

commissaries and low rent housing on the base.

Wives of men who go overseas normally must give up base housing and if they don't live in a town close to a base, they may lose many other benefits, including medical care, by default.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues in the House of Representatives will be interested in the excellent statement on Vietnam made by my friend, Harold W. "Abe" Lincoln, candidate for Congress, seeking the Democratic nomination in the new Eighth District of Maryland. "Abe" Lincoln formerly served me most ably as administrative assistant and in addition has 25 years of legislative and executive experience in the Government. The character and spirit of this man is admirably shown by this fine and thoughtful statement on a subject which has received the attention of many of the citizens of our country. It gives me great pleasure to share with my colleagues, and I hope many other Americans too, "Abe" Lincoln's clear, firm serious treatment of the important and serious matter of Vietnam:

[Summary]

DEFENSE—FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THEIR INTERRELATIONSHIPS—THE ROLE OF A CONGRESSMAN

Each member of Congress is first a national official and as such has a primary responsibility to work for and promote those measures directly related to our National Security. A flexible and viable foreign policy, together with a national defense capability second to none, are the interrelated components that determine our national security interests. Over 50% of our Federal Budget is devoted to direct defense expenditures and the conduct of our foreign affairs. Defense today means the war in Viet Nam and my position on this issue consistently expressed since my announcement on June 28th is as follows:

When national security considerations require the commitment of American troops to combat, as in Viet Nam today, the President of the United States in his Constitutional role of Commander-in-Chief of our splendid troops shall first as a citizen always have my prayers as I believe he will always have by the majority of Americans. As a candidate, they have my unqualified support for their unrelenting efforts to achieve an honorable peace by bilateral negotiations and as your Congressman, should I be deemed worthy of that position of high trust and responsibility, the President, as Commander-in-Chief, regardless of party affiliation, will always have my support when national security considerations require the commitment of American troops in combat when all efforts to keep the peace, or restore peace, have failed.

In determining what our national security interests are before troop commitment occurs, it is the constitutional duty of each Congressman to require a hard and specific accounting of what precisely our country's vital interest are and where they are located.

The war in Viet Nam has raised far more questions concerning the nature of our treaty alliances in Asia than it has supplied answers for the future. Are they unilateral in nature, or do they represent Mutual Assistance Pacts, as represented. I support a de-

termined use of our strength on behalf of principles we stand ready to defend, as in Viet Nam today. But I do not support a foreign policy based entirely upon force. I deplore the fact that after Viet Nam we are not addressing ourselves to the avenues that can and must be explored to prevent the Viet Nams of the future. What is at stake today is leadership in Foreign Affairs, just as this was the issue in 1960. I intend to be a question asking Congressman to the government and a question answering Congressman to my constituents, and I intend to find a better answer than we now have about the relationship of our interests and our commitments. I would urge the House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct a full review of our Asian treaty commitments and in this context to recognize that the key issue in the world today is the problem of Red China. Isolation and containment is not the answer for the long range future. Involvement in the affairs of the world must be the objective. Just as "windows to the west" were finally opened at the end of the Czarist Regime in Russia, so must we expand our present small steps to tempt China to lessen her isolation. Equally important is the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Evidence continues to mount that a non-proliferation agreement with the Russians is within reach. Such a treaty should be vigorously pursued and if inertia exists in the State Department, as some suggest on this issue, then I would urge President Johnson to assume the initiative personally as President Kennedy did in his American University speech of June 10, 1963, which led in short order to the atmospheric test ban treaty.

Certainly no freshman Congressman can solve all the problems, but he should know what they are and report his judgment to his constituents.

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

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

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

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

WATER POLLUTION SERIES—I

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

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been privileged to serve on the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development under the very able leadership of the distinguished Representative from Connecticut, EMILIO Q. DADDARIO.

The subcommittee recently conducted an investigation of what progress is being made in development of techniques and equipment for abatement of environmental pollution, and of what effects the increasing pollution of our waters,

air, and land are having on the health and welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, environmental pollution is not a new problem. It is one that has grown as our population has risen and our technology grown more sophisticated. For years, apathy and inaction allowed the problem of pollution to swell to unforeseen magnitude. However, now, as the miserable results have become all too obvious, public interest has quickened, fortunately, and the public is asking its representatives to provide leadership in the abatement of pollution.

Mr. Speaker, my concern with the problems and consequences of pollution has arisen through firsthand experience. A portion of the Second Congressional District of Michigan borders directly on Lake Erie. Public indifference in years past has resulted in the contamination of the once clean water of this great lake.

To aid in bringing the problem of water pollution to the attention of my colleagues, and to the people of the United States, I will insert items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will serve to provide further insight into this major national problem.

As the first part of this series, I insert a recent speech made in Detroit on November 4, 1965, by Mr. Murray Stein, Acting Assistant Commissioner for Enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Mr. Stein relates the consequences of water pollution in Lake Erie, his remarks clearly point out how imperative it is that immediate action be taken to redeem this national resource.

THE SECOND BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

For both the United States and Canada, one of the most lucky consequences of the ice age was the formation of the Great Lakes. As the giant glaciers began to recede and the temperatures rose, about 18,000 years ago, the first small finger lakes appeared where the southern edges of the Great Lakes are now. As the glaciers shrank further northward, the Lakes grew to their present size. They are the largest area of fresh water in the world, and they have undoubtedly been the single most important factor in the development of the region around them. Were it not for the Great Lakes, this region would probably have developed as a primarily agricultural economy. Instead the Great Lakes region, for both the United States and Canada, supports an industrialized, multi-faceted economy. In both countries the Great Lakes regions have made an invaluable contribution to the national economies, and both retain a tremendous growth potential.

Civilizations are conditioned by natural resources, but not completely predetermined by them. Not all countries are as rich as their natural resources could make them. In some cases men have exploited what the earth has given them; in others they have let the earth lie fallow. In the early history of the Great Lakes region the Indians did not change their mode of existence by harnessing the talents of the Lakes. The Indians fished the Lakes, used them for drinking water and transportation, and left the Lakes much as they had found them. The potential of the Great Lakes lay waiting, and their beauty remained undisturbed.

The Europeans in their expansions westward seized the Great Lakes region as quickly as they could. In 1615 Samuel de Champlain first ventured onto Lake Huron; 55 years later France owned the entire St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes region. No

Aspen Award should go to the Athens Center of Eklistis which tries to create the City of Man.

But dreaming and conceiving is not enough. We have to carve the stones and lift them and this is why I try hard to help build all sorts of cities because we can learn only by building and suffering.

Faced with the practical every-day difficulties I turn to myself and ask whether we can build the human city. My body is beginning to get weaker, my senses, especially my eyesight, do not help me as in the past, but my mind advances in knowledge and sees the confirmation of this possibility, and my soul mobilizes my whole self into a very positive affirmation: Yes, mankind can build the human city.

AMERICAN POW FAMILIES

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

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 24, 1966, the Washington Evening Star published a story by John T. Wheeler which shocked me and I am sure many other Members of Congress as well. David Brinkley of the National Broadcasting Co. news staff also commented on this story in the Huntley-Brinkley evening news.

The headline of the story read "Red-tape, Indifference Snarl POW's Families." It seems that immediately after an American serviceman is taken prisoner or is listed as missing a heavy burden falls on his wife and family.

For one thing, the pay of the serviceman is stopped. It is frozen, and his family is forced to do the best it can without any of his pay. This done presumably because the serviceman's status is indefinite. He is not recorded as killed in action, so his family cannot receive insurance, but he may be dead in which case his family cannot receive his pay.

Wives and families have to leave military bases and thus have a difficult time obtaining the free medical care that they are entitled to. There are other problems directly traceable to the Federal Government as well as State governments. For example, joint tax returns can no longer be used because the husband is not present. Many legal problems result and the attorney fees, of course, have to be paid for by the family of the serviceman. Many men are sent to Vietnam on short notice, and there is not time for them to arrange for powers of attorney for their wives.

The article leads us to believe that the families of servicemen are left alone to contend with the bureaucracy and walls of red tape because their husbands are placed in a gray area in relation to Government regulations. According to the article, a Pentagon spokesman said that such problems are "normal things that must be put up with when a man is missing or captured. Anyone with someone missing in action or captured will hit snags." If this is a normal situation with these families, I think the situation should be changed. If a burden has to be placed somewhere when there is doubt as to a serviceman's status, the burden should be placed on the Govern-

ment and not on widows, wives, or families. Where there is a choice between the convenience of a Government finance officer and that of a family, the burden should be shouldered by the finance officer.

I am going to contact the Secretary of Defense to see if there is any way that the Government can do its share to clean up this mess. If his answer is not satisfactory, I will ask that the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, which is continuing its investigation into the "paperwork jungle," look into this matter and clean up this situation.

The article follows, and I ask that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1966]

RED TAPE, INDIFFERENCE SNARL POW'S FAMILIES

(By John T. Wheeler)

Wives of U.S. fighting men missing or captured in Viet Nam say they sometimes must shoulder bewildering burdens because their husbands have become legal "nonpersons."

Some of them contend they have been forced to tackle walls of red tape and bureaucratic indifference in carrying the load.

When a man is declared missing or captured, his status falls into a gray legal area, somewhere between alive and dead. He cannot act for himself, and his wife or dependents can't act for him, except in special circumstances.

THE MAJOR PROBLEMS

Major complaints reported by next of kin include:

Problems in making ends meet because money the serviceman had been sending home stops and the pay he was getting is frozen. It can take weeks or months to unfreeze part of it.

A federal income tax bureau refused to process a joint return unless the wife somehow got the signature of her husband, who had been shot down over North Viet Nam. The same woman had to sell the family car because when she moved to a new state she couldn't get new license plates without the signature.

Wives and children who are entitled to free medical treatment can't get it sometimes in emergencies because they are not allowed to live on military bases.

Attorney fees to solve legal problems directly related to a missing man's or POW's status must be borne by the families.

CALLED "NORMAL THINGS"

Only bare-boned, sometimes confusing reports are issued by the Defense Department concerning the fate of lost men. Many doubts are cleared up only after families ask congressmen for help.

A Pentagon spokesman said such problems are "normal things that must be put up with when a man is missing or captured. Anyone with someone missing in action or captured will hit snags."

He said the Pentagon does its best to give families the full details of casualties. Complaints he said must be the exception.

Each service maintains a casualty assistance office to help dependents in whatever way possible after their men become casualties, the spokesman said.

Instances of problems faced by families have cropped up in reports from a recently formed civilian group seeking to protect POWs legal rights, and in interviews with some wives.

Names of the missing men and their families have been omitted to prevent the Communists from confronting captured men with reports of difficulties encountered by their

dependents. The Defense Department declines to make public information about the men for the same reason.

One woman who tried to get quick cash from the Air Force after her husband was shot down reported, "One officer at the base told me to go on relief because he couldn't give me the money.

"It was only a couple of weeks before Christmas and I said, 'You've got to be kidding me.' But he wasn't."

She had been getting a regular postal money order from her husband in addition to a monthly allotment of \$200, a deduction from his pay arranged by the serviceman.

Told she could not draw against her husband's pay, which was accumulating in a special account, the woman threatened to go to the newspapers. She also wrote President Johnson. She says she got the money and a letter of apology from the Air Force.

Although the finance officer apparently did not know it at first, there is a way to get money from accounts set up for POWs and missing men.

But a Pentagon spokesman says this involves much paper work and a detailed investigation from Washington. He said there is no way for a wife to get immediate cash to tide her over until the formalities are completed.

SOCIETY GETS COMPLAINTS

The troubles of some service wives came to light during the past two months after Patrick McGahn, an Atlantic City, N.J., lawyer, formed the Society for the Defense of American Prisoners.

McGahn's original interest was in trying to get American lawyers into North Viet Nam to defend American fliers, then threatened with trials as war criminals.

To ease the threat of red tape, the services encourage Viet Nam-bound men to give their wives general powers of attorney—permitting them to act for the husband legally no matter what comes up. But some wives report this doesn't always solve the problem.

INCOME TAX RED TAPE

One wife tried to file a joint federal income tax return that would have meant a sizable refund, badly needed for the household expenses.

Although she had a power of attorney and explained that her husband was a POW, the Internal Revenue office insisted that her husband sign the form. After much protest, the wife said, the government finally accepted the return.

A Pentagon source said men who try to make out valid powers of attorney from Viet Nam cannot do so in 23 states which insist that the documents be witnessed by a notary public of that state, or have other restrictions.

Many men are sent to Viet Nam with only a few days notice and don't get around to clearing up all their personal affairs.

Some men balk at filling out powers of attorney or assigning nearly all their pay to their wives for a variety of reasons.

One is that an unscrupulous woman could put everything in her name and then sue for divorce.

Some men have said their wives just don't have the needed business sense. Many decline to act for the same reason other men refuse to make wills. They don't want to admit even indirectly that they may not be coming back.

The Pentagon spokesman said the Army has an aggressive and effective program to get its men to do their best to insure that wives will not run into unnecessary problems.

He said the Navy and Air Force have not done nearly so well.

Fringe benefits are a major factor in encouraging men to stay in the services. These include free medical care, base exchanges,

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20077

where it became necessary for me to speak. There is yet time to remedy the situation.

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RHODES of Arizona's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FARMER AND CONSUMER

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's decisions on the 1967 wheat program may mean lower returns to producers next year.

As the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture has pointed out, a drop in wheat prices would be a serious blow to farmers, and would do nothing to stem the increase in retail bread prices. The principal factors in the bread price rise are not wheat prices, but the rapidly increasing processing, marketing, and distribution costs which are being pushed up by the administration's own inflationary fiscal policies, plus the cost of the wheat certificate program.

All of these inflated costs of production and processing must be paid for by the consumer under present programs and policies. The American consumer is also required, in effect, to subsidize our wheat exports to foreign countries.

Wheat acreage for next year has been increased almost one-third more than this year without any change in the Government's price mechanism. The Department of Agriculture has quietly announced that farmers in the wheat program will receive certificates on little more than a third of their production next year, compared to 45 percent of this year's crop. This means that if increased production causes market prices to fall next year, wheat producers will receive a lower blend price per bushel than they could have under similar circumstances this year.

U.S. farmers are not contributing to inflation, but are its principal victims. Total farm production expenses are 5-percent higher this year than last, and in the past 6 years have increased 20.5 percent. Yet, while inflation is constantly driving up their costs, farmers still have no assurance that they will receive fair or adequate prices for their production. Instead, they are faced with Government actions which would have the effect of seriously deflating their income.

I do not see how the administration can take this big a gamble with our food supply. We need increased production, but farmers are going to think twice about planting more wheat if they see a chance that their prices might take a nosedive next year—they do not want to be left holding the bag, as they have so often in the past.

VIETNAM WAR FINANCING

(Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.) was granted

permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, syndicated columnist Eliot Janeway, whose outstanding articles are carried on the financial page of the Cleveland Press, has an excellent commentary on the economic consequences of Vietnam.

I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

VIETNAM WAR FINANCING: NO WAY TO RUN A WAR

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Last time there was a war, people scrambled to load up on sugar and shoes and tires. They cleaned out the car dealers' lots. They made sure their homes were in good repair—especially their deep freezers. Draft calls and tax talk started a flight from money into items expected to be on the shoppers' list of shortages.

Franklin D. Roosevelt codified our way of thinking about the economic consequences of war in his momentous proclamation, at the time we accelerated our preparations for World War II, that "the silly-fool dollar sign is out for the duration."

F.D.R.'s simple rule of thumb saw us through the Korean war as well. It made sense about how the dollar ceased to be almighty when it gave way to the wartime ration ticket. The moment it did, dollars became cheap.

The normal peacetime premium which money commands was switched to the ration ticket needed to use it.

But our new war in Vietnam is working out differently from any emergency test of strength we've experienced or anticipated as a major power—and not just because of the way we're fighting it. The way we're financing it is different, too.

Dollars, instead of being down-graded for the duration, are commanding an all-time premium; the more the war is escalated, the higher the premium. Whoever has them or is able to raise them—at any cost—can call the tune in the marketplace.

This time around, no one's worried about not being able to buy a car. Even the price of copper, the war material par excellence, which as always soared on war news, has been coming down while the cost of money has continued upward; this is a double switch in war-time market performance.

Lyndon Johnson's present approach to war financing has been to borrow. Each time interest rates rise previous borrowings at lower rates look better.

Certainly, anyone who had borrowed to the hilt at any time since the escalation in Vietnam triggered the inflation in money would be way ahead of the game today.

In fact, the Washington authorities have been advertising the scarcity value of cash and inviting everyone—bankers as well as their customers—to hoard it.

The runaway in rates suggests a disturbing parallel with the break in stock market prices: While both changes have hurt, neither has provided a corrective or, therefore, run its course.

The worst is yet to come for borrowers; and, because money conditions determine stock market conditions, for investors too.

Early in August, Cong. JIM WRIGHT of Fort Worth, a prominent supporter of the liberalism LBJ espoused before he turned himself into the father figure of war finance, took the House floor to complain that "since just last December, interest rates are up 37½% . . . more than 10 times the increase in general wages and prices which the President has certified as conducive to sound economic health."

Labor and producers won't and, moreover, can't hold still for 3.2% or (as the air line mechanic snafu shows) even 7.5% increases in the face of a money squeeze of the crisis

proportions protested by Cong. WRIGHT.

Money users are stymied, too. New York state, for example, has an anti-usury law aimed to protect individuals against interest rates above 6%.

But the banks, understandably, are calling in 6% money lent to individuals in order to relend it to corporations at 8%. It's a helluva way to run a war.

ANDREW EDMISTON, FORMER WEST VIRGINIA CONGRESSMAN, PASSES

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of one of its former distinguished Members, Andrew Edmiston, of Weston, W. Va.

Mr. Edmiston represented the Third Congressional District of West Virginia with distinction for five terms from 1933 to 1943. In 1962, by reason of congressional redistricting in West Virginia, Mr. Edmiston became my constituent and steadfast friend.

At the time of his death, Andy Edmiston, as he was affectionately known, was 73 years old. During his lifetime, Mr. Edmiston compiled a distinguished record in military combat and the political arena. He was also noted as a journalist, farmer, and manufacturer.

During the First World War, he served overseas as a second lieutenant with the 39th Infantry, 4th Division and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Purple Heart with oak leaf clusters, and the Distinguished Service Medal of West Virginia.

As a journalist, Mr. Edmiston was editor of his hometown weekly newspaper, the Weston Democrat for 5 years. He engaged in agricultural pursuits for several years prior to World War I. During World War II, he was the State director of war manpower for West Virginia from 1943 to 1945 when he retired to private business.

Mr. Edmiston was very active as a member of the Democratic Party. He was delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1928 and 1952. He served as State Democratic chairman in West Virginia for 4 years and was mayor of Weston for one term.

There are, I am sure, a number of my colleagues still serving in this body that shared the friendship of Andy Edmiston and, as I, profited from that association.

Andy Edmiston was a loyal Democrat; however, our friendship over the years melted away any real differences that may have existed. I was more than proud to call him my friend.

Mrs. Moore and I extend to his family our deepest sympathy at his passing.

TOWARD A MODERN U.S. TEXTILE IMPORT POLICY: THE LONG TERM ARRANGEMENT REGARDING TRADE IN COTTON TEXTILES AND U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

20078

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 29, 1966

man from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, also, that I may insert into the RECORD this full speech, in order, and as it would appear in the RECORD as given in full. I will then pick up certain points at which a colloquy might possibly develop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TOWARD A MODERN U.S. TEXTILE IMPORT POLICY: THE LONG-TERM ARRANGEMENT REGARDING TRADE IN COTTON TEXTILES AND U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 four of our colleagues—Messrs. LANDRUM, JONAS, DORN, and DAVIS—discussed the commentary on U.S. policy regarding international trade in cotton textiles in my May 31 report on the sixth round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. Their criticisms—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 12701 to 12705—raised some serious questions about the long-term arrangement regarding trade in cotton textiles and U.S. policy which I will explore here. I am grateful to the gentlemen for providing the stimulus and the opportunity further to express my views.

The problems of world textile trade are important both for developed and developing nations, and they involve fundamental questions of international trade policy and theory. But these problems also affect the interests of the American consumer, worker, and investor. The cost to the consumer of some of the most basic types of consumer goods—shirts, sheets, socks, and dresses—is materially affected, and the range of choice open to the housewife in purchasing for her family is limited. To the worker it means employment in an industry which appears to have a weak economic base, and to the investor it means investment in an industry which is to some extent artificially prosperous.

For these reasons I approach this subject as a problem of U.S. foreign trade policy in the broadest sense, rather than as a concern simply of the U.S. textile industries, wool and manmade as well as cotton. The many aspects of the long-term arrangement can be correctly assessed only in this context.

Thus my approach will be to discuss: First, the history and administration of the U.S. cotton textile import program; second, important elements of the international impact of U.S. textile policy including effects on developing countries; third, whether the industry has a need for import protection in the light of its present prosperity; and fourth, recommendations for future policy. I will say at the outset that I will be glad to discuss this subject further. There are few final answers to a problem as complex as this. I hope the gentleman will agree to the value of exploring in detail many of the facets of textile production and trade

which, though no doubt well known to them, may not be to the layman, to whom my remarks will, I hope, be informative.

THE ADVENT OF THE LONG-TERM COTTON TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT

By 1960 the trend that had developed in the previous 5 years toward increased U.S. imports of cotton textiles had suddenly accelerated. According to statistics published in 1965 by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—U.S. imports of cotton yarns from the rest of the world were 380,000 metric tons in 1958 and 6,943,000 metric tons in 1960, compared to exports of 7,039,000 metric tons in 1958 and 5,899,000 metric tons in 1960. U.S. imports of cotton fabrics from the rest of the world in 1958 were 14,179,000 metric tons and 51,662,000 metric tons in 1960, while U.S. exports of cotton fabrics declined from 63,498,000 metric tons in 1958, to 55 million metric tons in 1960.

The ratio of imports to domestic consumption rose from 4 percent in 1959 to 6 percent in 1960, which, while not high for many industries, was considered by the textile industry to be drastic. These imports came not only from Japan but also from Hong Kong, India, and Pakistan, Portugal, and Spain.

The increase of imports and decline of exports revealed by the above statistics were major factors leading to the Kennedy administration's special program for the cotton textile industry, some of the elements of which were sound measures that had broader application to all U.S. industry. My colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] cited some of the elements of what has been called the "seven point textile program." In their entirety, as formulated by the President's Cabinet Textile Committee appointed by President Kennedy on February 16, 1961, and as announced by him on May 2, 1961, the seven points were:

First. A government program for market research and product development;

Second. Liberalization of the depreciation allowance on textile machinery, in combination with the 7 percent investment tax credit for new machinery then being proposed to Congress;

Third. Small Business Administration loans for the cotton textile industry;

Fourth. Removal of the "adverse differential" between domestic and foreign textile producers' raw cotton costs—"two-price cotton";

Fifth. Adjustment assistance for industries "seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports";

Sixth. A conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries to seek an "international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries"; and

Seventh. "Careful consideration" to any application by the textile industry for action under the escape clause and national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

HISTORY OF INDUSTRY CLAIMS FOR PROTECTION

President Kennedy's seven-point program for textiles had been preceded by a

campaign against imports by the textile industry, a campaign that gained heat in 1960, the year of his election to the Presidency. But U.S. industry claims for protection cannot be said to have begun even in the period 1955-56. Indeed, such claims had been made in the 1930's and no doubt earlier.

In 1955 and 1956 trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade were held at Geneva, in which many U.S. cotton textile tariffs were cut. Under the "peril point" procedure provided by section 3 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951, as amended, the cotton textile industry in Tariff Commission proceedings had asked that tariffs on competing cotton textile imports not be cut in GATT trade negotiations in those years.

During 1955 and 1956 increased import competition mostly from Japan was felt in certain textile lines, such as velveteen. The increased imports led in part to applications by the cotton textile industry for relief under the "escape clause," section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951, as amended.

A brief review of the results of Tariff Commission escape clause investigations is important. The results of such investigations to determine the validity of claims of serious injury from imports is an indication whether such claims were founded in fact. It might also show whether the escape clause would be applied by the Tariff Commission to allow relief from certain imports when justified by the test of serious injury.

AUTHORITY FOR ESCAPE-CLAUSE INVESTIGATIONS AND FINDINGS

The 1951 Trade Agreements Extension Act required that an escape clause be included in all trade agreements concluded by the United States, and it established the basic escape clause procedure effective until October 11, 1962, when repealed by the Trade Expansion Act. Section 7 of the 1951 act provided that the Tariff Commission, upon the request of the President, resolution of either House of Congress, resolution of either the Senate Finance or House Ways and Means Committees, upon its own motion, or upon application by an interested party was promptly to conduct an investigation to determine whether any product on which a trade agreement concession had been granted was, as a result of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

If the Tariff Commission were to find the existence or threat of serious injury as provided above, it was required to recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, or the establishment of an import quota. When the Commission judged that there was insufficient reason so to recommend, it was to report its findings and conclusions.

Executive Order No. 10401 of October 14, 1952, established a procedure for review of and periodic reports on escape clause actions taken. Such reviews were

point in the RECORD a summary of quotations by world leaders on the world population and food crisis, prepared by the Population Crisis Committee.

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

The following quotations clearly indicate that most governmental, educational, and business leaders are agreed that a world population and food crisis is imminent:

"Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world.

"Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth \$100 invested in economic growth."—Lyndon B. Johnson, June 25, 1965.

"Along with former President Truman I am co-chairman of the Honorary Sponsors Council, Planned Parenthood-World Population. I accepted this position in order to demonstrate my recognition of the urgency of the entire problem and the alarming consequences that are certain to follow its neglect.

"I devoutly hope that necessary measures will be enacted into law to authorize the Federal Government, as well as appropriate private and semi-public organizations, so to cooperate among themselves that the necessary human and material resources can be promptly mobilized and employed to cope effectively with the great need of slowing down and finally stabilizing the growth in the world's population."—Dwight D. Eisenhower, June 22, 1965.

"No, our population cannot be allowed to grow at the savage rate of the present, or humanity will very soon revert to the darkest ages . . . but for those of us . . . who do not want mankind to suffocate in an abyss of its own making—least of all our own people here in the Americas—for us the humane, Christian, economic and political solution is birth control—and the sooner the better."—Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, and Chairman, First Pan-American Assembly on Population, August 11, 1965.

"This rapid growth of population creates frightening prospects for those looking into the future . . . all our efforts should be directed toward the control of this menace. If it is not done, we are asking for total disruption and chaos in a few years time."—Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan, March 10, 1964.

"Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and to stabilize population growth, or we face disaster of an unprecedented magnitude."—Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, March 24, 1965.

"There can be no doubt concerning this long-term prognosis: Either the birth rate of the world must come down or the death rate must go back up."—Report on "The Growth of World Population," National Academy of Sciences, April, 1963.

"There may still be a chance to avert a Malthusian disaster . . . At best, the apparently unequal race between human procreation and food production can be won only after an immense and prolonged struggle during which man will be ever more precariously crowding the margin of safety."—Dr. J. George Harrar, President of The Rockefeller Foundation, Spring, 1965.

"One thing is certain: If steps are not taken very soon to check or curtail this ominous rate of growth—food production, however intensified, will be unable to keep pace with the fast growth in population in many countries where bare subsistence is already the best that most can achieve."—John H. Loudon, Chairman, Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., The Netherlands, September 13, 1965.

"Everywhere there is a growing recognition that this is the number one problem of the world. If tackling it is left too late, all our political and economic achievements will be swept away like sand castles before the advancing tide."—Lord Caradon, July, 1965.

"It is evident that the rapidly worsening world food situation can be permanently improved only by two measures—a more rapid increase in food production in the developing countries and a less rapid increase in population."—Nevin S. Scrimshaw, Head, Department of Nutrition and Food Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, October 18, 1965.

"I am convinced the world is plunging headlong into a crisis of catastrophic proportions and that this crisis can not be averted unless massive preventive action is started at once. The stark fact is that the world's population is exploding so swiftly that it is outrunning man's capacity to produce enough food."—John J. Haggerty, Director, Project Development, AGRIC Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., January, 1965.

"The underdeveloped world—Asia, Africa, and Latin America—is on the threshold of the greatest famine in history. This famine will be the most colossal catastrophe in history—it will affect hundreds of millions of people and maybe billions."—Dr. Raymond Ewell, Buffalo State University, April, 1965.

"We live in a world of 3.4 billion human beings, one-half of whom do not have enough to eat . . . The global food crisis now pending on the horizon calls for bold and timely action. In the simplest terms, the population explosion must be contained and world food production must be doubled and re-doubled."—Thomas M. Ware, Chairman, International Minerals and Chemical Corp., and Chairman, American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Inc.

"If the developing nations are to escape widespread famine, disease, and the prospect of wars initiated in a final desperate effort for survival, one—or more probably both—of two things must happen: the birth rate must be consciously reduced to planned proportions; or the production of food and other necessities must be multiplied in relation to the population growth rate."—Roger M. Blough, Chairman of the Board, United States Steel Corp., November 4, 1965.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN SAIGON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, some time ago in my committee, the question arose with the Secretary of Defense concerning social problems in Saigon.

Inasmuch as the Secretary of Defense, I believe, has a wrong impression of conditions in Saigon, as evidenced by his testimony before my committee at that

time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post today entitled "GI's Babies Worry Vietnamese," written by William Tuohy.

I think that it will be beneficial if the Secretary of Defense recognizes how serious a problem the presence of so many American soldiers in Vietnam is.

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

GI'S BABIES WORRY VIETNAMESE (By William Tuohy)

SAIGON, August 28.—American authorities here are concerned about the increasing number of illegitimate children born to U.S. servicemen and Vietnamese women.

The problem is not yet of serious proportions, because the big buildup of American troops began only a year ago.

But in the view of social welfare specialists here, the specter of unwanted half-caste children born out of wedlock could reach worrisome proportions in the months and years ahead.

Thus Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge is setting up an informal committee to look into the matter. Lodge and his wife, who are deeply concerned with the disruption to Vietnamese society caused by war and the input of American troops, are seeking whatever ways may be found to lessen the problem.

SUBTLY COLOR-CONSCIOUS

The situation is complicated in Vietnam, which is subtly color-conscious, by babies of American Negro fathers and Vietnamese mothers.

Welfare specialists say children born of American-Vietnamese parents may have severe difficulties in being assimilated here. There are simply no estimates available of the number of such children—just as no reliable estimates exist for similar cases in Japan or Korea.

Under years of French rule, thousands of Eurasian of "mattise" (mixture) children were born of French fathers and Vietnamese mothers—in and out of wedlock.

But every child born of a French father automatically received French citizenship, which carried many benefits and privileges. Vietnamese women, therefore, often considered themselves fortunate to have such a child.

Children born of American fathers have no such privileges, consequently such babies are not looked upon as prizes.

According to specialists, most illegitimate offspring so far have come from Americans who have set up housekeeping with Vietnamese women. The servicemen are in a position to look after and support the family.

The problem grows acute when the father comes up for rotation home: Most American servicemen or Government workers are in Vietnam for 12 or 18 months.

"What happens when those men go home?" asks a young British woman involved in child-placing.

The woman adds: "What happens when these girls begin to lose their looks? Bar girls are early blooming, but they fade and wither quickly. Then the child becomes a burden, a millstone who may jeopardize her chances of marriage. That's when the child is in danger."

Beyond the matter of mixed children, there is the broader problem of Vietnamese orphans in general, some of whom are adopted by Americans.

Ironically, well-meaning American servicemen are sometimes responsible for the large number of children in orphanages.

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20243

(9) Specific statement that section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 applies to the assistance provided through sales under Public Law 480 (sec. 620(e) prohibits assistance to countries expropriating property of U.S. citizens).

(10) Financing of entire price of cotton product exports in the same manner as products of other surplus agricultural commodities (instead of financing only the raw cotton content of any cotton product export).

(11) Minimum CCC release price of 120 percent of current price support loan plus carrying charges for any price supported commodity subject to a voluntary adjustment program when estimated carryover will be less than 25 percent (35 percent in the case of wheat) of domestic consumption and exports (subject to the usual statutory exceptions and use for redemption of PIK certificates).

(12) Repeal of 5-year limit on credit under dollar credit sales to Poland and other countries subject to the Battle Act.

(13) Title II no longer restricted to CCC commodities.

(14) Convertibility of currency to cover American tourist expenses (up to 25 percent of currencies received under future agreements).

(15) Extension to dollar credit sales of various provisions now applicable to foreign currency sales (e.g., dollar limits on total agreements, requirement that purchaser pay basic freight costs, restrictions on sales to the United Arab Republic and countries dealing with Cuba).

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, there are three changes in the program which I consider of greatest importance:

First. The removal of the "surplus concept."

Second. The emphasis on "self-help" by recipient countries.

Third. The authorization for funds to be used for family planning programs.

The family planning amendments of the bill are substantially those which I had the honor of introducing on February 25, with the cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Senator TYDINGS also sponsored a related amendment of his own. These amendments are similar to those in the House bill, which were adopted under the great leadership of Representative PAUL TODD, JR., of Michigan. I wish to commend the chairman [Mr. ELLENDER] and the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their wisdom in adopting these amendments.

The family planning amendments are found in three parts of the bill. Section 103(a) reads:

In exercising the authorities conferred upon him by this title, the President shall take into account efforts of friendly countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance, including efforts to meet their problems of food production and population growth.

Section 104 reads as follows:

Sec. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes:

(b) (3) . . . to support, on request, programs of medical and scientific research, cultural and educational development, family planning, health, nutrition, and sanitation;

(h) For financing, at the request of such country, programs emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and activities, where participation is voluntary, related to the problems of population growth, under procedures established by the President through any agency of the United States, or through any local agency which he determines is qualified to administer such activities.

These family planning provisions are needed because the world faces severe food shortages in the decade ahead unless we are willing to take steps to meet the coming challenge.

The problem exists primarily in the underdeveloped areas of the world where populations are growing much more rapidly than the supply of food can be expanded.

Historically, traditional societies expanded food productions along with population by expanding the acreage under cultivation. Today, however, many densely populated underdeveloped countries have little new land that can be brought under cultivation. Studies show that increased production in the future must increasingly be from higher yields per acre. This method of increasing food production is vastly more difficult than the traditional method. It requires a reasonably high level of literacy, capital, a "market oriented" economy, and support from the rest of the economy in the form of fertilizers, insecticides and other products. These are precisely the things that are lacking in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

The food-for-peace bill will enable us to assist underdeveloped land in developing some of these "preconditions for a yield per acre takeoff."

However, let us consider what would happen if we were successful beyond our wildest dreams, if we could raise yields in the underdeveloped lands at the same rate at which they are increasing in the developed areas. The French have raised wheat yields 2.3 percent per year. This is one of the most successful performances in Europe, and when compared with the French population increase of 1 percent per year, has meant real progress in France. But the French performance would not have been adequate had it been confronted with population growth rates as high as those which prevail in many underdeveloped countries.

Or take the United States as an example. We have raised wheat yields 2.7 percent from 1935-39 to 1960-62. When combined with our 1.7 percent rate of population growth this gives us a net gain in output per capita of 1 percent. If this rate of wheat yield increase had been achieved in Brazil, with a population increase of 3.1 percent per year, however, output per capita would have declined.

Let me now quote from page 20 of World Population and Food Supplies, 1980, published by the American Society of Agronomy. This gives an even more revealing picture of what would happen should we bring the rate of growth of

production in underdeveloped lands up to that in developed areas:

Consider these facts. The agricultural land resources of the two economic regions (developed, and underdeveloped) are approximately the same. The 1960 population of the developed world was less than 0.9 billion, that of the less-developed world was more than 2 billion. The projected increase between 1960 and 2000 for the developed world, according to the United Nations medium level projections, is 0.4 billion and that for the less-developed world is nearly 3 billion.

Now let us interchange the projected growth in population of the two regions. The developed world would then absorb the 3 billion and the less-developed world, the 0.4 billion. The United States, with about one-fourth of the agricultural land resources of the developed world, could expect to accommodate one-fourth of the 3 billion total (750 million). This amounts to an addition of about 190 million per decade—roughly the equivalent of our current population every 10 years.

This statement alone illustrates that the United States with all its riches could not stand the rate of population growth now taking place in the underdeveloped world. Thus we cannot escape the fact that even if we bring the growth of food production in these underdeveloped areas up to what it is in the developed half of the world, we will still be fighting a losing battle in the war against poverty and famine—losing, that is, unless we do something about the other half of the equation—population growth.

President Johnson recognized this problem when he said in his message to Congress:

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine.

With this bill we shall be investing substantial amounts in economic development. In his 20th anniversary message to the United Nations President Johnson stated:

Let us act on the fact that less than five dollars invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth.

When experts tell us how difficult, indeed almost impossible, it will be to bring increases in food production to underdeveloped areas up to the level of increases in population, it makes no sense to spend millions of dollars to feed all these additional hungry mouths unless we also render assistance to allow individuals, if they choose to do so, to exert some measure of rational choice over just how many additional hungry mouths we shall have to feed every year. We must look to the causes of our problems; if we treat only the effects we shall never win our battle.

I believe that these three amendments will be helpful in bringing into the picture the other side of the dual-natured enemy we are fighting. We must attack both the cause—population increasing faster than food supplies—and the effect—insufficient food to feed the population. What is here suggested is a limited step, a prudent step. Let us make this beginning.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this

August 29, 1966

SAME PROBLEM IN KOREA

Says a U.S. official, "The GIs did this in Korea, too. They come in and say, 'What can we do? Let's build an orphanage.'

"Pretty soon the orphanage is filled up. Parents in the neighborhood send their children because they think they will get free food and clothing, and they will.

"But it is not good in this country to separate children from the family group, and, besides, what happens when the servicemen leave?"

"The American aid mission is becoming increasingly involved in the social welfare function, though specialists add:

"This is really a Vietnamese problem. All we can do is assist and advise. Right now we're just beginning to look at the broad problem of children without parents."

As more U.S. troops arrive in Vietnam, the more specific problem of illegitimate, unwanted children of American-Vietnamese couples will grow more acute, say officials, particularly as troops shift from combat to garrison duty.

It is this complex, touchy problem that the informal committee set up by Ambassador Lodge will try to deal with.

"This question is a source of concern to us," says one U.S. Embassy official. "And, frankly, we don't have a very satisfactory method of handling it."

NEED FOR 12-MILE FISHERY ZONE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I have been to this floor many times in recent months to speak on the problems facing this Nation as the result of foreign fishing off our shores and the critical nature of this growing threat. I have spoken often of our need for a world fisheries conference; our need for bilateral discussions and agreements with the Soviet Union; our need for a keener awareness of ocean resource values; our need for higher level consideration of general fishery matters; and our need for better understanding of the coastal fishery threat.

There is mild reward in the token progress I view in some of these areas, though in most the action seems to be tedious and resentful, if not altogether too late.

Madam President, it is high time this administration awakened to the realities of the fishery world. This Nation was once No. 2 in world production of fisheries; today, we are a doubtful fifth, and the present attitude of this administration offers little hope for measurable change.

On May 18 of this year, I called for Commerce Committee hearings on S. 2218, legislation to establish a 12-mile fishery zone off the U.S. coast. It was legislation which we had purposely withheld in deference to some segments of the American fishing industry who now catch their fish off other nations' shores, particularly off South America. It was legislation, in my opinion, which was long overdue.

As of June 1 of this year, there were 122 nations in the United Nations system. Of this total, 23 nations have no coastline. Of the 91 coastal nations, about which our State Department has information—and frankly, I am at a loss to explain why our State Department is unable to determine jurisdiction for 8 coastal nations—49 nations have a 12-mile fishery jurisdiction. Of the remaining 42, only 15 nations, including

ourselves, claim only 3 miles. Ten nations claim more than 3, but less than 12, and 17 nations claim more than 12 miles.

Madam President, I was amazed and shocked at the total indifference of position expressed by the agencies of this administration at our hearings on S. 2218. It is true that no Government agency appeared in opposition to the legislation, but it is equally true that anyone reading that hearing record could not help but conclude that this administration does not seem very interested in protecting its resources.

Here is an area of 120,000 square miles—an area the size of the State of New Mexico—lying readily available to the plunder of more than a dozen fishing nations of the world who do not observe conservation. And our Government seems reluctant to take down the welcome sign. This is not just a problem to our helpless commercial fishermen—nor is it merely a problem for our growing legion of ocean recreational fishermen—it is a problem and a question of broad national interest and indeed, national respect.

The witness from the State Department who appeared before our committee spoke of the strengthening of the 200-mile claims of South American nations as the result of passage of a 12-mile bill by this Nation. Are we afraid of establishing some sort of precedence in the world fishing community? How can you lead a trend when 66 of the 91 nations reported are already at 12 or beyond? How can you strengthen somebody else's unreasonable claim by leaving the minority of 15 to join the preponderant group of 66?

I asked the State Department witness if our clinging to the antiquated 3-mile zone had taken 1 mile off the Chilean, Ecuadorian, or Peruvian claims for 200 miles. He admitted it had not. I asked him if our continuance would assure the removal of even 1 mile off those claims. He admitted it would not.

Madam President, we have just upgraded our fishery position in the Department of State. I have worked long and diligently for this change, but the ambassadorial status of our new negotiator at the bargaining table is not going to be very impressive to the nations sitting on the other side when his supporting lifeline from home is predicated on a position of fear and weakness.

Madam President, some of those resources the administration regarded so snugly as undamaged and unthreatened back on May 18 could not be included in a survey today. They could not be listed, even as potential, because they virtually do not exist. Some of our Federal fishery officials are now seeing the light and I have asked the Departments of State and Interior to reexamine their weak and indifferent positions of last May in the light of new realities.

Madam President, I repeat: It is time this administration awakened to the realities of the fishery world.

Last week, an Oregon fishery scientist positively identified several tons of salmon aboard the Soviet catcher vessel *Kahhovko*. This scientist and our Federal fishery experts were astounded, though our commercial and sports fish-

ermen have been reporting this condition for months. The *Kahhovko* was in a position 10 miles west of Long Beach, Wash. Whether he took the salmon closer to shore I do not know, but he was inside this 12-mile fishery zone we are talking about. The thousands of commercial salmon trollers and recreational charter vessels who seek the coastal fisheries off Washington and Oregon are not indifferent to this question of jurisdiction.

We have a new Pacific hake fishmeal plant in my State at Aberdeen. That plant opened its doors last July, just following the arrival of the more than 100-boat fleet of the Soviet Union. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries assurance of more than adequate Pacific hake stocks offshore is no longer valid. That fleet is supplying Pacific hake to the plant from inside 12 miles, and the anticipated production for their first year will probably not exceed 20 percent of what they had planned as a "break even" tonnage.

Off the State of Oregon, again in the wake of the Soviet fleet, trawlers seeking perch report a virtual marine desert and the production is just 11 percent of what it was for the same periods last year.

And even more tragic, Madam President, up in the Bering Sea, off Senator BARTLETT'S State, the yellow tail flounder fishery—boasted by Japan and the Soviet Union as the world's largest floundery fishery—is now in an admitted state of depletion. The Soviets point the finger at Japan, I do not think it makes much difference. At Moscow, 3 weeks ago, Russian negotiators admitted that this fishery had been over exploited by a factor of three times its sustainable yield.

The Soviet Union refers to the Japanese high seas salmon fishery as "barbaric." But the Soviets are apparently taking American salmon in a similar fashion.

Just about the time this year the Japanese were employing their annual high seas salmon fishery at 175° west longitude under a loophole in the terms of the North Pacific treaty, that nation's fishery agency made an interesting statement which was reported here in America by our Embassy in Tokyo. The statement said:

In late June, the Japanese Fisheries Agency released a statement to the effect that the fishery resources close to Japan have been greatly depleted due to "reckless fishing." For this reason, the Agency said, it is essential that Japan develop new fishing areas around the world.

Just a week ago a Japanese exploratory side trawler joined the Soviet fleet off my State to help write the obituary of the Pacific hake. Since then, the same Japanese fisheries agency had announced the licensing of four more trawlers to proceed immediately to the hake grounds.

When Japan has fished out our resources, who is next? This is the heart of the conservation matter. The extent and reproductive capacity of certain species are not known with precision and may not be capable of being determined. What is known is that species can be overfished and suddenly and dramatically decline at great cost. This gives the coastal nation a special obligation to

August 29, 1966

protect and preserve fishery resources. The 1958 Geneva Convention recognizes this fact, our own expenditures on fishery research and development recognizes this fact; all those countries who have extended their fishery jurisdiction recognize this—and yet the administration will not face up to even minimal conservation responsibilities.

This is a conservation matter. It is not a case of fighting foreign devils or subsidy or trade protection. We have to make a decision now that determines whether or not all countries are going to be able to use the marine environment.

In Moscow, 3 weeks ago, our negotiators found themselves on the short end of a scientific debate as to the extent of the Pacific hake and Pacific Ocean perch resources. Our hake vessels were returning to port empty, our Oregon trawl fleet was landing only 11 percent of the 1965 perch production, but we did not have the "scientific" evidence as to the size of the stocks.

Madam President, this is just another example of fishery indifference. Why did we not have this information? Was the Soviet and Japanese arrival off our coasts a surprise? It certainly was no surprise to me.

The House this week was considering Senate Joint Resolution 29, legislation to try and survey these adjacent stocks. If approved, the survey will be useful to some of our resources, but can we expect it to warm the hearts of the commercial fishermen and sportsmen of Oregon, Washington, and Alaska? Indeed there are many on the Atlantic coast who will also find the measure hopelessly overdue. And they will ask as I have, "Why was this not done before?"

Madam President, the 12-mile fishery zone legislation is late also. But it can still be in time to save thousands of tons of valuable marine resources and to reserve 120,000 square miles of potential fishery area as a part of our American heritage.

If the 12-mile fishery zone legislation fails in the 89th Congress, the sin of failure will rest squarely with this administration and I, for one, will not raise a finger in its defense. If it fails, it will be government by minority, sacrifice of the American coastal fisherman, and an indelible mark against fishery progress.

But it will be more than that, Madam President, it will be the sacrifice of a part of the deserved heritage of our children and our children's children, and we will have forfeited our right to a claim for posture in the world fisheries community.

This country was once before confronted with an invasion of our fishery resources by nations unwilling to observe conservation. That we still have these resources is directly attributable to the forceful and forthright action of President Truman. We enjoy a powerful legacy from President Truman in other fields, why not in fisheries? Why is this administration less aggressive?

Indifference which breeds inaction and defeat is as dangerous as violent opposition, and there will be many like myself who will be eternally unforgiving.

CRIME WAVE WEAKENS AMERICA; CITIZENS MUST MEET THE CHALLENGE; RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER MUST BE TAUGHT AND PRACTICED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, newspapers, magazines, and television dramatize the wave of crime and rioting which have been sweeping across the United States.

It is a repulsive condition, but it is a fact which we must confront, even though, apparently, we would rather debate economic issues.

And, understandably, we are concerned with our continuing commitment against Communism, especially the war in Vietnam.

We cannot ignore the issues involving the economic life of the citizenry and the country; nor should there be an inclination on our part to neglect in any degree the fight against Communist aggression and Communistic expansion efforts.

But the crime wave and rioting demand high priorities, too—much higher priority attention than we have been subscribing as individuals, as families, and as a democratic society.

It is my duty, as a public official, to help focus attention on this problem, whether the audience is labor, management, professional, or broadly representative of the public, including my colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

Madam President, the crime problem is not generated by any one group or class or creed or race.

There has been wild rioting in and on the fringes of ghettos, but we know that crime is not confined to the tenements of our large cities.

For there has also been rioting in the mansions of the wealthy on Long Island and in the suburbs of Chicago. Indeed, crime at its worst—in massacre proportions—was perpetrated on eight nurses in a relatively quiet suburb of Chicago. One killer on that night caused more fatalities, but less property damage, than did the rioting, arson, and looting by mobs in so-called ghetto sections of that great midwestern city. And it was a university campus that was the scene of a heinous crime which claimed at least 16 lives of police officers, students, and other citizens, when they and 32 other wounded persons came within range of a single sharpshooting sniper.

These shocking crimes may be isolated instances of extremity. But the dimensions of the nationwide problem are alarming. Ponder these questions:

Why have the crime rates in this country been soaring, and why—especially since 1960—has the yearly total of crimes increased by 47 percent?

Why is crime growing nearly six times as fast as population?

With recent massacres, and with rioting, arson, and looting added to other types of crimes, is it not a fact that we are in a national crisis while, at the same time, we are in a war against Communist aggression in Vietnam?

Is it not time that we take drastic and comprehensive action against homeland

crime, while also giving attention to domestic economics, foreign aid, and military assistance?

Again, I call attention to the substantial commitment of our manpower in southeast Asia. They are fighting for a just cause. We must not renege on this commitment, nor dare we fail to support fully our men serving in the fulfillment of this commitment.

The need is prevalent, too, for turning back the crime wave, including the riots, many of which are racially inspired. It is time that we pay as much attention—really more attention—to the moral, medical, and sociological problems inherent in the crime wave as we are devoting to the mercenary aspects of our society.

More than 2,780,000 serious crimes were reported during 1965; a 6-percent increase over 1964. There were 14 victims of serious crime per 1,000 inhabitants in 1965; an increase of 5 percent over 1964 and 35 percent over 1960.

There were more than 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults with a gun, and over 68,400 armed robberies in 1965. There were 118,900 robberies, 1,173,000 burglaries, 2,500,000 larcenies, and 486,600 auto thefts. They resulted in total property stolen in excess of \$1 billion.

The problem is not limited to any particular geographical region, nor to the large urban areas, although they remain the largest contributor to the increasing crime rate. When viewed geographically all regions experienced crime increases in 1965, with a rise of 10 percent in the Western States, 8 percent in the Northeastern States, and 4 percent in the North Central and Southern States. All city population groups had increases in 1965, led by a 7 percent rise in the group of cities having less than 50,000 inhabitants. The group with 500,000 or more population showed a 4-percent upward trend. City groups in the intermediate population range from 50,000 to 500,000 had increases from 4 to 6 percent. Suburban areas with an 8 percent rise again had a sharper percentage increase in the volume of crime than cities over 250,000 population, which were up 4 percent as a group, and rural areas which were up 3 percent.

There apparently is widespread official agreement among police commissioners, mayors, public prosecutors, and judges that the causes of the crime problem are to be located deep in the American society—and that the final answers are not to be found solely in more police officers and better courts.

Fundamentally, the "public attitude" is blamed for causing crime to reach nearly out-of-control proportions.

One report on an analysis of the problem noted that "a spirit of lawlessness" and a "contempt for law and order" seem to be growing among people in America.

A "breakdown in family life" is recognized, and the charge frequently is heard that parents are failing in too many places and too often to discipline their children.

Let us look first to something most of us would rather dismiss, but which we

20186

outside the South, have incorporated Negro leaders much more in party organizations, they have provided more patronage, they have shown more paternalism and finally they have become associated in the minds not only of nonwhite but of all voters with more jobs for Negroes.

Today, even in the South, the Negro voter shows much greater interest in the Democrat Party. We are told that school housing, voting rights, desegregation, public accommodations, and civil rights in general have been the great friction points insofar as the Negro voter is concerned. Yet the basic need for employment seems to be the real "first."

Here would seem to be a great Republican opportunity.

Negroes and business

The Negro can, of course, be trained for the skills needed in industrial plants. The one vocational area where he is least observable, however, is that loosely defined as the small business-commercial area, the traditional training ground—in addition to farming—for poor, immigrant minorities working their way up to the great middle class.

Republicans could sponsor a wide variety of training programs, even financial assistance programs, to enable the nonwhite to learn business and commercial operations, to become managers or owners of the many, many service-type establishments needed in urban areas.

If the Republican Party has a certain affinity toward "business," it should use its connections to attract the ambitious, talented young Negro toward business and commercial careers, with the goal of ownership or management of an enterprise.

It is an appeal that is less blatantly political and less paternalistic than that used by Democrat city bosses, and yet it could be the constructive and effective means to transform the outlook—and dissolve the bloc-voting pattern—of the nonwhite.

Negroes and unions

One of the problem areas for Negroes is the segregated membership policies of unions, particularly the craft and trade unions. Recently, NAACP executive director Roy Wilkins pointed to the anomaly of support for civil rights legislation by the leaders of organized labor, but a refusal to carry out such policies by many union locals—the level at which it really mattered in terms of apprenticeship training and actual jobs. Mr. Wilkins pointed out that some unions were even urging the importation of skilled Europeans rather than supporting training programs at home for unskilled workers, which category would include many Negroes.

Nevertheless, there are more Negroes in unions today. There is more opportunity for Negroes in union leadership posts. With the much more rapid turnover of rank-and-file union membership, the old chain of command can be disrupted. If he remains in his union and gains sufficient seniority the bright, ambitious Negro can find more room at the top.

Young Negro men, particularly, can and must receive readily identifiable Republican encouragement. For Negro teenagers had a late-1965 unemployment rate that was three times its 1953 level.

And all Negroes, in late 1965, had an unemployment rate almost double their 1953 rate, despite low overall unemployment and a booming, wartime economy for the Nation as a whole.

The argument that the Negro can't be won by the Republican Party, according to Senator JACOB JAVITS, turns in some degree on the nature of the 1960 campaign. John F. Kennedy, in his race for the presidency, made a strong effort to capture the votes of Negroes and, in the end, won 68 percent of their votes, although Richard Nixon, as Vice President, had an enviable civil rights record.

In his book, "Order of Battle," Senator JAVITS says:

"Yet this argument, more than anything, points up a need for resolute action by the Republican Party; it does not justify a 'why bother' attitude. The need is to have our Party foster imaginative and effective civil rights measures—to show by our sincerity and diligence as well as by our intelligence in this struggle that we recognize it is for the soul of our Nation; and to make a special effort to this end, not only at election time, but in between elections as well. Nor can any of this be done by some officeholders only; it must be a national party effort."

The Senator adds that Republicans should not overlook the fact that in political terms there is more involved in the civil rights fight than the votes of Negroes alone:

"In my 1962 campaign, for example, a poll was taken in a district, which I carried handily and which was white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, with a reputation for being hostile to civil rights activism and to minority groups in general. It was found that among the various reasons given as to why voters backed me my strong stand on civil rights ranked first. The pollsters, surprised at such findings, went back for another sampling—and the results were the same.

"This experience strengthened my conviction that the struggle for civil rights touches deeply the conscience of all Americans, for they know in their hearts that what hurts any minority hurts every minority."

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL understood this when he fought for the rights of Negro troops in America's Armed Forces.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER understood this when he fought for a better education for Negro children.

And Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, in effect, wrote the book.

With the simple facts of population growth and migration bringing control of 8 out of America's 10 biggest cities within the potential control of Negroes in the next generation, Republicans—particularly on the national level—face an opportunity equal to that of the Democrats in the 1930's.

Edward W. Brooke, a Republican, a practical politician, and a Negro, says:

"In competitive America, skills, training, ambition, knowledge and acquaintances are what count—these are the products of investment and development over many generations. There is, I think, no other meaningful way to examine the 'Negro' problem."

And it is here, says Brooke—G.O.P. candidate for the Senate from Massachusetts—that the Negro's needs are greatest. The ability to compete—man to man, skill to skill, degree for degree—will not be bestowed upon Negroes magically, says Brooke.

Mere passage of time, he says, will solve nothing for the gap is widening. As previously stated, unemployment among Negro teenagers today is 3 times what it was in 1953.

Concludes Brooke:

"The solution will not be easy. It will require much more than passing and enforcing laws dealing with the surface aspects of equality of opportunity. It will require working with the human stuff which is the real measurement of equality. And the task, however massive, must be faced. Racial inequality permeates every aspect of our national life; no domestic or foreign issue is more important."

Concludes Michigan's Governor George Romney, "The Republican Party has the opportunity to play the crucial role in rebuilding faith in the authentic American Revolution. . . . (It) must work without respite, (and) dedicate itself with unalloyed devotion to the task of securing equal rights for all Americans."

EPILOG

These past 60 years have brought us from Kitty Hawk to Venus.

The future is not just a fresh page on the calendar, but a time when things are basically different and it is arriving at a voracious speed whether we like it or not, whether we are ready for it or not.

What will it be like? Take the wildest speculation you can imagine and then square it and then cube the result and the answer still won't be big enough to match the truth.

VIETNAM IS A GLOBAL QUESTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this month, I addressed the Senate to state my strong conviction that America must not leave the world in doubt about its resolution to see through the grim conflict in Vietnam. I said:

This war has become far too deadly to tolerate further shadow shows. The oriental aggressors should look behind the screen to see that the tiger is real.

It is highly important that America's voice come through, loud and clear and officially. There is no second American voice. However hard some may try to mount one, it is a false voice.

The August 20 edition of the London Economist in its lead article entitled "This is the Third World War," taking note of the recent emergence of Marshal Lin Piao as the apparent successor to Mao Tse Tung, has provided a further exposition of this point in light of later events. I quote the following excerpts:

And Mao has picked out Lin Piao as his chief assistant. The meaning is clear. Mao Tse-tung, now almost mystical in his certainty, is not backing down one inch from his hopes of ideological expansion.

This is the most important fact about Asia today. It is the background against which the debate on American policy in the Far East has to be measured. Whether the United States has a job to do in Asia is not, at bottom, something to be decided in Washington. It has already been decided in Peking. The Americans were a Pacific power long before they became an Atlantic power * * *

The Russians took a long step in the right direction at Tashkent this year, when they declared their interest in the stability of the Indian subcontinent; but they have still not been able to bring themselves to say out loud that China's idea of universal revolution is a hell of a way to run the world. They probably will in the end. But meantime the Americans, and the Americans alone, are in a position to do something about the problem man of the 1960s: Mao the evangelist, with his hot gospel of guerrilla liberation tucked under his arm * * *

The argument is about how much strength will be needed, and where it can best be applied * * *

Until and unless there is solid evidence that China does not intend to do what Lin Piao says it wants to do, or cannot do it, the only safe assumption for the Americans or anybody else to make is that the Chinese mean every word they say. That is where any sober Asia policy starts from * * *

Marshal Lin Piao saw the connection all right for China's purposes [between Vietnam and other guerrilla wars] in the article on people's war that the Peking central committee has just commended: "The people in other parts of the world will see * * * that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too."

China has nominated Vietnam as a test-case for what it claims to be a new kind of war. It is a land war, fought by relatively small formations of very brave men who are prepared to persist for years with the tactics of ambush and terrorism until the other side's nerve cracks. Those who believe that

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20185

owner or driver a voter, and all downright disgusted at one time or other by traffic conditions—then to these voters, to these taxpayers, to these drivers—traffic congestion is a reality; it is not a myth; it is totally unacceptable.

And in the meantime: Detroit is turning out automobiles at a rate 1½ times our human birth rate.

That this already has affected the New Electorate is demonstrable. In city after city the 20-minute drive to work of 1955 has become a grim 45-minute competitive grind.

During rush hours, north-south traffic in New York today moves at an average speed of 11 miles per hour; east-west traffic at 8 miles per hour. A man's normal walking pace is 4 miles per hour.

In Atlanta, the population is growing at a rate of 40 percent, automobiles by 75 percent.

In Philadelphia, by 1975, there will be 18 percent more people driving 47 percent more cars to make 54 percent more trips. Nearly all will be voters and they will might take their transportation problems to the voting booth.

An angry snarl, a clenched fist banged on the steering wheel, seem to plead for someone to do something. Who? The Democrats? On the Federal level? Or, perhaps an effort similar to Republican George Christopher, who as Mayor of San Francisco successfully welded local, county, State, and private resources into a topflight mass transportation system? (San Francisco is building the Nation's first all new rapid transit system since 1907. Preliminary work started 14 years ago. When completed in 1971, computer-operated electrical trains will be shuttling passengers at speeds up to 80 miles an hour over 75 miles of surface, elevated, and subway track in the City of San Francisco and suburban counties.

Mass transit versus the auto

Yet systems of mass transportation must be competitive with the private automobile in terms of comfort, speed, cost, and convenience. If not, they are a waste of money, time, and very valuable land. If transit isn't competitive, no one will use it.

As we have seen, more than 7 out of 10 Americans live in metropolitan areas in and around central cities and this concentration is increasing. Over 70 percent of an electorate experiencing a growing difficulty in transporting itself represents a segment of American voters too large to ignore.

Yet with few exceptions the Democrat Party has been successful in assuming unto itself the role of "caring" for the commuter, of wishing to "help" the working man and woman (one-third of all married women in the U.S. have jobs and are working today) in their daily struggle to escape traffic congestion and skyrocketing accident rates.

Death on the highway

Nor is carnage on America's highways to be ignored by either political party. This year about 50,000 Americans will die—men, women, and children—in automobile accidents on America's highways. Last year the rate of this slaughter was just below 50,000. The year before it was in the high 40,000's. The most conservative estimates by reasonable men place traffic deaths at slightly below 55,000 per year in the next 3 years and slightly under 60,000 per year in the next 8 years.

In the last 7 years, we've lost more lives in highway deaths than we lost in all of World War II.

It is neither dramatic, nor idealistic, nor wishful to inquire of any government, on whatever level, precisely how long this rate of slaughter will be continued.

Better law enforcement

Supreme Court Justice Byron R. White laid out a program last year to upgrade traffic courts across the country. It included:

1. Eliminating the "fix."
2. Running traffic courts for the purpose of influencing behavior rather than for revenue.
3. Ensuring that serious violators "must face the judge."
4. Seeing to it that "the accumulated experience of the better traffic courts" is made available to all.

Justice White said there are 30 million violators a year and the "mushrooming case-load has overwhelmed every city and State."

"Traffic courts," he said, "should be brought into the regular court system, subjected to judicial and administrative control and made courts of record with responsibilities equal to the task before them."

The justice called for "full-time judges of adequate ability with proper insulation from political control." He said the tools to do the job—such as a model traffic law—are available.

"Legislatures, as well as the people, must be moved, and the courts and judges, although they must do their share, cannot carry the burden themselves," White said.

But since we are talking about voters, particularly young ones, the preference in America has been, and still is, for automobiles. In spite of traffic snarls and slow-downs in automobile transportation, patronage of mass transit continues to decline in America. In 1965, according to the American Transit Association, it declined again by 0.82 percent. The automobile continues to be private, convenient, flexible, and it takes people where they want to go. Young voters—32 million between 21 and 35—prefer them to busses.

This is not to say that automobiles cannot and should not be made safer. They must be. But recent automotive hearings in Washington, provided the GOP with an object lesson in the merits of logic vis-a-vis the merits of pure politics.

Democrats said cars are horribly unsafe. Arjay Miller, President of Ford, said, "If safety were the only objective, solutions would be fairly easy. We could design a vehicle that would look like a tank, float in water, and not travel over ten miles an hour, with all occupants harnessed inside like astronauts."

Mr. Miller was being logical. The Democrats were being political.

What were Republicans? Republicans said a car is an inanimate object, that drunken driving, reckless driving, and speeding are the root causes of America's appalling carnage on the highways.

The GOP was eminently logical. Bad drivers are the principal violators: i.e., Republicans said the voters themselves are at fault!

Democrats, in turn, say the voters are OK, it's the handful of big car manufacturers who are to blame.

In this instance, as in others, the GOP was logical, the Democrats were political, and the average voter only knows what he reads in the newspapers.

Democrats made the newspapers.

Transportation paradoxes

Voters are frustrated at worsening urban congestion, yet they vigorously oppose new freeways. City planners want open grass space in their cities, yet they need improved high-rise property in their tax base.

Mass transit enthusiasts see their system as the answer to many problems, yet an overwhelming majority of the crisscross, all-direction, daily, urban trips of both people and things cannot be handled on a fixed transit system. There are solutions to these problems and we are starting to find them.

Solutions

More important, as Erwin D. Canham, former editor of The Christian Science Monitor says: "Solving today's transportation

problems can help to provide the impetus to economic growth in the 60's, as did the automobile in the early decades of the century."

Top priorities:

1. Rescue of mass transportation—"our most urgent metropolitan problem."
2. Railroad consolidation, with uneconomical schedules lopped off.
3. Removal of aviation bottlenecks, such as transportation to and from airports.
4. Tax reforms, to encourage risk-taking.

That volumes of traffic will double within the next 25 to 35 years is known. Which political party will be lodged firmly in the minds of the electorate for: (a) reducing this awful death rate; (b) making the going and coming from work more palatable; (c) doing it without grossly violating the taxpayer's purse; and (d) doing it quickly is a question which can be answered only by political leadership aware of a trend and seeking a pattern of action.

PART IX: NEGROES—NO LONGER A POWERLESS MINORITY

"If nonwhites continue to hold the same proportion of jobs in each occupation as in 1964, the nonwhite unemployment rate in 1975 will be more than 5 times that for the labor force as a whole . . .

"If trends in upgrading the jobs of nonwhites continue at the same rate as in recent years, the nonwhite unemployment rate in 1975 would still be about 2½ times that for the labor force as a whole."—Report to President Johnson by the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, February 1966.

Negroes—No longer a powerless minority

In 1960, one out of 10 Americans was a Negro.

Today, one out of 9 Americans is a Negro. In 10 years, one out of 8 Americans will be a Negro.

As has already been shown the makeup of tomorrow's electorate will be radically different from yesterday's electorate; and ¼ of tomorrow's voters will live in or near America's cities. Consider these additional facts: If present trends continue, Negroes will equal or outnumber whites in 8 of the 10 biggest cities in the United States within the next generation.

Negroes also will make up one-third of the population in most of our 30 biggest cities.

Negroes will find it within their power to control, in the next generation, the city governments of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Baltimore, and Newark.

Washington, D.C., also among the ten biggest cities, is pushing toward a 75 percent Negro population. Only Houston and Los Angeles are not moving to Negro majority status.

Civil rights leaders—and Democrats—are no strangers to these statistics. Louis Martin, deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, makes the observation that the "possibility of Negroes winning the mayor's seat in some of our major cities is very real."

And Paul Hope reports in The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., that although "Some Democrat officials are inclined to take the view: 'Where else can they go? They certainly wouldn't leave us for the Republican party,'" it is nevertheless "true that the Democratic party has made, and is making, more effort than the Republicans to pull Negroes into party activities."

Like all other minorities, especially when packed into specific urban areas, Negroes have tended more and more toward bloc voting. While the Republican Party was the original "civil rights" party, and far outshines the Democrat Party even today in terms of commitment and accomplishment, it has lost all but about 7 percent of the Negro vote. The Democrat city organizations,

August 29, 1966

this technique of people's war should be opposed, because its aim is to set up an unacceptable form of society, have little choice but to fight it on its own terms: that is, by a land war. It is not the right war in the right place. Defensive wars seldom are. It is not the sort of war that the Americans will be able to bring themselves to fight time and time again in other parts of the world. But if it comes out right in Vietnam, it will with luck not have to be fought all over again elsewhere. If the dissident minority in South Vietnam fails to take power by force of arms, dissident minorities in other places will think twice before they believe Lin Piao's tip that they are on to a winner * * *

Those who do not like the war in Vietnam, but equally do not want to see Mao Tse-tung's beliefs sweeping across Asia in a wave of guerrilla wars, have a duty to ask themselves where else they think the wave can be stopped, Thailand? But the non-Communist Thais are not going to call for help from a defeated American Army, and in any case it is logistically much harder to get help into Thailand than into Vietnam. Burma? Not on the cards. India, then? But the mind swerves away from the difficulty of doing anything to help that fragile country if the guerrillas once get to work in West Bengal or Kerala or wherever * * *

The deal the Americans cannot reasonably be asked to strike is one that threatens to sell the pass to the whole of southern Asia. This is Mr. Johnson's enormous problem. It is also the problem of those who criticize his decision to take America into the war. Those of them—an increasing number—who agree that America has a responsibility towards the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot dodge the question it poses. How else can you suggest holding the line, if not by fighting in Vietnam?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks a substantial portion of this article from the Economist—a most excellent article—be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, China is the key to the problem. The people of Asia understand this. They want no part of communism or Chinese imperialism of any kind.

There are signs, in the Philippines, in Thailand, that Asians themselves realize the need of containing the Chinese dragon.

I associate myself at this point with my Republican colleagues who have called for an All-Asian Peace Conference. It is vital that such an initiative gain momentum—and that the impetus for this conference come from Asians themselves.

Last week, I spoke of the grave threat of Communist penetration in the northeast frontier of Thailand. I salute the courageous Foreign Minister of Thailand for his forthright support of an Asian Peace Conference. But Thailand stands at the edge of the vortex of the Vietnam war. What about the other, and more powerful nations, more distant from the center of battle but equally concerned with the problems of peace? Japan has taken up the cause, but what about India and Indonesia? They too must provide leadership, if this effort for peace is to have a chance.

The President has recently suggested that the Soviet Union may ultimately agree to a nonproliferation treaty. This

is good news for Asia—and, if such a treaty were consummated, would undoubtedly strengthen the cause of peace, in Asia.

Mr. President, the fires of conflict rage more deadly each day. They threaten to break out beyond the borders of Vietnam. Each day there is a greater need for American forces to hold the line in southeast Asia. We have accepted this task, and let no one mistake our resolution.

But for the sake of the people of Asia, for the men who must face death in the jungles of Vietnam, for every person on the face of this earth who fears a third world war, that the leaders of the world must painstakingly explore every turning in the labyrinth to peace. When we fail, we must chalk off each blind alley and patiently begin again. We must beware of pitfalls and avoid false hopes, but we must continue. This is the least we can do—and our friends, even our adversaries, would do well to heed danger and do likewise.

EXHIBIT 1

THIS IS THE THIRD WORLD WAR

There is no Mao, but Mao, and Lin Piao is his prophet. That is what the past week's events in Peking boil down to. The communiqué from the Chinese communists' central committee at the weekend, followed by the ominously martial rally in Peking on Thursday, with a uniformed Mao Tse-tung presenting his "close friend in combat" Lin Piao to the people, mark out unmistakably the path Mao means China to follow. It was predictable that the central committee, in the sort of words Stalin once made Russians use about him, would duly declare Mao Tse-tung a genius, "the greatest marxist-leninist of our era." After the Mao-organised purges of the last four months, and his baptism in the Yangtze last month, this was inevitable. Like all monopolists of temporal power, from the Roman emperors to Stalin, Mao is spending his last years in arranging to become a god.

What was not inevitable is the emergence of Marshal Lin Piao as China's number two, and the meaning this has for China's foreign policy. The only other Chinese mentioned by name among the encomiums to Mao in the central committee's communiqué—and twice at that—is Lin Piao. At Thursday's rally in Peking it was Lin Piao who took precedence immediately after Mao himself, before the country's president and prime minister and the communist party's secretary-general. It was Lin Piao who made the main speech under the approving gaze of Chairman Mao. Sick man or not, palely self-effacing or not, the defense minister has risen to the rank of Mao's chief assistant and his successor-apparent. He has done this partly because he can speak for the army, and partly because he has loyally used the army as a guinea-pig for the "cultural revolution" dose of salts with which Mao is now purging the whole country. But Lin Piao has probably risen for another reason too, and this is bad news.

A year ago Lin Piao wrote the famous article, "On People's War," which said that China's foreign policy was to encourage guerrilla wars in the "countryside of the world"—Asia, Africa and Latin America—in order to encircle and destroy the imperialists in the "cities of the world," north America and western Europe. The year that has passed since Lin Piao wrote his article has been a bad one for China's foreign policy, in Indonesia, in Africa and now even in North Korea. It would have been reasonable to expect China to whistle its revolutionary tune under its breath this year. Not a bit of it. The central committee has picked out the Lin

Piao article for a pat on the back as a scientific analysis of "the world revolution of our time." And Mao has picked out Lin Piao as his chief assistant. The meaning is clear. Mao Tse-tung, now almost mystical in his certainty, is not backing down one inch from his hopes of ideological expansion.

This is the most important fact about Asia today. It is the background against which the debate on American policy in the Far East has to be measured. Whether the United States has a job to do in Asia is not, at bottom, something to be decided in Washington. It has already been decided in Peking. The Americans were a Pacific power long before they became an Atlantic power. In Europe they have generally had a comforting layer of friendly countries between them and their main potential enemy, Germany or Russia. Across the Pacific, there is nothing but cold water. That is why the Americans sent Commodore Perry to Japan a century ago, when all they were asking of Europe was to be left alone by it. It is why they now have virtually no choice but to resist what China is trying to do. No one else can. It will take the other Asians at least a decade to summon up the strength to look after China themselves. The British are still snarled up in the non-sequitur of thinking that belonging to Europe means not belonging to the rest of the world. The Russians took a long step in the right direction at Tashkent this year, when they declared their interest in the stability of the Indian subcontinent; but they have still not been able to bring themselves to say out loud that China's idea of universal revolution is a hell of a way to run the world. They probably will in the end. But meantime the Americans, and the Americans alone, are in a position to do something about the problem-man of the 1960s; Mao the evangelist, with his hot gospel of guerrilla liberation tucked under his arm.

None of this is really in dispute. Mr. Walter Lippmann, the most persistent and intelligent of President Johnson's critics, agrees that it is right for the United States to use its strength to establish a balance of power against the Chinese. The argument is about how much strength will be needed, and where it can best be applied.

It can be argued that in the end the whole business of restraining China's missionary zeal may turn out to be much easier than it looks right now. China is a very poor country indeed. An article on page 720 argues that its chances of ever becoming a rich one, or even of building up a modestly successful industry, are much dimmer than most people have usually assumed. If China does remain a poor country, its hope of inspiring revolutions all around the world will be rationed by the amount of help it can actually send to would-be revolutionaries. And that, to be fair to Mao, is all he aims to do. He is not an expansionist in the sense of wanting to push China's own territory beyond what he considers its historic boundaries. He just wants to spread the good word—but "out of the barrel of a gun." Ten years hence, if China is still too poor to export many guns and many missionaries, Lin Piao's thesis about "the revolution of our time" could look as punctured as President Nasser's grandiose aims of the 1950s look now. This is the optimistic way of looking at things. There is nothing wrong with hoping that the worst will not happen. But it is not a basis for policy. You look so stupid if the worst does come. Until and unless there is solid evidence that China does not intend to do what Lin Piao says it wants to do, or cannot do it, the only safe assumption for the Americans or anybody else to make is that the Chinese mean every word they say. That is where any sober Asia policy starts from.

That is where it starts from. Did it really have to lead to what is happening in Vietnam? Mr. Johnson's critics say that it need

20188

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 29, 1966

not have done. But lately it has looked very much as if some of the steam has been going out of the critics' arguments. This is not because they like this singularly beastly war any better than they used to. Nobody does. It is because, if one leaves aside the marxists and the honourable pacifists, a good many of the critics are finding it increasingly hard to disagree with the basic premise of Mr. Johnson's policy—that it is at present America's job to try to keep China's evangelism under control. Having accepted that, they then find it increasingly hard to suggest any positive alternative to doing it in Vietnam. And every time Mao Tse-tung does something that seems to justify everybody's worst fears, the critics' job gets that much tougher. . . .

Mr. Lippmann, for his part, has walked into a couple of traps. He tried to argue on July 26th that there is no connection between the guerrilla war in Vietnam ("one small corner of the world") and other possible guerrilla wars that might follow it elsewhere. But Marshal Lin Piao saw the connection all right for China's purposes in the article on "people's war" that the Peking central committee has just commended:

"The people in other parts of the world will see . . . that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too."

That was one trap, and Mr. Lippmann dropped into it. The other is bigger and deeper, and goes right down to the fundamental question about the whole war: how can you defend the non-communist parts of Asia unless you are ready to fight a war in Asia? Mr. Lippmann says, quite rightly, that with the single exception of Korea in 1950 the United States has always avoided land wars in Asia like the plague. So he argues that the Americans should discharge their responsibility to the Asians by means of sea and air power alone—which means, in effect, by air power deployed from aircraft carriers and from islands off the Asian mainland. But Mr. Lippmann himself has scathingly pointed out how limited the uses of air power have been in Vietnam. If air power has not yet succeeded in tipping the scales in a war to which the Americans have committed 300,000 troops, how on earth can it protect non-communist Asia all by itself?

The blunt truth is that this is now an academic argument. China has nominated Vietnam as a test-case for what it claims to be a new kind of war. It is a land war, fought by relatively small formations of very brave men who are prepared to persist for years with the tactics of ambush and terrorism until the other side's nerve cracks. Those who believe that this technique of "people's war" should be opposed, because its aim is to set up an unacceptable form of society, have little choice but to fight it on its own terms: that is, by a land war. It is not the "right war in the right place." Defensive wars seldom are. It is not the sort of war that the Americans will be able to bring themselves to fight time and time again in other parts of the world. But if it comes out right in Vietnam, it will with luck not have to be fought all over again elsewhere. If the dissident minority in South Vietnam fails to take power by force of arms, dissident minorities in other places will think twice before they believe Lin Piao's tip that they are on to a winner.

But if the technique of "people's war" does succeed in Vietnam, the past week's events in Peking will take on a new light. Those who do not like the war in Vietnam, but equally do not want to see Mao Tse-tung's beliefs sweeping across Asia in a wave of guerrilla wars, have a duty to ask themselves where else they think the wave can be stopped. Thailand? But the non-communist Thais are not going to call for help from a defeated American army, and in any case it is logistically much harder to get help into Thailand than into Vietnam. Burma? Not on the cards. India, then?

But the mind swerves away from the difficulty of doing anything to help that fragile country if the guerrillas once get to work in West Bengal or Kerala or wherever.

The fighting in Vietnam, it is said, could grow into the third world war. In a sense, it already is the third world war. It is not by the Americans' choice that this has become a testing-ground for the theories of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao. It need not have been. If there were any reasonable grounds for thinking that a communist victory in Vietnam would not be followed by communist bids for power in the rest of Asia—starting in Thailand, and moving from there towards India—it would not be necessary to make a stand in Vietnam. It would not be necessary if Lin Piao had not written what he has written, and had not now been given Mao's accolade for writing it. It would not be necessary if Russia were able to assert its authority over the communists of south-east Asia and guarantee that a stable truce line, like the line between the two parts of Germany, could be drawn along the Mekong between a communist Indochina and a non-communist Thailand. If either of those things applied, a deal could be done in Vietnam tomorrow. The only losers would be those South Vietnamese, Buddhists and Catholics alike, who keep on telling anyone who will listen that they do not want to be ruled by communists. It would be by a cynical deal; but it could be struck.

The deal the Americans cannot reasonably be asked to strike is one that threatens to sell the pass to the whole of southern Asia. This is Mr. Johnson's enormous problem. It is also the problem of those who criticise his decision to take America into the war. Those of them—an increasing number—who agree that America has a responsibility towards the non-communist nations of Asia cannot dodge the question it poses. How else can you suggest holding the line, if not by fighting in Vietnam?

AHEAD, AMERICAN HEALTH EDUCATION FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION AND ITS GOOD DEEDS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as an American citizen, I am quite proud and very grateful, at the generous, philanthropic exertions of a group of Americans calling themselves AHEAD, to serve mankind's needs. AHEAD, which stands for American Health Education for African Development, is carrying the tradition of private philanthropy in aid of the health of the people of Africa, a tradition which goes back to the time of the fabled Dr. Livingstone and includes the noble name of Albert Schweitzer.

Since its creation in 1963, AHEAD has embarked on programs of nursing education, plant research, recruitment of specialists and provision of training fellowships. A few days ago, I met with the president of the AHEAD Foundation, Mrs. Susan Bagley Bloom, to listen to a laudable venture it has undertaken. Its latest project is the establishment of a nursing education center in the western African nation of Sierra Leone. The foundation is receiving full cooperation from the host government and is receiving some support from the U.S. Agency for International Development. On its own, AHEAD must provide \$400,000 for construction of necessary buildings. I offer my sincere hopes that my fellow citizens all across this land will participate in this humanitarian undertaking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be included in the RECORD a letter to me from Mr. William C. Gibbons, Director of Congressional Liaison, AID, regarding the activities of AHEAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, among the peoples of Africa the scourge of disease is a continuing threat to progress and to necessary economic development. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the work of the AHEAD Foundation, and the fine example it has set for private American initiative in Africa.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, D.C., August 24, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Because of your interest in cases of participation in our program by private institutions, I wanted you to know of the help we are receiving from the American Health Education for Africa Development Foundation (AHEAD) of which Mrs. Susan Bagley Bloom is the founder and President.

One of the countries in Africa being assisted by American public and private agencies is Sierra Leone. Since its independence in 1961, it has maintained a democratic government respecting the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and freedom of speech. It has the oldest university in West Africa (Fourah Bay College) and is hospitable to private enterprise.

Yet it needs assistance in its efforts to raise the level of well being of the Sierra Leone people. One of the important needs, as confirmed by a recent World Health Organization study, is a Nurses Training School. And in response to a request from the Sierra Leone Government, a project has been established combining the efforts of a private American Foundation (AHEAD), the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Sierra Leone Government.

As its contribution to the Nursing Education project, AHEAD has agreed to provide \$400,000 for construction of a nurse's dormitory and classroom building. A.I.D. is financing the professional services of four American nurses from Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, D.C. They are assisting as teachers and advisors in the new school. The nurses arrived at Freetown early this month. The Sierra Leone government, as its part of the project, will construct a nursing education center and provide operating expenses estimated at \$56,000 a year. Although the government has a modest budget, it is keenly interested in the nursing project and is prepared to fulfill its responsibilities in making the school a successful undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. GIBBONS,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

NEARLY \$5 BILLION EARMARKED OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD FOR NEW AIRLINE PURCHASE OF PLANES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the State of California long has been recognized as a major breeding ground for outstanding advances in aeronautics and a major aircraft production source.

Naturally, it was highly pleasing to learn that American Airlines are earmarking almost \$5 billion for procurement of new flight equipment over the

August 29, 1966

under the 12½-percent rule has been obligated. This provision will liberalize the allocation of grants and allow areas with especially acute problems to receive more funds.

The urban mass transportation program under the 1964 act has more than proved its worth in the 2 years of its existence. More and more States, cities, towns, and other local public bodies have been turning to it for assistance in meeting their mass transportation problems. In many cases the situation has become so acute that only the assistance provided by the act has enabled local authorities to avoid a complete and total breakdown of transit service. This situation has not changed although much progress has been made under the present program.

The rate at which applications for transit aid are being received has grown to an annual level of \$200 million. House Report No. 1869 merely continues the existing program for 2 years with the same annual authorization of \$150 million. Surely this is a minimum operating level if this program is to continue to benefit our people as it has shown it can. This report will continue a program which is already contributing in an important way to the solution of a problem, and it will improve that program in modest but significant respects. At this time, I think that it is the best we can expect; but we cannot accept less.

We May Be Next

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the distressing incidents that followed the civil rights marches and demonstrations in the Chicago area, an editorial in a recent issue of the RECORD, of Hoffman Estates, Ill.—which lies in the 13th Congressional District—gives valuable advice to its readers in the event similar demonstrations should be planned for their area.

The editorial follows:

WE MAY BE NEXT

For reasons that still aren't clear to us and aren't important anyhow, we found ourselves, the other day, at a meeting of officials from a couple of communities that have been scenes, these past few weeks, of racial violence in the Chicago area.

The meeting was dull until somebody in the crowd said he'd heard that Schaumburg was high on the list for a so-called "peaceful" demonstration of "civil rights" agitators. That, we confess, made us sit up and take some notice.

How? Who? When? Why? Nobody seemed to know, but several participants agreed they'd heard the same thing.

We've tried for a week to obtain some verification from as many "civil rights" groups in the Chicago area as we could find. We got nowhere. Either we'd received misinformation or the "civil rights" leaders aren't talking.

It matters little. What does matter, however, is the reaction such a demonstration

might receive if it took place in one of our two villages.

Potent examples can be drawn from recent attempts by "civil rights" leaders. Last summer, a series of demonstrations along the North Shore fizzled. There was little publicity and certainly no bad name was earned for any of the North Shore communities involved.

The reason is simple enough. The residents of the North Shore communities refused to react to the demonstrations. The agitators found empty streets and life went on as usual.

Contrast that with the recent goings-on in Gage Park. There the violent reaction of the white citizenry resulted in publicity (remember: publicity is the goal of the demonstrations) that has given Gage Park a national image it will take long to live down.

Should such a demonstration be attempted here, our advice would echo that of responsible leaders throughout the Chicagoland community: Stay in your home. Do not line up on the streets to watch the demonstrators. Do not carry placards of your own. Do not wave flags. Do not in any way react.

The choice between what happened on the North Shore and what happened in Gage Park could easily become a choice to be made by Hoffschauers. We fondly hope they'll make it intelligently.

Significant Omissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, all the glowing reports on the state of the economy emanating from the White House do not offset one iota the ruinous inflation that is tearing the wage and salary earners' paychecks to shreds.

Government statistics indicate that the cost of living is far outstripping any pay increases that are occurring.

The Richmond, Ind., Palladium-Item had some appropriate comments on this recently, and I have unanimous consent to bring this to the attention of Congress. The editorial follows:

[From the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, Aug. 7, 1966]

SIGNIFICANT OMISSIONS

Reporters were called in by President Johnson's cabinet members and given a glowing picture of the domestic scene.

There was the usual array of charts designed to show that things were looking up: national output of goods and services, industrial production, business investment, per capita income, employment other than on farms, pay for all employes, farm income, profits after taxes, and dividends. All these were reported in tip-top shape.

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers, said:

"In all cases the economic gains have been spectacularly larger in the past two and a half years than in the previous decade."

That, of course, would be the period during which President Johnson has been at the helm of the government.

Conspicuous by its absence was any mention of the decrease in the dollar's purchasing power, high taxes, the prospect of even higher taxes, and steadily climbing prices of virtually every commodity which the average household must have.

President Johnson's cabinet members are kicking these problems under the rug. With a congressional election just around the corner it is easy to see why.

United States Failing To Sway Europe on Viet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SPECIAL REPORT: UNITED STATES FAILING TO SWAY EUROPE ON VIET POLICY

(By Ray McHugh, Copley News Service)

PARIS—The realization that the United States does "mean business" in South Viet Nam is finally coming to Western Europe.

It is only reluctantly that Europeans accept the fact that President Johnson and not Sen. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT directs U.S. foreign policy.

But realization is not agreement.

In a month of conversations in most capitals of Western Europe, an American feels a sense of frustration. The story behind the U.S. commitment in Viet Nam has simply not been sold.

Three countries are notable exceptions—West Germany, Greece and Spain.

The West Germans, particularly the West Berliners, express a high degree of comprehension and appreciation for the American investment in Southeast Asia. They interpret the decision to fight a little-understood war in far-off Asia as new evidence that Washington lives up to its international commitments. And Germans know that they live only by Washington's commitment to defend them.

In Greece, support for the U.S. policy is based on personal experience. Premier Stefanos Stefanopoulos reminded a Copley News Service reporter that Greece fought off a similar Communist aggression that began with the end of World War II, did not end officially until 1952 and still threatens to explode again.

"We know the situation in Viet Nam," said the premier. "We have borders with three Communist countries."

In Spain, support of the U.S. effort rests on traditional anti-communism.

Stung by three generations of ostracism that followed their 1936-39 civil war, proud Spaniards complain that they are not credited for beating back a Communist plot in the 1930s to clamp a massive Red pincers on Europe.

Spain is now considering a plan to send a large army medical contingent to support allied troops in South Viet Nam.

But in other parts of Western Europe—in Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium—there is little sympathy for American policy.

George Brown, No. 2 man in Britain's Labor government, admits that London walks a tightrope, trying to maintain its special relationship with Washington, but at the same time trying to appease a vociferous left wing that denounces the Viet Nam war, expresses sympathy for Red China and which would like to end the British defense commitment east of Suez and in Germany.

British officials plead that their monetary problems and their status as co-chairman of the defunct Geneva Conference make direct assistance in Viet Nam impossible. But the inescapable conclusion is that Britain

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

the great energy and devotion to the task being displayed by all officers and men of the U.S. Pacific Fleet in making possible prosecution of the Vietnamese conflict by an assured 'pipeline' of the countless tons of supplies necessary to be moved to the fighting zone. These are the tireless, unsung men of any war, but who deserve praise and hearty support of their fellow Americans just as much as the combatant crews or men on the line."

So my mission in Vietnam was more concerned with toys and soap than bullets and grenades.

But as my small party made its way through Vietnam, there is no doubt that enemy gunights were frequently trained on me. And there is no doubt in my mind that just as frequently I actually talked with disguised Viet Cong—through my interpreter, of course—in many villages and farming settlements.

I was assigned a Marine sharpshooter to ride "shotgun" on these trips, plus another jeep carrying two riflemen which followed a short distance to the rear. I was always well-armed myself. Fortunately, our party was always too small to cause an enemy force to tip its hand.

SOME COMBAT ACTION

I was able to take time away from my specific mission to check also on the fighting portion of the war. While I was aboard the U.S. *Kitty Hawk* prior to entering Vietnam I participated in a jet strike against the Viet Cong in the Mekong Delta. I was also able to make an amphibious patrol with a Marine contingent into VC territory. I made flights in armed helicopters over enemy areas and in this fashion visited the top of Hill 225 south of the Marines' Phu Bai enclave where a platoon of Leathernecks maintains a lookout post.

But I saw first-hand that the tremendous task of moving supplies on the part of the Navy is as important and as impressive as the heavy carrier strike activity carrying on the fight up front.

And the daily work on the part of U.S. troops with the South Vietnamese people and their living problems is as essential as ambushes and counter-attacks.

A FEELING OF SATISFACTION

I gained a great feeling of satisfaction and hope from "covering" the conflict on this basis. I was able to see the humanistic theme shining strongly through the frustration and mental drizzle of trading shots with a determined and vicious enemy.

While in Saigon, I also had time to fly over to Bangkok, Thailand, by way of Cambodia, to get a view of our Joint U.S. Military Assistance Command activities in "Anna and the King of Siam" country. In this case, we are "pre-convincing" the outlying areas of Thailand that the way of free nations far outstrips the Communist life, working essentially along the pattern of the Civic Action program underway in Vietnam. The only different is that the actual program participants who visit the villages are Thai medics and artisans. Thus, the United States in Thailand is able to keep clear of the initial "suspicion" factor as nearly as possible.

A BACKWARD LOOK

So how does a man feel about the Vietnamese situation after having flown, walked and jeeped his way from one end of the country to the other. As I made the tour of duty (and wrote this article) officially wearing a military hat, no opinions or editorial comment are offered. However, let my feelings be expressed in this way:

It was just after break of dawn on the day of my final mission to be flown before leaving Vietnam. We were standing by our Air Force plane on the apron at Tan Son Nhat Airport near Saigon, ready, willing and able to carry out our mission. Down the

apron a short distance, ambulance helicopters were coming in from the hills and paddies a few miles away. They were delivering stretchers of wounded men to the airport.

A little further on, a truck was backed up to a giant cargo plane. Our men were tenderly and quietly transferring aluminum caskets into the plane for the long last journey home of American soldiers.

As I watched the medics and Red Cross personnel move the wounded men—soldiers willing but no longer ready and able to carry on—and the row of caskets—soldiers who would never again be ready, able and willing—I knew the ugly and raw mental cloud which war extends over the human mind.

I couldn't help but mutter aloud as I boarded the plane for my mission: "Here is the cycle—the story of war—we are trading bodies for bodies."

A SILVER LINING

But as I write this, another scene drifts across my mind and focuses into sharp detail. I was at Dalat in the mountains. The wind was whipping across the little airfield and buffeting the sentries who formed a protective ring against the always-expected Viet Cong attack. The crew was unloading a huge box of sparkling new toys packed and sent by an Air Force officers' wives club in Florida. The women of the mountain tribe were standing nearby. The mothers had their babies strapped to their chests and backs. Other small children strained forward from their mothers' hands as they saw the toys.

Finally the toys were disturbed. And it didn't matter that the dark-skinned little girls looked with love at flaxen-haired dolls with white faces and pink cheeks. Or that the little boys had mechanical toys of which they had no comprehension.

I saw before me the universal innocence and joy of children. It was a thrill to behold! Here, then, was the silver lining of the war in Vietnam. A chance to bring forth joy and trust, to triumph over the dirt and death and sorrow of battle.

I turned my back momentarily from the children with their toys. I felt a lump rise in my throat and tears slide down my cheeks. I'll admit I cried.

And I wasn't ashamed.
Would you have been?

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964

SPEECH
OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I supported House Report No. 1869, the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. I was pleased to support H.R. 14810 in its original form and was opposed to reducing the amount of the capital grant authorization and to limiting it to 1 year only. The report under consideration extended the capital grant authority at an annual rate of \$150 million a year for 2 years.

House Report No. 1869 will continue and expand the urban mass transportation programs begun under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 for 2 more years. In that bill, Congress, for the first time, provided for Federal grants

to State and local bodies to help in purchasing the capital facilities necessary for urban mass transportation. This program has more than proved its value. Many urban mass transportation companies and systems, both public and private, have been given a new lease on life, but many more are in serious difficulty and face bankruptcy. It is my sincere conviction that this program must continue.

I am strongly in favor of the other provisions of the report which remain the same as those of H.R. 14810 as passed by this body on August 16. Thus, section 3 of the report would authorize increased grant funds to finance research, development, and demonstration projects. Such increases are justified by the growing number of communities willing to concentrate planning resources on the problems of modern urban transportation and the increased transit problems of the cities.

Section 4 of the report directs the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Commerce to cooperate in thorough research into new systems of urban transportation. Such initiative is long overdue, and the joint effort of the two Departments superbly characterizes the spirit of this legislation—that urban transit must be fully integrated into the metropolitan complex through comprehensive planning. A 5-year research program is planned which will look into alternatives to the inadequate urban mass transportation systems deteriorating daily under constant overloading. I was most happy to support this attempt to coordinate research and development of new modes of urban transportation.

The fifth section of the report further carries through the purpose of this legislation by authorizing grants, up to two-thirds of cost, to localities preparing surveys and research on comprehensive planning of urban transportation systems.

Finally I would like to announce I supported the provisions which originated in the other body and were included in the report under consideration. A new section 10 has been proposed to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public bodies to provide up to 100 graduate level fellowships per year in mass transportation studies. The new section 11 would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public or private institutions of higher learning to assist research programs, and management and research personnel training programs, in urban mass transportation, with the amount of such grants being limited to \$3 million per year. Finally a new provision, section 15 of the report under consideration, directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to reallocate sums not used in any fiscal year within the present 12½-percent limitation, and authorizes the Secretary to make grants—without regard to such limitation—up to a total of \$12,500,000 in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted

finds these convenient excuses. If they did not exist, others would be found.

French opposition to American policy is more complex. Part of it can be traced to President Charles de Gaulle's determination to set a separate course for France. Pro-Gaullist Frenchmen say the president has set a goal of bringing both China and Russia into detente with the West. Viet Nam is a "nuisance" war, they say—one that makes De Gaulle's task more difficult.

"And it is a war you cannot win," is a statement repeated constantly to Americans in Paris.

But underneath all this French opposition is an unspoken worry that America might win in Viet Nam.

"Many Frenchmen don't even realize it," said one American official, "but they want us to lose. They were driven out of Viet Nam. If we stay and win, it will be another blow to their pride."

It might also be a blow to French finances. It's no secret in Paris that France would like to see a neutral Viet Nam in which France could reestablish her economic links of colonial times.

The prospect of an American-dominated Southeast Asian economy is not a happy one in France.

In Italy the worry about Viet Nam centers on domestic politics.

"There is no question but that the war has become a major issue for the Italian Communist Party," said U.S. Ambassador Frederick Reinhardt. "They've seized on it as 'proof' that we are aggressive."

The Communist Party in Italy, which controls more than 30 per cent of the vote, is the best organized political unit in the country—some say it's the only real political organization.

Faced with this bloc and with the prospect that rival Socialist groups may merge, the pro-U.S. Christian Democrats have fallen almost silent on Viet Nam. The best the Rome government can muster is a statement that it "understands" the U.S. position.

In neutral Switzerland, prominent editors and businessmen express deep misgivings about the American policy and an alarming lack of appreciation for its basic direction.

Rene Payo, aging editor of the respected Journal de Geneve, tries to draw a parallel between Viet Nam and Algeria.

"You are defending colonialism," he said. "You have your feet stuck in mud."

Asked if Switzerland had any answer to the war that would prevent the Communist takeover of South Viet Nam, Payo only shrugs.

Conversations with a broad range of European editors demonstrated that the United States has not mustered an effective propaganda campaign to explain in detail its position. The fact that U.S. columnists highly critical of the war get wide circulation in Europe adds to the confusion.

Editors are much better acquainted with the statements of FULBRIGHT, Sen. WAYNE MORSE, Sen. MIKE MANSFIELD, and Sen. ROBERT KENNEDY than with the statements of President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN or Sen. RICHARD RUSSELL.

So are their readers. One American ambassador cited these factors in Europe's attitude:

1. A general belief that the Russian threat has receded and a fear that Viet Nam might revive it.

2. A selfish concern that U.S. attention and wealth might be diverted to Asia instead of Europe.

3. An attitude of isolation and remoteness from the war.

"I've heard more than one official dismiss Viet Nam as a war 7,000 miles away that

was of little direct importance to Europe," said the ambassador.

The phrase recalled British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's reference to Czechoslovakia as "a little country 700 miles away" when he returned from the infamous Munich conference of 1938.

The way the world has shrunk in the last 30 years, Viet Nam could be just as vital to Europe tomorrow as Czechoslovakia proved to be in 1939. But countries enjoying record prosperity which have finally begun to forget World War II don't like to think about it.

They would much prefer to "let Uncle Sam do it."

The Center for Urban Education in the Heart of Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of my district, at 33 West 42d Street, New York City, is located the Center for Urban Education which, among other things, publishes the Urban Review.

The Center for Urban Education is an independent nonprofit corporation formed in 1965 under an absolute charter from the New York State Board of Regents. The fundamental objective of the center is to contribute strategic knowledge and resources to the strengthening, improvement, and reconstruction of educational services of all kinds at all levels within urban society.

The Center for Urban Education was born of an innovation in Federal, State, and local planning in cooperation with the university community. This year, for the first time, U.S. Office of Education funding was authorized for the establishment of multidisciplinary, multi-functional organizations in the research and development tradition. These funds—and funds from five foundations—have made it possible for the center to bring to bear on the problems and possibilities of urban education a wide variety of resources and talents. These are drawn from eight major universities and colleges in the metropolitan area, the Board of Education of New York City, and the New York State Department of Education.

The member institutions are: Bank Street College of Education, Columbia University, Fordham University, New York Medical College, New York University, Teachers College of Columbia University, the City University of New York, and Yeshiva University.

In addition, the center has informal ties with several suburban school systems, other institutions of higher learning, and public and private organizations serving the needs of special problems in education. This is not a static confederation, for an underlying principle of the center is that it will always welcome affiliation, formal or informal,

with groups or individuals committed to the same broad goals of educational response of a changing urban society. The basic purpose of the center is to conduct research, development and demonstration in the whole range of issues common to education in large urban areas, and to offer a resource for the implementation of new practices. Currently the center is working on problems in curriculum innovation, teacher training, education of the handicapped, school administration, cognitive development, de facto segregation, and vocational education.

The Urban Review is published monthly by the center's liaison office, David Outerbridge, director. Its purpose is to disseminate information about new developments and ideas across the whole spectrum of urban education, with special emphasis on the activities of the center. All unsigned articles appearing in its pages are written by the staff of the liaison office. All signed articles, whether written by members of the center staff or by others, reflect the opinions of their authors, which are not necessarily shared by the center or its member institutions. No individual issue of the Urban Review attempts to report the entire range of the center's activities. Letters, inquiries, and manuscripts are welcomed and should be addressed to its editor.

The first issue of the Urban Review, of which Nelson Aldrich is editor, appeared in May 1966, and monthly since then.

In the first issue, it was stated:

The magazine represents a new effort toward achieving better communication between the educational practitioner, policy-maker, and scholar. Quite apart from the school systems themselves and the countless public and private agencies operationally involved in the educational process, government, industry and the mass media are today also deeply committed to the task of improving the quality of instruction at all levels and of all kinds. A necessary concomitant of this task is research, but all too often the policy-maker and the practitioner are cut off from the scholar's findings by the language in which he formulates them, and too often, also, the scholar is cut off from the others' experience by its resistance to formulation.

The Urban Review intends to promote a free and frank dialogue between these diverse groups. In this it mirrors the organization that sponsors it.

The Urban Review will reflect these and other concerns. "Education," wrote Henry Adams, "must fit the complex conditions of a new society always accelerating its movement, and its fitness could be known only from success." Society today, no less than in 1900, is still complex, still accelerating, and an imperative of education is still to keep pace, if not to lead. To stress movement is often to evade the question of aims. We do not intend to evade this question. By providing a forum in which academic and practitioner, teacher and school administrator, may participate in a constructive and critical dialogue, the Urban Review sets out deliberately to enrich the definition and further the achievements of the aims of education.

I am pleased to see the Center of Urban Education in operation and to welcome its new publication and to commend it to my colleagues.

Catholic Schools Are Integrated

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an irresponsible charge has been made that Catholic parochial schools are segregated schools and a haven for racists who wish to escape New York City's integrated public school system.

This allegation is simply not true. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the statement of the Right Reverend Monsignor George A. Kelly, secretary for education of the archdiocese of New York, made at a public meeting of New York City's Board of Education on August 17, 1966. Monsignor Kelly's recital of the facts makes it incumbent upon those making these ridiculous charges to retract their statements.

Monsignor Kelly's remarks follow:

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS ARE INTEGRATED

(Statement of the Right Reverend Monsignor George A. Kelly, secretary for education, archdiocese of New York, public meeting, board of education, August 17, 1966)

"While the subject of Public Law 89-10 is children, in particular disadvantaged children," at least that is what the President's National Advisory Council tells us, it increasingly appears that meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children for some minds must be delayed or avoided in order to satisfy points of view which have dubious legality and which are often prejudicial not only to children, but even to truth.

Take for example the allegation that Catholic schools are segregated schools, that enrollment in the Catholic schools of New York City has grown at the expense of the balanced racial proportion in the public schools, that Catholic schools are the refuge for white racists.

Aryeh Neler, Executive Director of the New York Civil Liberties Union made the front page of the New York Times last week with this bold charge: "It is no secret that one of the reasons that the enrollment of the non-public schools has been rising is that increasingly the non-public schools are seen as a refuge from the growing proportion of Negroes and Puerto Rican children in the public schools." Your own Assistant Superintendent in charge of Integration, Jacob Landers, alludes to the same explanation on page six of your booklet, "Improvising Ethnic distribution of New York City Pupils."

Should they be true, these are serious charges. Should they be false, this is slander. When I first heard them I shrugged my shoulders indifferently, convinced that this was just misinformation. When last April at a similar Board meeting, Monsignor Raymond Rigney of the New York Archdiocese and Monsignor Eugene Molloy of Brooklyn discounted the charges, I felt that perhaps now the matter was laid to rest. But I was wrong.

Every Catholic Educator I know considers the integration of children a desirable and a necessary objective for his school system. Across the country, the record of Catholic schools on this matter is quite good.

Catholic schools, which have helped assimilate millions of immigrants and foreign born for more than a century, were among the first schools of the nation to open their

doors on an equal basis to Negro and white children alike. And, if in the United States there is a fight from the inner city to the suburbs, for a variety of reasons, most of which have nothing to do with education, then the Catholic school system which is heavily rooted in the city must suffer in much the same manner that the public school system suffers in its effort to provide similar education for larger and larger numbers of poor children.

And I must respectfully remind the Board of Education that when we talk about the school system of the Catholic diocese of New York and Brooklyn, we are talking about a real school system with almost 400,000 children perhaps one of the five largest school systems in the United States, public or non-public.

But let us go to the charges. And since we are talking about the application of Public Law 89-10, I will confine my remarks to elementary school children, and, while I will draw on data culled from the office of the New York Superintendent which supervises schools in Manhattan, Bronx and Staten Island, Monsignor Molloy assures me that comparable data are available from the Superintendent of schools of the Brooklyn diocese.

First question. Have the parochial schools in New York increased their enrollment?

Answer. No. In 1956 there were 105,490 children attending Catholic schools in New York; in 1966 there are 105,695 children attending Catholic schools in Manhattan, Bronx, and Staten Island. If a bridge had not been thrown over the Narrows, there would only be 94,000 children in these schools today. Since the 6,000 deficit in that 10 year period for Manhattan and the Bronx was made up only by a 6,000 increase on Staten Island, due to children coming from a very Catholic Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn, which had been radically affected by the erection of that bridge.

Second question. As the middle class Catholic children leave the city for the suburbs their parents think so much of, who takes their seats in those schools?

Answer. Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and members of other minority groups, mostly Spanish Catholics.

Before I develop that answer in detail, let us make one passing observation which is quite germane to this discussion. No one should be surprised to see large numbers of Spanish children in the Catholic schools of New York and Brooklyn; for, while these people do not have a tradition of Spanish Catholic schools in their homelands, they do come from a Catholic culture and in due course begin to accept as the Italians, Irish and Germans before them did, the American Catholic institution of parochial schools. But, it must be kept in mind that of the 1,200,000 Negroes in New York City, less than 100,000 (about 8 percent) are Catholic and when we find 17,500 such Negro children attending Catholic elementary schools in these two dioceses, we have ample reason to know that the Negro Catholic rates the parish school rather highly, as do many non-Catholic Negro parents. Twenty percent of the Negro children in parochial schools are non-Catholic. There is no question in our minds that did we have the money to buy property to build or expand schools in or around so-called ghetto areas, we would receive a warm response from many more non-Catholic Negro parents.

Let us look at the parish schools of Manhattan and the Bronx where 1,000,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans live and which daily teach 91,000 children. 31.5 percent of those children belong to minority groups. In Manhattan 50 percent of all children attending parochial schools are Negro, Puerto Rican or others of Spanish origin. This is hardly to be described as segregation.

We have 133 schools in these two Boroughs.

I have only discovered 22 of these Catholic schools without Negroes, and of these 22 schools, nine were specifically erected to educate Italian, Polish, and German children. Only five of these 133 schools lack Spanish enrollment, and here again two of the parish schools involved are Italian in composition. Let me now make a point which the critics of Catholic schools never make: The very existence of the parochial school has helped to make or to keep many neighborhoods integrated.

Since not even the most hopeful civil rights leaders expect to find integrated elementary schools in Riverdale or Belle Harbor, let us now look at districts where hopefully one might find a mixed ethnic composition in both public and parochial schools.

The Ethnic composition of the parish schools in the following areas of Manhattan and the Bronx are as follows:

Manhattan
 [In percent]

	Spanish	Negro	White	Other
Lower East Side.....	24.9	2.8	60.8	5.4
Upper East Side.....	9.2	1.0	86.2	2.9
East Harlem.....	54.6	15.2	29.3	.7
Harlem.....	15.6	82.8	1.3	.3
Lower West Side.....	33.0	1.9	62.5	1.3
Upper West Side.....	57.7	9.0	29.1	4.2
Washington Heights.....	36.8	6.2	55.6	1.4

Bronx
 [In percent]

	Spanish	Negro	White	Other
South Bronx.....	57.1	10.3	31.7	0.8
Concourse.....	6.7	2.5	90.4	.4
Central Bronx (Tremont).....	36.4	13.1	49.9	.5
East Bronx.....	14.4	3.7	80.8	1.1
North East Bronx I.....	1.4	.3	98.1	.1
North East Bronx II.....	5.5	5.1	89.2	.1
West Bronx (Riverdale).....	2.3	1.0	96.3	.4

Only in six of these fourteen areas, white children make up a predominate body of Catholic school enrollment. As a matter of fact, only in two districts can one find so called "lily white" catholic schools.

Let us approach this problem of integration as the Board of Education has, one in evaluating the public school system's efforts. An "X" school was defined as one with 90 percent of a minority group enrollment. A "Y" school is one with 90 percent white population.

A "mid-range" school is that school whose population composition lies between two extremes. On this basis the City Superintendent of schools was happy to report this year that 50.4 percent of the public schools of New York City are "mid-range," and only 49.6 percent can be found in the "X or Y" categories.

I have applied the same standards to the 133 parish schools I mentioned and this is what I found.

	Manhattan and the Bronx		Manhattan only		The Bronx only	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Midrange.....	74	55.6	49	70	25	40
X.....	5	44.4	6	21	0	60
Y.....	54		16		38	
Total.....	133		70		63	

This would suggest, it seems to me, that the parochial schools compare quite favorably to the public school in matters of integration with all the differences between the two systems understood and accepted.

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20171

I want everyone to know that as a Senator I appreciate what they have done in this very important area.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Montana for his kind comments.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois just stated that the Railway Express Agency has finally reached a year in which it made profits instead of ending up with a deficit.

I would not want the Senator to think that the Post Office Department's parcel post fourth-class section is operating in the black.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I know that it is not.

Mr. CARLSON. From 1946 until 1965, it was on the plus side in only 1 year.

When this bill is passed, in the first year of its operations, due to the increased weight limits and size, revenues should reach \$17 million.

However, the last pay increase given the postal workers this year, 2.9 percent, cost fourth-class mail \$16 million. Thus we can see how this money is spent very rapidly when dealing with this kind of operation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator, however, that size and weight will increase only slightly the amount of revenue during the early period. However, the rate increases will produce \$76 million revenue—other revenue will come in as the size and weight changes take effect over the 5-year period.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further, I should like to make one more comment: Certainly, Congress has some responsibility here. It has steadfastly refused to face its responsibilities. It is trying to run an institution on the basis of 1966 costs with 1945 revenues. It just cannot be done. That is why the whole picture needs a good look-see before we finally get around to a workable formula and make it stand on its own base.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

GENERAL DE GAULLE'S VISIT TO CAMBODIA AND GUADELOUPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of France, Gen. Charles de Gaulle, is in Africa on a journey which will take him around the world. He will soon be in Cambodia. Toward the end of his journey, he will pass through the Americas for a pause at Basse-Terre on the French island of Guadeloupe in the Caribbean.

General de Gaulle's visit to Cambodia is of particular interest and importance. His meeting with the Cambodian Chief of State brings together Europe's elder statesmen and an authentic popular leader of southeast Asia. The two leaders will be meeting in what is an oasis of peace and enlightened progress in southeast Asia. Since achieving independence, Prince Norodom Sihanouk has led Cambodia to an outstanding success in modern nation building. That estimate, may I say, is based, in part, on firsthand observations during several visits. The first visit was 13 years ago, in 1953, a year before Cambodian independence. And the most recent was in December 1965, in the company of several distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], the ranking Republican member; the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]—both former Governors and very much interested in southeast Asian affairs; and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], an expert and student on Pacific affairs.

General de Gaulle and Prince Sihanouk will come together at Phnom Penh—I believe tomorrow—in a personal atmosphere of high mutual esteem, trust, and understanding. These two statesmen have been through the great postwar French colonial transition. Indeed, both played major roles in bringing about the transition. Both have surmounted the bitterness which inevitably accompanied it. Both have done much to salvage and to restore what was culturally constructive in the relationship of France and Cambodia.

The meeting between the two leaders, therefore, will mean a great deal to their respective countries. It could also be, moreover, of profound importance to the world. It is a unique occasion for an exchange of views. There will be an opportunity for a close-up review of the devastating war in Vietnam and the prospects for bringing it to a close. In fact, their meeting will be an imperative as well as an opportunity for such a review. General de Gaulle and Prince Sihanouk owe that review to their respective countries. They owe it to the people of the world.

Cambodia and France have great national interests in the prompt restoration of peace in Vietnam. Cambodia's stake, in the end, may be as fundamental as national survival in peace, because there is the grim prospect of a spill-over of the war in Vietnam into Cambodia and all of southeast Asia. For France, the stake in peace in Vietnam is the opportunity to give a magnificent new expression to her historic relationship with all three Indochinese nations now that the earlier ties have been freed from the fetters of colonialism. France, moreover, as a perma-

nent member of the Security Council of the United Nations, has a special responsibility to play a constructive role wherever in the world its influence may be brought to bear for peace.

It would appear that both Prince Sihanouk and General de Gaulle already tend to see the problem of Vietnam in similar perspective. Both are fully aware, moreover, of the interrelationship of that problem with the broader question of a secure peace in southeast Asia. Some years ago, General de Gaulle called for neutralization of the entire region, and the full implications of that concept have never been adequately explored. Prince Sihanouk has expressed similar thoughts. He understands the problems of neutral national survival in southeast Asia, in a way which can be taught only by firsthand experience. Cambodia is, along with Burma, an effective example of a nation which has managed to live in a progressive independence preponderantly by self-effort and without a one-sided dependence for aid or anything else on any outside nation.

It should be noted that most of the diplomatic channels which may lead ultimately to peace in Vietnam are open to France and Cambodia. Both are signatories of the Geneva accords, and are competent, if such is indicated, to call for a reconvening of the Geneva conference. Both have diplomatic relations with Peking and full access to Hanoi, if the need is for preliminary explorations. Both can arrange ample contact with the leadership of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. In short, whatever road promises best to lead to negotiations for peace, these two nations are in a position to follow it.

Insofar as the United States is concerned, moreover, the doors are open for any suggestion which may be advanced by President de Gaulle and Prince Sihanouk. The fact is that this nation is not unaware that what began as a limited and local conflict in Vietnam among Vietnamese has evolved into a major war in which outside nations, and the United States in particular, are increasingly the focus of the struggle. That evolution is already a disaster for the Vietnamese people, north and south; it can readily become a disaster for all of southeast Asia, if not for the entire world.

So, I repeat, whatever suggestions may emerge from the De Gaulle-Sihanouk meetings will be welcomed. I am confident that if there are suggestions, they will be considered with the utmost of thoughtfulness and respect by this government and weighed by the President with the greatest of care.

There are many potential and acceptable routes to peace in Vietnam. In my judgment, there can be a U.N. approach, a neutral-nations approach, an all-Asian approach, a Geneva approach, or a direct and limited confrontation, public or private, between any or all of the belligerents. The approach is relevant, but it is certainly not fundamental. What is fundamental is the need to stop the conflict, to forestall its enlargement by whatever approach promises best to supply

20172

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 29, 1966

the first effective step to the restoration of a satisfactory and honorable peace at the soonest possible moment.

I would express, most respectfully, the hope that the De Gaulle-Sihanouk meetings would be addressed, in part at least, to that fundamental question.

I would express the further hope that a personal meeting between President de Gaulle and President Johnson might be feasible at some subsequent time. In a matter of such fundamental importance as the restoration of peace and the future not only of Vietnam but of Indochina and southeast Asia, a direct communication between the President of France and the President of the United States would certainly appear warranted. I do not know if arrangements could be made at this time for this purpose. It may be, however, that the scheduled stop at Basse Terre, Guadeloupe might provide a most convenient place for a meeting between President de Gaulle and President Johnson.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to say that I think the people of the United States and of Asia—in fact, of the whole world—owe a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Montana, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], for relentlessly searching for a formula for establishing peace in southeast Asia. I do not know what will come of the meeting of General de Gaulle and Prince Sihanouk.

They are, in a sense, rather unusual people. General de Gaulle is extremely proud of his country, perhaps a bit temperamental at times. Prince Sihanouk has, by some miracle or other, maintained a virtual island of peace surrounded by war in Asia.

I was quite impressed by the fact that Cambodia seems to be the only country in southeast Asia that is increasing its food production. I was particularly impressed by the development of new types of seed corn which I understand they are not only planting for themselves but are supplying to other countries in southeast Asia. What will come of the meeting, of the two heads of state, however, I do not know, but we should not overlook any clue to an honorable peace no matter how faint it may seem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. As to a meeting between President Johnson and General de Gaulle I think it would be best if President Johnson could meet with as many heads of state as possible.

I am glad to see that General Ne Win is coming to this country next week and that his visit will likely be followed by the heads of several other governments.

It was my privilege to be with the President when he met with the President of Mexico and the Minister of Canada. I do not know

that we ever attended more fruitful meetings than these. When we see the improvement in our relations with Mexico and Canada, some of us wonder why that cannot be done with other countries if it can be done with our neighbors.

Reading the news of this morning and of yesterday, we find that Russia is finding it hazardous business to call the shots on other people's wars. We see that the chickens are coming home to roost, as is evident by what has happened in Peking, with Chinese children picketing and attempting to attack the Russian Embassy there, and also by an attack on the East German Embassy, as reported on the ticker half an hour ago.

So it appears to be rather hazardous to attempt to direct other folks' affairs, as the Chinese as well as the Russians have been attempting to do in the case of North Vietnam with respect to the United States.

I think it proves that alliances for destruction or for war are not always dependable. When we are working for peace it is difficult to work for peace for only one or two nations, or whatever the number involved is, but it must be for all the nations of the world.

We can recall the situation of 25 years ago, and yet now West Germany and Japan are among our closest friends and business partners in the world.

I suppose we have to put up with the fact that the world situation never will be perfectly stable. We are watching dramatic moves in so-called Communist or Socialist countries attempting to swing to the right without appearing to do so. Many of the measures we have adopted in this country in recent years would have been called socialistic 25 years ago.

We have to accept the fact that the pendulum never stops swinging. If it stopped on dead center, the world itself might stop and progress would come to a standstill. But I rose to commend the Senator from Montana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish first to commend the Senator from Montana for a very interesting statement, and one which I hope the executive branch will take seriously.

This is not the first time the Senator from Montana has taken the initiative in making what I consider to be very intelligent and persuasive suggestions. The only trouble is that, so far, I find very little evidence of effort to follow through on the part of the executive.

The Senator mentioned General de Gaulle's call for neutralization of the entire region. This has been mentioned before, but, as I understand, our Government rejects the concept of neutralization of this area.

The Senator suggests a meeting between our President and President de Gaulle. I very much favor such a meeting. I only wish to ask the Senator, suppose they do have a meeting, does the Senator have any reason to believe that our Government is prepared to reach any kind of compromise, short of surrender by the North Vietnamese? What can our Government do if the North Vietnamese requires surrender?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think this country requires anything approaching an unconditional surrender. I think President Johnson has time and time again considered possible approaches for reaching the negotiating table, to the end that an honorable and satisfactory peace can be achieved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know he has explored all these avenues, and has carried on a peace offensive. But this peace offensive is always reduced to the simple formula that "the other side must stop doing what it is doing." If this means anything to me, it means surrender; "You stop doing what you are doing." What does the Senator himself feel that phrase means? It has been repeated interminably, publicly and in the executive sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say the phrase, in my opinion, does not mean unconditional surrender.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does it mean?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think there is an area which could be explored, and on which agreement could be achieved, if it were possible to reach the conference table. There are many suggestions and proposals which have been made. To the best of my knowledge, the President has indicated his willingness from time to time to consider any practical proposal which may be advanced, either by the Asian nations or by others who may be interested.

However, it takes two sides to get to the negotiating table. We would like nothing better than to reach that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With all deference to the Senator—I know he is very solicitous of the administration's point of view—I think he goes as far as he can. Although I have great admiration for his frankness in discussing this matter, I still believe that as to the substance of the agreement or settlement, the administration's position always reduces itself to something the other side must view as surrender. There has never been, to my knowledge, any offer on terms short of that, or any kind of a compromise.

I think this is the explanation of why there has never been any willingness by the other side to negotiate. Here is a great opportunity, I think—and the Senator is very wise in calling our attention to it—that the President of France, having visited in Southeast Asia and having also a direct relationship with the other countries involved, may open up an opportunity for discussions.

But I do not see how we can have a discussion if we give the impression that the only thing we are interested in is the acknowledgement of a surrender, or saying, "You stop what you have been doing."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must disagree with that thesis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's time be extended 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-

August 29, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20173

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know whether I make myself clear. This exploration of all the avenues, and the constant reiteration that there is no dearth of communication with the other side, I accept. But communication is not the same as developing some basis upon which one might reach an agreement.

I think this is a very important matter, because there seems to be something very mysterious about the arbitrariness of the enemy in refusing to meet or to negotiate. I think we should try to understand that. If the Senator could, I wish he would indicate any statements which went to the substance of the agreement, other than "we want to negotiate unconditionally." Usually that means—without exception, in my opinion—that the other side stop what it is doing, which seems to me a rather sterile formula. On what basis could we agree?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, I am certain that the President has said that he would consider a ceasefire if it were mutual. I believe the Secretary of State has said the same thing.

I would point out also that in August of last year, the President enunciated 9 points—they have been added to since, to the extent of 14 points—on which we would sit down and negotiate the difficulty.

There has only been one contact, that I know of, direct with Hanoi, and that was through the American Ambassador to Burma, who did receive a message during the 37-day pause earlier this year. That message, I understand, was transmitted to Hanoi, but there was no reaction to it.

I do not know just how far we can go, unless we lay down our arms. While I have my doubts, and have had for a long time, about the advisability of our ever getting into Vietnam, we are in there now; we cannot withdraw, and we have to find a way to the conference table, to the end that this miserable conflict can be brought to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I raised this question for the express purpose of trying to elicit from the majority leader and others a suggestion or statement that would give a reason for people like President de Gaulle and Prince Sihanouk to meet with our representatives and discuss the matter. I do not know, frankly, what it is we will say—the real minimum basis for negotiation. I was very distressed and very disappointed that Prince Sihanouk refused to see Ambassador Harriman.

Here is an opportunity, and if what the majority leader says is true—and I certainly have great respect for his opinion—and if there is a basis for compromise rather than surrender, then by all means I wish to endorse the majority leader's suggestion that it might be arranged. Because I think thereby some progress could be made.

So I congratulate the Senator both for requesting the meeting and for suggesting that there is some basis for compromise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I stated, for example, that the President had made a

number of suggestions which indicated his desire, by means of various approaches, to reach the conference table.

On August 3 of last year, I put in the RECORD a set of nine proposals which he had made, in one speech, relative to his desire to bring this barbarous and miserable conflict to a close.

I pointed out then that what the President was doing was extending the olive even as the arrows were flying in the hope that it would be successful in achieving a conference.

I commended the President for the frankness he showed by making these proposals in public and expressed the hope that those interested in peace, who have eyes to see and ears to hear, and can recognize print when they see it, would take into consideration the nine points he made at that time.

Earlier this year the administration, in the person of the Secretary of State, acting, of course, for the President, indicated that there were 14 points which were open for consideration in the administration's desire to reach the peace table.

First. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia. Everybody seems to be agreed on that, but nobody does anything about it.

Second. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or any part thereof.

Third. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions," as the 17 neutral nations proposed early last year.

Fourth. We would welcome unconditional discussions, as President Johnson put it.

Fifth. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions.

Sixth. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Hanoi's four points be included in my remarks under a subheading.

There being no objection, the 4 points were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSALS FROM HANOI

North Vietnam has in effect proposed the following:

1—The independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Vietnam must be recognized. According to the 1954 Geneva agreements, this would require withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam, an end to the American "military alliance" with South Vietnam and a halt to all American "acts of war" against North Vietnam.

2—Pending reunification of North and South Vietnam, neither country would be allowed to enter into military alliances with other nations, or permit foreign bases or troops on Vietnamese soil.

3—The affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves without foreign intervention and in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front, the parent movement for the Viet Cong.

4—Peaceful reunification of the two Vietnams is a question for the Vietnamese people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Seventh, we want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia.

There have been allegations lately to the effect that we desire to maintain a permanent foothold on the southeast Asian mainland. A start has been made on the construction of various kinds of installations in Thailand and near Cam Ranh Bay in South Vietnam. We have no desire to maintain any kind of permanent foothold in any part of southeast Asia. I cannot emphasize that point too much.

Eighth. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is secured.

Ninth. We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

Incidentally, may I say that those elections are to be held on the 11th of September. Frankly, I do not anticipate much from them because I do not think they will include all of the Vietnamese population of South Vietnam. The so-called neutralists are excluded, and so are the Vietcong.

I would like to know how anyone can tell the difference between a Vietcong and a citizen of South Vietnam loyal to the present government. They look alike, they talk alike, and they have the same traditions and customs.

I think they should be allowed to vote to show how strong or weak they are; then we would have a better idea of what we are up against in Vietnam itself.

Tenth. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision.

Eleventh. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral if that be their option.

That would seem to fit in with the idea suggested by General de Gaulle, who has proposed that all of southeast Asia be neutralized—an excellent idea, which I think should be explored with more enthusiasm than has been shown to date.

Twelfth. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia rather than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least \$1 billion.

A start has been made in the creation of an Asian Bank, which has total assets of \$1 billion, to which we have allocated \$200 million, and also on the Mekong River development, where three projects are at the present time, if my information is correct, in various stages of construction.

Thirteenth. The President has said:

The Vietcong could not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that this would be an insurmountable problem.

That is a far-ranging statement and takes in a lot of territory if one wants to make a literal interpretation.

Fourteen. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward

peace, although there has not been the

20174

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 29, 1966

slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

These are concrete suggestions covering every area possible. But, as I say, if there is to be negotiation, it will take at least two. I would like to see the time come when we would go to the conference table, and I think that we should overlook no opening in our efforts to achieve that objective.

President de Gaulle's visit to Cambodia does offer a slight hope. It is best to try to light a candle than curse the darkness.

Mr. PELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I find Senator MANSFIELD's statement on General de Gaulle's coming visit to Cambodia excellent and worthy of close reading and consideration. I hope it will give heart to General de Gaulle and thought to our administration in their joint search, though by different paths, for a stable and peaceful world.

Be a man American, French, or Cambodian, we all share this common desire. And, if there are followed the approaches suggested by Senator MANSFIELD, I believe we will be closer to that common goal.

WORLDWIDE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Thursday, August 25, 1966, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee opened its hearing into our worldwide military commitments and our ability to respond to them. The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, was our first witness.

In view of the importance and significance of this study and inquiry, I believe that it would be well for all Members of the Congress as well as the other citizens of the Nation to be informed of its nature, purpose, and scope. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement at the hearing last Thursday be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, CHAIRMAN, PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, AUGUST 25, 1966

Today we open hearings on the extent and nature of our worldwide military commitments and our ability to respond to them. We are pleased to have the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as our first witness in this important inquiry.

We believe that this study and inquiry has a special significance. It marks the first occasion, so far as we have been able to determine, when the legislative branch of the government has consciously undertaken a careful and deliberate assessment and survey of our military commitments and an evaluation of what is required of us and our allies in manpower, equipment and other resources if we are to be able to respond to these commitments.

It is our hope that, through this study, Congress will be provided with factual information which will serve as a measuring rod against which to assess our strengths and our weaknesses as emergencies occur and as additional military commitments are being considered. Such a measuring rod—available in advance and kept up to date as far as possible—should be of immense value to

Congress in the future, since, with such information already developed, the Congress will not be forced to rely entirely on hastily prepared statements, information and estimates presented to us by the executive department in times of emergency or semi-emergency.

This information will be useful to the entire Congress but particularly to the Senate since it is to the Senate that all of the treaties by which we assume military commitments and obligations to other nations are referred for approval or rejection.

Although both the facts and the policy with respect to the military implications of this matter necessarily overlap to some extent, we do not expect to infringe or intrude upon the most useful and valuable functions discharged by the Committee on Foreign Relations. We are primarily interested in the extent of our military commitments and our ability to respond to them—in short, whether or not we are or may be over-extended either now or in the future.

These questions are of direct and primary concern to the military committees of the Congress since it is through these committees, and the Committees on Appropriations, that the Congress discharges its obligation to provide for the common defense and raise and support our military forces. To do this effectively we must have all facts which are necessary to enable us to reach informed and intelligent conclusions.

Secretary Rusk said in his appearance before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last February that there were over 40 countries with which we have formal agreements committing us to assist them militarily in the event of aggression. This indicates the magnitude of our global commitments. It indicates also that, as a truly world power, we cannot afford to become overly preoccupied with one area of the world or one set of problems. We cannot let the requirements and demands of Southeast Asia, for example, degrade the importance of the NATO area which is still the decisive region for the United States and Western Europe. Although changes in and reductions of force commitments may be inevitable, it is still of primary importance that we and our NATO allies maintain adequate forces for deterrence and defense.

Yet we are faced with the hard fact that a relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Vietnam has been able to tie us down and require a very substantial commitment of our military manpower and resources over many months. This clearly shows us what we can and must expect if similar wars of aggression or similar outbreaks should occur at other points around the world. This also makes it necessary that we face up realistically to the situation and make a hardheaded and realistic assessment of the problems with which we would be confronted if two, three or more of such contingencies should occur simultaneously.

The Congress needs and must have all of the facts. We cannot afford to be satisfied with rosy generalizations to the effect that we are fully prepared to meet all of our treaty commitments throughout the world. We must have the facts and, in the last analysis, may very well have to make a distinction between what we are willing to do and what we are reasonably able to do within the limits of our military manpower, resources and assets.

Further, we must think in terms of using our manpower and resources in such a way that we will protect ourselves; we must guard against over commitment that would drain away our manpower and resources and thus leave us weakened and unable to protect ourselves.

Further, we are concerned about the military capability of our allies, as well as their willingness to respond in times of emergency.

Among other matters which we propose to examine and study to a degree as we proceed with this matter is our military aid program and the status and effectiveness of it.

To the extent possible, open hearings will be held on this matter. However, it is clear that the great majority of the testimony will have to be taken behind closed doors for security reasons. Secretary Rusk will appear before us again which shall include a closed session.

Secretary Rusk today will give us a broad view of our worldwide commitments and will also address himself specifically to NATO and its problems. If a question is asked inadvertently which would require getting into classified information for an appropriate response, I am sure that he will call this to our attention and we will reserve the question and the answer to the executive session.

We shall address this matter in all phases and by important areas to the extent possible. We will first take up the NATO area and when we complete that go on to the Rio Pact, SEATO, CENTO and other areas.

GEN. BERNARD A. SCHRIEVER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, August 31, 1966, will in a sense, mark the end of an era. On that date Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, will retire and thus bring to a close one of the most brilliant, outstanding, and remarkable careers in our recent military history. Both the Department of the Air Force and the Nation as a whole will be much the poorer as a result.

The distinguished and invaluable service which General Schriever, an immigrant boy, has rendered to his adopted country during his career of more than 30 years assures him of a large place in our military history. In various commands since 1954, culminating with the Air Force Systems Command, he had a primary and decisive role in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missiles upon which we rely so heavily to deter would-be aggressors.

It is well known that our ballistic missiles became a reality despite widespread doubt and skepticism among many informed people about their technical feasibility. It was General Schriever who was responsible for pushing forward research and development on all technical phases of our Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles and for providing concurrently the launching sites, equipment, tracking facilities, and ground support equipment necessary to missile operations. The propulsion, guidance, and structural techniques so developed have played a vital role in our space program. Most NASA launchings have been with Air Force developed propulsion systems.

I could say much more about General Schriever and his many and varied achievements. However, it is sufficient to say that his guiding genius and vision in pointing the way will remain a major influence on Air Force development and technology for many years to come. His stamp is indeed indelible.

This is one of the most remarkable achievements of our time and of many years prior thereto.

On a personal note, let me say that I have worked very closely with General Schriever over the years. He has appeared as a witness on many occasions