should not be under anyone's thumb. He should have access to any official of District government on any matter relating to that official's duties.

June 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12045

He should have the right to recommend to the Commissioners any changes and reforms he thinks necessary.

He should have the right to examine official DC records and make whatever inquiries he thinks necessary.

He should be free to publicize whatever he thinks necessary in the performance of his duties.

This Public Protector, in short, would be a powerful and effective intermediary between the people of the District and their present unrepresentative government. Lacking home rule, the residents of this city at least would have a champion of their own, not a series of disinterested appointees.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

[This editorial was broadcast on June 6 and 7, 1966, over WTOP radio and television]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC PROTECTOR—IV
This is a WTOP Editorial.

Sometime within the next several days Senator EDWARD LONG of Missouri will introduce a bill calling for the creation of a District of Columbia Ombudsman. Ombudsman is a Swedish word meaning representative, in this case a person assigned to represent individuals in their dealings with bureaucracy. We prefer the term Public Protector, which we've been using in our editorials of the last several days.

Under the terms of the Long bill, the DC Public Protector—or Ombudsman—would be appointed by the President for a three-year term and would receive a salary of \$25,000 a year.

His duties would be to receive complaints from DC residents about the operations of their government, investigate whether those complaints are justified and do what he can to correct matters. He could make specific recommendations to the DC commissioners or to Congress and could publicize any of his findings.

This, in effect, is a way for the ordinary man to communicate with and make an impression on those who conduct the DC government. As we all know, that government is now immune to many citizen pressures because the District is governed by autocracy, not democracy. If any city needs a Public Protector for its local citizenry, Washington is it.

The Public Protector bill will go either to the Senate District Committee or to the Administrative Practices and Procedures Subcommittee, of which Senator LONG is chairman. Either way, we'd like to have hearings held to see if the public supports the Public Protector idea for Washington.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

VIETNAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when we hear so much criticism of our efforts to help the South Vietnamese maintain their independence, it is gratifying to see evidence of support for our position there. The communicants of the Aldersgate Methodist Church in Chelmsford, Mass., have expressed their feelings in a most heartening affirmation of belief in the principles for which we are fighting. This statement of position appeared in the Lowell Sun on May 11 and I call it to the attention of my colleagues. It expresses very well I think the essence of why we are in Vietnam and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

No. 94—13

STATEMENT ON POSITION: METHODISTS TAKE
STAND ON VIET NAM

(From the Aldersgate Methodist Church)

CHELMSFORD.—We believe that communism, as practiced in the world today, is a categorically evil thing: a godless ideology based upon the subjugation of the will of each individual to an all-powerful totalitarian state. We believe that present-day communism is diametrically opposed to Christianity, and that the two have always been and are now totally incompatible.

We believe that a fundamental and unchanging goal of the Communist party is the establishment of a worldwide Communist society, and that the Communist party is using every means at its disposal—psychological, economic and military—to further this goal. We believe that the Viet Cong and the military forces of North Viet Nam are instruments of this international Communist conspiracy, dedicated to the establishment of a Communist state in South Viet Nam against the will of the South Vietnamese people.

We believe in the morality of the Truman Doctrine of Containment; we believe that the United States government has not only a moral right but a moral obligation to counter the forces of Communist aggression anywhere in the world when it is apparent that the local government is unable to prevent its overthrow through its own efforts, and that the United States is fully justified in using military force if necessary to prevent Communist takeover of a non-Communist country.

We believe that only the presence of United States military forces in South Viet Nam now prevents an imminent Communist takeover of that country. We believe that United States withdrawal from South Viet Nam would in effect deliver the lives of millions of Vietnamese people into the hands of the international Communist conspiracy, and we believe that such action would be grossly immoral.

We believe in the United States government's stated objectives in Southeast Asia. We believe that the Vietnamese people must be protected against a Communist takeover of their country. We believe that it is imperative that the people of South Viet Nam be free to determine their own form of government. We believe that the course of action being followed by our government in Viet Nam is necessary to prevent the strengthening of the Communist position in Southeast Asia.

We do not condemn the actions of our government in Viet Nam. Rather, we thank God that our leaders have the insight to recognize the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy and the determination to prevent the addition of one more acre of land or one more human life to the sphere of Communist domination.

A MAYOR TELLS HOW TO MODERNIZE
AMERICA'S CITIES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Mr. Herman W. Goldner, mayor of St. Petersburg, Fla., has written a thought-provoking article on the fiscal problems of American cities in the April issue of Nation's Business. Titled "A Mayor Tells How To Modernize America's Cities," the article has some interesting observations regarding Federal, State, and local responsibilities for metropolitan problems and alternative suggestions for meeting those problems.

Mayor Goldner is a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and of the Board of Trustees of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. He is

a businessman-attorney, now serving his third term as mayor of St. Petersburg. His article deserves the attention of Members of Congress and State and local leaders. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From Nation's Business, April 1966]

A MAYOR TELLS HOW TO MODERNIZE AMERICA'S
CITIES

President Johnson wants "a massive program," to attack the problems of America's cities including "demonstration cities" in slum sectors and model communities in the suburbs, teacher corps in slum areas, rent subsidies and anti crime and anti pollution programs for urban areas. This is all in addition to an array of existing programs.

Against this background, Nation's Business presents the views of an authority who feels federal efforts are best devoted to enabling localities to solve their own problems.

Too many of our ailing cities today are calling for massive doses of federal aid as a cure-all, complaining bitterly that they do not have the resources to heal their own maladies.

They are wrong. They have potential cures at hand if they will honestly seek them out.

Most of our urban areas are stopped tantalizingly near to solutions by archaic laws and equally out-of-date thinking. They need not only more money but new systems and tools—from super-cities to computers—to help meet people's needs.

If most of the nation's municipal governments were private corporations, they would be out of business when the next payroll comes due because they cannot build the fiscal and organizational resources needed to carry on.

No sane businessman would dream of structuring a corporation which has obligated itself to provide millions of dollars in services, maintenance and capital improvements without adequate income.

No sane businessman would consider forming a corporation which must rely upon its "competitors" for revenue.

Yet municipal governments, as they exist today, are comparable to private firms which have gone into business without the ability to sustain their endeavors financially.

Our cities and urban areas must rely primarily upon sources of income already tapped by their "competitors" in government—the county, state and federal systems.

And when our cities find they cannot function fiscally, they begin to call loudly for help and too often the first call is for federal cash and lots of it.

Our cities, often neglected in the past by unsympathetic state legislatures, expect some return on the federal taxes paid by their citizens.

Massive federal aid, however, can mean an atrophy of municipal self-reliance. It causes a breakdown in planning to meet future needs; the feeling is that "if we run into trouble we can always go to Washington and hook onto some program or other."

It leads, furthermore, to a distortion in allocation of local resources on a sound priority basis. The temptation is great to concentrate local spending on projects for which federal grants are available, regardless of need.

Urban problems must be solved at the urban level. The federal government should lend financial assistance only in those areas meeting basic criteria, the most important being that an honest local effort has failed.

This is not to deny Washington's responsibility, which exists if only because federal

spending ultimately taps the same till as local government. But straight substitution of federal programs for local programs is wrong.

The true federal responsibility, it seems to me, is to create an environment wherein the cities can better solve their own problems with their own resources.

Municipal officials, myself included, jump at the opportunity to testify before congressional committees and point out that the 220 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) as defined by the Bureau of the Census contain over three fourths of our people. We emphasize that in these areas occur most of the poverty, delinquency and traffic congestion in the country and that these are national problems requiring financial aid in large doses.

However, there are some other shattering facts about these SMSA's and their own financial potentials which we mayors fail to mention:

They account for three quarters of our bank clearings.

They account for four fifths of all value added by manufacture.

They contain four fifths of all bank deposits.

And most important of all, at least 80 per cent of all federal personal income taxes are collected from people within their boundaries. The personal income tax is the major source of federal revenue from which federal grants-in-aid are financed.

Of course, the difficulty is that within the SMSA's the problems (poverty, crime, etc.) are not in the same jurisdiction as the fiscal resources. Combined action by state and local governments is essential to meet these disparities. One of the questions we in municipal government must honestly begin to ask ourselves is:

Are federal funds too often taken by local governments simply because they are available?

We must soon seek the establishment of realistic criteria for the giving and receiving of federal funds by local governmental units. I suggest some of the points to be considered are:

1. Is there a real need for federal funds for the particular local program for which they are sought? How urgent is that need and what is the honest ability of the local government to meet that need?

2. What realistic formula can we agree upon to indicate the amount of local effort being brought to bear upon the particular problem for which federal funds are sought?

3. Can this formula include an honest appraisal of the tax base in use by the local unit and can it determine the extent to which the local unit is taxing, or otherwise seeking to raise money, to meet its needs?

In addition, I believe we must have some hard and fast guidelines outlining the scope of federally funded local programs. When do they begin, how broad an area do they encompass and—most importantly—when do they end?

As one of four mayors serving on the President's Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and now nearing my fifth year of service in a metropolitan city, I find myself becoming increasingly aware of some municipal facts of life.

My fellow members in the U.S. Conference of Mayors, I find, also are becoming more aware of these facts.

NEEDED: COURAGE

Most of us have the revenue potential to enable us to survive without massive federal aid. Few of us have the political courage sincerely to use this potential.

This revenue potential is available to us in the form of state or municipal personal income taxes. It is almost the only local level tax which can grow with the economy. It can be a revenue source to supplant, in part, massive federal aid.

The federal government—if it is sincere and honestly means what it seems to say about assisting urban areas to meet their problems—must provide a realistic tax break to enable these state and local governments to consider some form of personal income tax to finance programs.

Such a cutback, or refund to persons in areas in which local governments are levying an income tax, would permit greater use of what is almost the only really untapped tax source left to the lower echelons of government.

It also would permit local governments, in effect, to levy taxes for greater local use. And, conversely, it would permit greater taxpayer control over expenditure of tax dollars.

Without a reduction in federal income tax rates to those taxpayers contributing to state and local income levies, the individual burden would be oppressive and grossly unfair.

This is the only approach that recognizes the facts of political life. The taxpayer, who feels that he has little or no control over federal spending levels, is hardly to be blamed if he votes down a local bond issue or opposes a local tax increase. Doing so he feels he can exercise direct influence on spending for public purposes.

Now, with federal taxes levied for urban programs, it is hard for the local official confronted with real needs to resist pressure to ask for his "share."

With creative administration, local governments can solve a good part of their problems. Proper zoning can, in many instances, ease the need for massive urban renewal programs; proper housing code enforcement, more often than not, can lessen the crises of slum clearance; sensible taxing practices can permit a return of investment and risk capital to our central city core areas.

In any event, we must not—indeed, we cannot—increase the tax burden upon real estate or land.

In most urban areas, and particularly in the heart of the city, land taxes must be reduced.

High land taxes in these older central city areas actually cause blight and decay, in many instances. Because of a prohibitive tax structure, owners of older properties there are reluctant to keep up, or improve, existing buildings.

This tends to encourage blight and decay—the very things most of us are seeking to halt, and usually are seeking Federal funds to help us halt it.

A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations showed these changes and reductions are necessary because historically the federal government's intensive use of the personal income tax is the single most important deterrent to its expanded use by states and cities.

Our research showed that between 1937 and 1960 not a single state adopted a personal income tax. During this period 13 states did adopt general sales taxes.

A relative handful of the nation's cities are given a share of state income taxes for their needs.

JOB FOR STATES

In addition, however, to making additional levies other than property taxes available to local governments, the states must take revolutionary action to remedy the vast disparities of resources between individual jurisdictions in metropolitan areas. Among these possibilities are:

Generous state financial assistance to urban areas in such fields as sewage treatment, improvement of schools and mass transportation.

Imposition of a special state income tax upon the residents of metropolitan areas and rebating the tax to the metropolitan areas on the basis of population or other formulas.

Creation by the state of area-wide tax authorities to finance the most expensive urban services—including elementary and second-

ary education, vocational training, public health and law enforcement.

Important as they are, finances are but one part of the fight to save our cities.

Cities are more than a conglomeration of physical facilities feeding upon tax dollars. They are great, sprawling, teeming areas filled with an intellectual and cultural vitality which must live on.

We recognize that urban needs and problems do not stop at the city limits. However, our cities are deprived of the authority to offer services and seek revenues by these artificial geographic boundaries.

They create a broad "no man's land" around the periphery of our cities.

One answer is annexation of adjoining areas. It has some merits as a stopgap. More land area provides a broader base for real estate taxes, more geography on which to base general obligation bond issues. A larger service area can mean a lower per capita cost for such things as sewage disposal, garbage, and trash pickups and water supply. Unchecked annexation, of course, can create as many evils as it attempts to solve. It can create straggling "strip cities" without enough revenue to provide services, or to keep pace with population growth.

The 212 metropolitan areas in the nation in 1962 (the latest official figure) had 18,442 local governments; 310 counties, 4,142 municipalities, 2,575 townships, 6,004 independent school districts and 5,411 other special purpose districts.

A way to end this duplication and overlapping of function and tax sources could be the creation of "corporate cities" under a regional board of directors. These super-cities could have the authority to override archaic tax laws, the flexibility to expand and contract physical boundaries within the region to match population movements and full recognition by other governmental units.

They could absorb all of the functions of the governmental units within their boundaries.

In this way, each city and local government could retain its individuality, yet have a functioning unit through which it could try realistically to meet the needs of its citizens.

The 1965 Utah Legislature approved a somewhat similar concept. It provides for an amendment to the state constitution subject to voter approval.

If the amendment is approved by Utah voters this year, it will establish a procedure enabling a defined metropolitan area to take over the powers and functions of existing governmental units within its outlined district.

PARING COSTS

In 1962 I conceived a plan setting up "regional substates" in an effort to provide authority and ability to meet growing urban problems and to remove the increasing duplication of services and consequent taxation.

Under my plan, Florida would have been districted into five regional areas of comparable population. The regions would have been so geographically defined as to preserve the basic integrity of rural and urban areas.

Each of my five substates would have an elective head, a cabinet and a legislature.

This would permit each region the authority and local lawmaking ability to meet needs quickly as they arose.

There are, of course, alternatives to this plan.

Consolidation of services and authority within county rather than city limits is an attractive alternative. This, in great part, can eliminate duplication of services, taxation and governmental authority.

Nashville-Davidson County in Tennessee and my own state's Dade County are embarked upon a comparable endeavor to streamline and make most efficient their governmental practices. These two units are simply and basically reorganized county governments supporting urban area needs.

medical condition which warranted a transfer to a nursing home installation. This provision, in view of the absence of Veterans' Administration facilities in Alaska and Hawaii, prevented the furnishing of nursing care in these two States.

The purpose of section 2 of this bill is to permit the furnishing of nursing care in Alaska and Hawaii where such care is found to be warranted.

The Veterans' Administration did not give cost estimates in their report on S. 562 (sec. 1 of the amended bill). They indicate in their report that the cost of this portion will be "relatively small," and that precise figures involve too many contingencies to be accurately calculated. The best information available, however, indicates that the cost will be about \$500,000 per year.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the annual cost of H.R. 13187, without regard to section 1 of the instant bill, will be approximately \$22,000.

THE CONTINUING UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—A GROWING DANGER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, year after year since 1945, in order to strengthen the forces of freedom around the world, the United States has expended an average of over \$8 billion annually for foreign aid and military support payments.

In 1965, for example, our total Government payments abroad were \$8.5 billion, including \$4.3 billion in foreign economic aid and \$2.8 billion in offshore military expenditures, plus \$1.4 billion in service payments.

A statistical tabulation was presented by General Lemnitzer in testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This testimony included a comparison of U.S. defense expenditures in relation to the size of our economy with comparable figures for other NATO countries, for the period between 1947 and 1963. The testimony, once and for all, dispels any illusion that the United States is not carrying the major burden of defense for the free world.

The figures of General Lemnitzer show that the United States spends annually for defense close to 10 percent of its gross national product; whereas France spends 6 percent, the United Kingdom about 5 percent, Germany and the Netherlands 4.5 percent, and Belgium and Italy 3.5 percent.

In other words, U.S. defense expenditures abroad are more than twice as large, in relation to gross national product, as are the expenditures of most of our NATO allies.

The United States has now become the world's major debtor nation, owing abroad, primarily to the foreign central banks, over \$29 billion in liquid liabilities; with its dwindling gold stock now standing at less than \$13.6 billion.

In addition, recently it has been reported that the United States had a balance-of-payments deficit of \$582 million in the first quarter of 1966. At an annual rate, this would make the year-

end deficit \$2.4 billion, far above last year's reported deficit of \$1.3 billion.

As the size of our Vietnam commitments increase, U.S. offshore military expenditures are bound to rise; and the strain now being placed on our domestic economy can only cause a continuing rise in our imports.

It is now clear that, if we are to remain internationally solvent, we must stop financing our current expenditures abroad on Government account by borrowing from abroad; and also reexamine carefully the magnitude and direction of our foreign aid, along with our overseas military expenditures.

The United States continues to spend \$1.5 billion a year in Europe for military presence alone; at the same time, it continues to lose a substantial portion of its gold to that same Europe.

An article in the New York Times June 6 contains the following statement:

There are alternatives, and Bonn insists they can be made to work. One is a Defense Payments Union in NATO, which the Johnson Administration is about to propose, mainly to ease Britain's coming sterling crisis. American and British troops in Germany, Italy and Belgium then would pay in scrip, and it would be the host country's responsibility to spend it for arms purchases or to accumulate useless paper.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the majority leader, since he left the Chamber, has indicated that, in obtaining unanimous consent for a morning hour, he failed to request that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that statements be so limited.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, under the prior unanimous-consent agreement, I asked permission from the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. COTTON] to continue for 5 minutes. It was agreeable with him, and I was hopeful that it would be with the majority leader.

Mr. HART. Indeed it is. The request to limit statements during the morning hours is not applicable to the Senator from Missouri.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Michigan. In conclusion, Mr. President, scrip is now recommended, and a crisis shortly in British currency taken for granted. One has the right to ask how long can this go on without a reckoning?

(At this point Mr. CANNON assumed the chair.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri for calling to the attention of the Senate this very important matter which is coming up. I

was going to say crisis. It evidently is going to be a crisis as far as Britain is concerned and it could be for the United States. I thank the Senator from Missouri for performing a valuable service in bringing these matters to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am grateful to the senior Senator from Indiana who, as a member of the Committee on Finance, is an authority on the subject which I have presented this morning.

(At this point Mr. HARTKE assumed the chair.)

UN

THE COST OF VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, upon returning from South Vietnam last January, it appeared to me that this country should either move forward in that area against more meaningful military targets, or move out; and I so reported to the Senate.

It was not possible to perceive the advantage, net, of long drawn out military action in which our major effort was conducted where the enemy is strongest—on the ground—instead of where we are supreme—sea and air.

Later, upon return from Europe last April, this conclusion was reaffirmed, not only because of the great and growing cost, but also because of conviction this country is now over-committed as the result of our steadily increasing involvements, in men as well as money, over the past 20 years.

Since April there have been new developments, especially in South Vietnam, where there is now serious internal dissension between various elements, all of whom we are presuming are anti-Communist. And it is becoming steadily more difficult for me to understand how this Nation can successfully defend a people who are constantly fighting among themselves.

The problem is emphasized in the following news report published earlier this week:

Vietcong ambushers killed a detail of six U.S. Air Force men in an area where political turmoil has diverted South Vietnamese troops from normal campaigning against the Communists. The Americans, members of a survey team from a radar installation, were trapped in a truck 15 miles south of the border with the North.

In any case, most discussions about Vietnam center on either diplomatic or military problems, with relatively little consideration of the great and growing economic problems this Vietnam involvement is now giving our Government.

There was an interesting letter to the Washington Post on June 7, entitled "The Cost of Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent this letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

COST OF VIETNAM

Despite the millions of words in newsprint about the Vietnam war, very little has been written about its economic aspects. Our avowed humanitarian aims are looked upon by many peoples of the world with suspicion or outright disbelief. It is even doubtful if

June 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12037

adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any veteran who is furnished care by the Administrator in a hospital in Alaska or Hawaii may be furnished nursing home care under the provisions of this section even if such hospital is not under the direct and exclusive jurisdiction of the Administrator."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, once again the veterans of Alaska have cause to be grateful to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Because of his leadership and concern we are today considering my bill, S. 562, which has been favorably reported with amendments from his committee.

I urge Senate adoption of this bill.

The bill has two sections: The first, would provide for the restoration of hospitalization benefits which Alaska and Hawaii veterans enjoyed before statehood. It would give the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration the authority to contract with private hospitals for the care of veterans with non-service-connected disability. The bill provides that this particular authority, which now extends to noncontiguous territories of the United States, would be extended once again to Alaska and Hawaii. This will expire in 10 years' time. At that time Congress could determine whether the services provided by this bill and which are now so badly needed are still warranted.

The second purpose of this bill would be to permit veterans hospitalized under VA jurisdiction in Alaska and Hawaii the same opportunity to be transferred to nursing homes as veterans in other States now have.

Under present law the VA is authorized to transfer veterans needing extended care to public or private nursing homes. Such transfers reduce the costs for caring for the patients, insures him the care he needs before being returned to a normal life and provides an additional hospital bed. In the act authorizing these transfers it is specified that they may be made only from hospitals under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Administrator. This lets Alaska out. This lets Hawaii out. There are no VA hospitals in Alaska or Hawaii.

In Alaska, veterans with service-connected disability are treated at the Army hospital at Fort Wainwright, the Air Force hospital at Elmendorf Air Force Base, and various small hospitals run by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Alaska natives. These hospitals are obviously not under the direct jurisdiction of the VA and, thus inadvertently, Alaska veterans are unable to obtain nursing home treatment. This is also true for veterans in Hawaii and the Philippines. The bill before the Senate today would correct this oversight and would give to Alaska, Hawaii, and Philippine veterans the same standard of treatment as that accorded to veteran residents in the 48 States.

The VA contracts for a small number of beds in the federally owned Government hospitals of Alaska. These beds are the only medical facilities provided for the more than 22,000 veterans living in Alaska. These beds, I am told, are fully utilized. The veteran who lives near one of these Government hospitals, and who, I might say, is fortunate enough to have a service-connected illness, will receive proper treatment. If the illness is not service connected it is difficult for him to receive proper treatment. Far more than half the beds in VA hospitals in the lower 48 States are occupied by veterans with non-service-connected illnesses. Such men in Alaska, however, receive VA care only if there is a bed available in the leased space.

Alaska is a vast land. There are few roads and the principal means of transportation is by air. This is expensive and, if illness is involved, sometimes dangerous.

Before statehood the costs and the dangers were recognized by the Congress. It authorized the care of veterans in the closest available private hospital. The costs of this care were paid by the VA. The justification for such a provision was explained by Administrator Gleason in a letter to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HULL] dated March 12, 1963. Gleason explained why the VA supports giving such care to veterans living in the noncontiguous territories. He said the distance from the mainland, the difficulty in transferring patients to the States, and the relatively small volume of patient demand made such provision acceptable to the Administration.

These conditions not only pertain to the territories, they also pertain to the two noncontiguous States, Alaska and Hawaii.

On the basis of simple justice, I, therefore, urge the Senate to give this measure its approval and I again would like to thank the senior Senator from Texas for his continued interest and concern for the welfare of Alaska veterans. All Alaska veterans are appreciative of his efforts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term 'Veterans' Administration facilities,' and to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska and Hawaii."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in explanation of the bill, section 1 of the bill amends the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities" contained in section 601(4)(C), title 38, of the United States Code, to include private contract facilities for a veteran of any war when such veteran is in a State not contiguous to the 48 contiguous States.

Bills of similar intent have been considered in several earlier Congresses. The bill is identical in purpose to S. 625, which passed the Senate in the 88th Congress; to S. 801, which was reported from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the 87th Congress; and to S. 2201, which passed the Senate during the 86th Congress.

Under the present law, war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are entitled to hospitalization in VA hospitals when they themselves are unable to pay the costs, and when space is available in such hospitals. Further, they are entitled to hospitalization in private contract facilities, but only in a "Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States."

Alaska and Hawaii are the only States in which the Veterans' Administration maintains no hospitals, and the veterans in these States do not have the advantage of hospitalization in facilities devoted entirely to the care of veterans.

Before statehood, private contract facilities were used in these areas to provide hospital care to veterans with non-service-connected injuries. When Alaska and Hawaii became States, however, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs lost the power to contract there for private hospital facilities, and it is to this problem that section 1 of the present bill is addressed. In practical effect, this section of the bill merely restores the situation which existed prior to the time Alaska and Hawaii achieved statehood, and they are the only States affected by this legislation.

At the present time, hospital care for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities is provided in Alaska and Hawaii through other Government hospitals. In Alaska, beds are allocated for veterans in hospitals of the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In Hawaii, the Department of Defense has allocated beds in the Army's Tripler General Hospital. Under the appropriate conditions, veterans may go to these hospitals if beds are available. But with the present increases in the demands on Department of Defense hospitals, it is possible that space will be less available than before. Also, travel in the remote regions of Alaska and the outlying islands of Hawaii is difficult, and there is a need to allow the veteran to be hospitalized in private hospitals near his home.

Section 2 of the bill is identical to H.R. 13187, the 89th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives.

When Public Law 88-450 was enacted authorizing among other things the furnishing of nursing care in Veterans' Administration operated nursing homes and in community nursing homes, there was no provision made for the furnishing of such nursing care in the States of Alaska and Hawaii. One of the basic provisions of Public Law 88-450 is that in order for an individual to be placed in a privately operated or community nursing home for temporary care at VA expense the patient must first have been in a Veterans' Administration hospital and reached a

June 8, 1966

12039

the bulk of the South Vietnam people are convinced. The notion of humanitarian motive for an expensive war is entirely foreign to their habit of thought. The acceptance of the idea depends on social consciousness, which on a national level hardly exists in most of Asia and has reached only rudimentary development in many other regions of the world. If our avowed purposes are not accepted as the truth our actions breed distrust.

In the beginning, economic factors must have seemed insignificant. The initial cost of our involvement was little more than the pay and allowances of a few thousand men. That undoubtedly seemed worth the venture. But we didn't win and from then on we reacted like the hapless gambler trying to recover his losses by increasing the stakes with the result that each successive stake became worse than the first. Now that we have already expended \$5 or \$10 billion and have had three of four thousand fatal battle and nonbattle casualties, we must ask ourselves, "Is the venture still worth it?"

There has been no Pearl Harbor, our national security is under no immediate threat, we have not committed ourselves to an all-out war and we have so far expended only a small part of the resources which an all-out war would call for. Should we commit these resources?

If, for example, the estimates (and these are conservative estimates) suggest that the war and occupation will last 10 years, that we will suffer 30,000 fatal casualties, and that the monetary cost will be in the order of \$100 billion, Congress will be in a position to determine whether this is a reasonable price for making South Vietnam safe for some distant future democracy or whether we should spare the 30,000 men and begin searching for some less costly ways of containing communism.

With a \$100 billion purse this should be easy.

H. SCHULZE.

NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know the author, but do know he is right when he says his estimates of this tremendous cost could well be conservative. These costs are growing. To them must be added the billions apparently we plan to expend in effort to salvage our position in Europe.

In the meantime our gold reserves continue to dwindle, mostly to Europe; and current U.S. Government liabilities redeemable in gold and owned abroad, primarily by the foreign central banks, continue to increase.

If our policies and programs continue to necessitate this heavy price, and our 17-year unfavorable balance of payments continues unfavorable, there must be a reckoning in the not too distant future.

SECRETARY RUSK IS WRONG

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk should cease and desist his reprehensible and highly contemptible references to Communist China. He invariably publicly displays his contempt for the Chinese and for the leaders of mainland China. He publicly terms the capital of that nation "Peiping" instead of by its historic and proper name, "Peking." A Secretary of State of the United States should be supposed to exercise some degree of tact and restraint in public statements. The contrary has been the rule.

Under direction of Secretary of State Rusk, officials of the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and other Washington officials have been issued instructions to refer to the capital of mainland China as "Peiping," the terminology that Chiang Kai-shek applied to it, and must not refer to it as "Peking," the historic name and the name adhered to by Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime.

The meaning of the word "Peking" is "northern capital." Peking was the recognized capital of the Manchu dynasty and historically the capital of China. Even Secretary Rusk should know that the Chinese for thousands of years had a great history and noble tradition and that they have reason to be proud of their culture. Yet, due to technological superiority and weapons of war, European nations throughout the 19th century conquered vast areas of the Chinese mainland.

The English set an example of oppressing Chinese nationals. They and other Europeans came to regard Chinese as an inferior, low-grade people and over the years constantly humiliated them. In fact, in the 1840's England fought a war of aggression against the Chinese because Chinese officials, to save the lives of their own people, tried to suppress the opium traffic which was extremely lucrative to English merchants. To the shame of the British Empire, this war has been termed the "Opium War." It resulted in the seizure of the island of Hong Kong and other areas that had been Chinese for thousands of years. This lush territory, homeland of the Chinese, was taken either outright or under the guise of 99 year leases.

Throughout the 19th and the early 20th centuries, officials of European governments and even the United States frequently treated Chinese scholars and statesmen with contempt, regarding them as people to be exploited by the great powers such as Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia.

When liberty-loving Chinese rose in revolt in what was termed the "Boxer Rebellion," even our own Armed Forces joined with other powers to crush the rebellion.

Shortly thereafter the Manchu dynasty was overthrown and a period of anarchy followed with various Chinese warlords fighting one another with their private armies. The great powers took further advantage of this internal weakness and seized additional territory and privileges in China.

In 1928 Chiang Kai-shek overcame other warlords, and to downgrade those he had beaten and to demonstrate his contempt, he moved the capital to Nanking and changed the name "Peking" to "Peiping" which, translated, means pacified capital.

Following the time the Communist forces chased Chiang Kai-shek from mainland China, they in 1949 reestablished the capital at Peking. From that date to the present time Peking has been the capital of Communist China.

Nevertheless, on instructions from officials of the State Department, many U.S. officials continue to use the term "Peiping." This is an unnecessary ir-

ritant to the people and rulers of Red China. Without a doubt this exercise of bad judgment, in fact stupidity, on the part of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, causes the Chinese leaders to be more inflexible in their intransigence.

In 1814, in the course of our war with England, termed the "War of 1812," a small English army under General Ross with some marines and sailors under Admiral Cockburn routed American militiamen at Bladensburg and captured Washington. These raiders burned the President's house in retaliation for Americans burning the then capital of Canada, York, earlier in that war. President Madison barely escaped capture. Immediately following the capture of Washington and burning the President's house, the English withdrew. This was in 1814.

How would the people of the United States have liked it if a Prime Minister of England, around 1832, contemptuously referred to Washington as "pacified capital" instead of referring to our capital by its correct name, Washington?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk would be well advised to discontinue the use of this insulting word, "Peiping," unless he is utterly lacking in sincerity in his claim that he is offering the olive branch of co-existence and peace.

Claiming that our puppet Chiang Kai-shek, whose forces fleeing from the Chinese mainland slaughtered some 18,000 unarmed citizens of Formosa, including women and children, in establishing his rule there and claiming that his government in Taiwan, the name he gave to Formosa, is the only legitimate Government of China, is fakery as statesmen of the world know.

Our proper policy would be to continue the recognition of the government of Taiwan and then go ahead seeking a more flexible trade policy with China, continuing, of course, the ban on strategic materials but permitting the export to Communist China of whatever the Chinese may wear, eat, drink, or smoke and, in return, buying the products and handicraft of the Chinese.

We should offer diplomatic recognition to Communist China which has maintained a government in mainland China for nearly 20 years. Were we to have an embassy in Peking with an Ambassador and staff we would have an open window and listening post in China. Because ours is an open society, China would have less to gain in opening an embassy in Washington.

Mr. President, I shall continue to condemn and denounce State Secretary Rusk if and whenever he indulges in the use of the contemptible and insulting term "Peiping," aping the language of Chiang Kai-shek.

PERMITTING THE PLANTING OF ALTERNATE CROPS ON ACREAGE WHICH IS UNPLANTED BECAUSE OF A NATURAL DISASTER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the conference report on H.R. 15151 is at the desk? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.