

June 17, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13467

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the quest of Mr. MILLS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DIET STUDY BILL

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

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of our leading television news commentators recently told a nationwide audience that despite our share of national and international crisis, the chief topic of conversation in official and unofficial Washington was "let me tell you about my diet."

We are becoming a Nation of weight watching diet dabblers. The trouble is, along with the measuring eye and the big talk, we have got the big appetite. And too many of us are getting big all over.

Overweight American is an unhappy byproduct of a happy situation—our affluent and productive society. While much of the world is still struggling against the diseases of starvation and malnutrition, we fortunate Americans may be eating ourselves to death.

Not only do we have more and better food, but our way of life is becoming more and more sedentary. We ride more and walk less. Machines do more and more of our work for us. Electric can openers open our diet drinks, electric knives slice the fat off our meat and now they even have electric pepper mills. But because we have so little opportunity to work off our excess calories, even with our diets, we are faced with an increasing gap between our intake and the energy we use which is reflected in that most distressing gap between the two ends of our belts.

Our individual and collective concern is reflected in the totally bewildering array of diet plans, products, and programs, with which we are confronted. I became personally and a trifle painfully aware of this during my first term as Maryland's Congressman at Large when too many of my constituents thought that the title meant large Congressman. You know, you can get a low calorie anything—from bubble gum to lasagna; from soda pop to split pea soup. And the diets—the drinking man's diet; the housewife's diet, high fat diets, liquid diets, high carbohydrate diets, and just plain starvation diets. All with dubious success records. Also, there are pills, shots, candies, and crackers designed to whittle the waist and shed the extra pounds. Physicians disagree, the new ways to reduce keep coming and the American people keep getting fat.

I think it is time, because of the direct relationship of diet to health and physical fitness, for the Federal Government to undertake an effective survey of existing literature and studies of this problem and to conduct the necessary basic research so that the American public can have a sort of Federal measuring tape for

their waistline problem. From the outset, let me say that I do not expect this study to develop information that will make each of us as slim as the after models in the diet ads. But I would hope that the Surgeon General would convene a panel of medical and nutritional experts to study the complex interrelationships between diets and health and take a good hard look at the possible effects of some of the food substitutes for which Americans are spending millions each year in our too often futile or temporary efforts to break the next lower size barrier.

To accomplish this purpose I have today introduced legislation which directs the Surgeon General to make a study of diets and health, and report his recommendations back to the Congress by January 31, 1967. As I indicated before, I do not expect a definitive diet which will work for every one of us, because people vary too greatly in their individual weight problems and in their reactions to any specific remedy. But I do hope that some guidelines will be forthcoming which will shed some light and enable more of us to shed our unnecessary and unhealthy poundage in a sensible, effective, and healthful manner.

DAVID BELL, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to those being spoken today by my colleagues commemorating the tenure in office of David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

There are few people in this Government who have inspired so much confidence from the executive branch, from their employees, and from the members of the legislative branch as has David Bell.

And for many reasons. As should be expected from every agency and department head, he has done his job well and with distinction. Perhaps what makes him stand out as exceptional is his dedication to our country in one of the most difficult positions in our Government—administrator of the foreign aid program.

Under Bell, foreign aid is an important arm of our foreign policy and one of the most constructive programs in the history of mankind. Helping hundreds of thousands of people to help themselves and establish viable economies is a formidable undertaking.

Coupled with this are the problems that the aid program has undergone in the past—AID has been the target of many a critic both within our Government and within our Nation. Bell took over the directorship of the program when criticism was at its highest.

Since then, he has gone on to right the past wrongs of the foreign aid program—to make it a program which should inspire confidence in all of us. AID has imposed the most stringent conditions of self-help and performance upon recipient countries.

Under Bell's administration, foreign aid has become more concentrated—cutting the number of recipient countries to those that show the most promise and promptly terminating assistance when a country can become self-supporting. Nine less countries will receive foreign aid in 1966 than in 1964, for example. Reservoirs of talent and skill from the private realm have been tapped to aid the development of the economics and private sectors of the less-developed countries.

David Bell has given his Government reason for new confidence in a strategic, but difficult program. May his service be an inspiration to all of us and to those who come after.

DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on December 22, 1962, David E. Bell took office as Administrator of the Agency for International Development. People who knew the problems of that office speculated he would follow in the footsteps of his predecessors and have a short tenure. But on June 12, Mr. Bell celebrated having been with the Agency longer than any Administrator before him. I think we should also celebrate his accomplishments—for since that December day, 2 years and almost 6 months ago, under his direction the foreign aid program has made tremendous strides in improving the quality of U.S. assistance to the developing nations.

On the day he took the oath of office, David Bell said:

In order to conduct effective programs of U.S. assistance to the growing strength and security of other free countries, we must engage the wisdom, resources, and the talents of agencies throughout the Federal Government and of the institutions throughout our country.

And this promise was made good, for under David Bell, a great cooperative effort has been undertaken by AID to utilize the enormous productive and diverse skills and resources of the private sector of the American economy in helping the underdeveloped nations.

Under Mr. Bell's leadership, the AID program is now utilizing the same institutions that transformed the United States into the great nation which it is today.

American colleges, universities, business and professional firms and service organizations currently hold 1,206 AID contracts, amounting to \$404 million for technical assistance in 76 countries.

More than 200 employees of private American thrift and cooperative associations under AID contract are helping other countries develop savings and loan associations, credit unions, electric distribution, housing and farm marketing cooperatives.

Private American engineering, architectural, and construction firms are supervising some \$4 billion in capital projects in more than 50 countries under AID. Nearly 90 percent of all

13468

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 17, 1965

AID architectural and engineering contracts are held by American firms.

American labor unions, local governments, and universities on contract with AID provide specialized training in the United States for some 6,000 people from the developing countries each year.

There has been a rapid growth in programs available to American investors through AID. Investment guaranteed nearly quadrupled from 1961 to 1964 to a total of \$1.8 billion. AID's investment survey program initiated 110 survey grants with the result that American investors are proceeding with new investments totaling a potential \$15 to \$20 million. AID's new catalog, listing 1,200 economic and feasibility studies for potential American investors, is enlarging the opportunities for businessmen in the developing countries.

Besides these direct cooperative efforts with American private firms, most of AID's dollars are now spent in the United States, which produces a beneficial effect on the U.S. economy. During David Bell's tenure in office the proportion of AID-financed commodity expenditures from U.S. business and industry increased from 79 percent in 1963, to 87 percent in 1964, and reached 94 percent in the first quarter of 1965.

In individual categories, AID is the major financier of American exports to developing countries, accounting for more than 40 percent of iron and steel product exports, 65 percent of fertilizer exports, and 30 percent of railway equipment and sales.

On December 22, 1962, David Bell expressed his great confidence in the American people and the American private enterprise system. Since that time he has put it into practice by making the foreign aid program one of the greatest cooperative efforts of the American people and their Government. I would like to return that confidence by paying tribute to an exceptional man who has done an exceptional job for his country.

DAVID BELL, ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, David Bell is a name familiar to every one of us here and indeed to most people in the country. He has now served as Administrator of the Agency for International Development longer than the nine previous directors of the program during the 17-year history of U.S. foreign assistance.

Mr. Bell finds this to be a "minor distinction." If I may differ with him for once, I think that this is a major distinction when a man sticks to a tough job, a job in which he has to continually strive to overcome great odds.

David Bell has overcome these odds by having a firm grasp of the facts, a clear understanding of the problems, a characteristic of leadership and, most of all, a strong conviction that his job is necessary and vital to the interests of

the Nation. I do not think that anyone can deny that David Bell has always presented facts; not vague hopes and dreams of what the program could accomplish. We always got answers—never evasions.

He has brought the foreign aid program from the former practice of literally giving away dollars to a program that today consists of 85 percent products and technical help. And almost two-thirds of this will be paid back with interest.

Free enterprise has been put into the aid picture. Dave Bell has pushed a wide range of programs designed to stimulate local investment and new businesses in the developing nations of the world.

In a sense, this aspect of AID is setting an entirely new tone to foreign assistance—a tone that rings with the excitement and progress, the success and sometimes failure that we so dearly associate with free enterprise.

I think that Dave Bell has helped us to grasp the basics of the revolution of rising expectations and to help turn the nations enveloped by this revolution toward the United States and freedom. Not only are poverty, hunger, and disease being defeated, but, most importantly, allies are being cultivated. These friends are not only strong and self-sufficient, but they are free.

Dave Bell took over the AID job after the novelty had all worn off. Europe, for the most part, recovered and was well on the way to economic prosperity. The Communist revolution in this area had never materialized. So the next logical step was for the Communists to set their sights on the new and very poor emerging nations of the world.

Dave Bell's job has been to help these less-developed countries enter the community of nations in freedom and dignity. People have to be trained, leaders educated, capital uncovered—whole patterns of life altered. This tremendous and important task requires as much foresight, determination, and courage as did the first aid programs.

I recall when he first appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. I asked him why he accepted such a difficult, thankless and almost impossible task. He answered with his directness. He said, because President Kennedy had asked him.

He has now served under two Presidents and has served them well. But even more importantly, he has served his Nation well.

DOMINICAN CAAMANO PARALLELS CUBAN CASTRO

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the strength and support of rebel forces in the Dominican Republic has been grossly overrated.

Present estimates show the rebels to number 2,500 to 5,000 fighting in a country of 3.3 million people. Despite these small figures the rebels claim they have wide popular support, yet have refused to accept free elections supervised by the Organization of American States.

If these Dominican rebels claim to represent over 3 million people, why should they fear free elections?

It is the same old story we heard when Fidel Castro came to power, and in many respects the circumstances surrounding Cuba and the Dominican Republic run a shocking parallel. For example, both Cuba and the Dominican Republic are island nations, easily infiltrated along the shoreline; have the Communists using similar guerrilla tactics; have widespread poverty; and have lived under harsh military dictatorships.

But there is another aspect to the parallel, and that concerns reports circulated about the rebel leader, Col. Francisco Caamano Deno. We keep hearing, for example, that Caamano is not a Communist, that only those around him are the Communists. We heard that about Fidel Castro not being a Communist, that only those around him were Communists, and I hope we have learned a lesson about that by now.

However, there are some facts about Caamano which need to be brought out. He claims to be a champion of the Dominican people, yet his own father was chief of the armed forces under the brutal Trujillo regime. In addition, on December 27, 1962, Colonel Caamano participated in a massacre of his fellow Dominicans at the village of Palma Sola, near the Haitian border. The entire village was burned, and the mission left a large number of Dominicans either dead or wounded.

It is clear that had the United States acted as swiftly in Cuba as was done in the Dominican Republic Castro and communism would not be in Havana today. It is also clear that we must pursue a firm policy in the Dominican Republic to curb Castroism in the Caribbean.

COME TO TEXAS

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that on Thursday, May 27, an article by Ted Lewis in the New York Daily News has cast unwarranted aspersions on the scenic grandeur of my native State of Texas.

Commenting upon President Johnson's drive to beautify the general landscape of America, Mr. Lewis, with tongue in cheek and eyes obviously closed, dreamed up a fantasy and passed the solemn judgment that "the Lone Star State is big but its landscape is drab and without one scenic beauty worth touting."

This comment, I am sure, not only wounds the pride but inflames the passions of Texans everywhere with an eye for beauty and a tongue for touting.

No beauty, sir? Obviously the author never has traveled the broad, white highways through the piney woods or driven down a country lane through the flowering dogwood trails of east Texas, or seen the mystic brooding cypress swamps at twilight with their draping curtains of moss filtering the fading sunset.

Well traveled though he must be through the subways dark and dank, Mr.

June 17, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13569

Concerning direct buying—I quote from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service 1960 Outlook Issue of the "Marketing and Transportation Situation" that "one of the principal reasons why chains have adopted direct buying is that it gives them greater control over their supply."

The meeting of buyers and sellers at properly regulated competitive markets makes possible the flow of livestock from sales agency to the competitive purchaser with ease. Consider this example on the New York or American Stock Exchange. The reason that some 1,200 companies list their stocks on the New York Stock Exchange is because they know their listing will provide a sales center which will bring the highest possible price obtainable because most competition is available. This gentlemen, cannot help but be true in the livestock industry also.

To cope with marketing deterrents we suggest formulating specific educational marketing guideline data or rules which will provide for all livestock producers, information for the forth every variable. The guideline data should be prepared by marketing country representatives who know the score and in conjunction with officials of the Packers and Stockyards Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture. For authoritative and meaningful presentation, this data should be illustrated, published, and distributed throughout the nation by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The industry today needs a definite set of guidelines or rules on livestock marketing from a U.S. Department of Agriculture source which will set forth for the livestock producer and feeder, complete information on all variables of marketing. I repeat again, these guidelines or rules for authoritative and meaningful purpose, should be presented, published, and illustrated and thoroughly discussed throughout the nation by representatives of the Packers and Stockyards Division.

Thank you.

THE COUNTRY THAT WANTED LOVE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Arthur Hoppe, and published in the Washington Star of June 16. Mr. Hoppe has written in an interesting and provocative manner about a serious matter.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 16, 1965]

THE COUNTRY THAT WANTED LOVE (By Arthur Hoppe)

Once upon a time there was a big, warm, wonderful country. It had towering mountains and shining rivers and fruitful plains and lots and lots of very nice people. It was truly a wonderful country. And what it wanted most of all was to be loved.

Like many countries, it had been a bit of a bully at times while growing up. It had picked on smaller countries and pushed weaker people around and even, on occasion, broken its promises. But now that it was full grown, it didn't want to grow any more. And now that it was rich and powerful, it didn't want to push anybody around any more. It just wanted to be loved.

Probably no country ever cared more what other countries thought of it. In order to be loved, it did all sorts of nice things. It gave poorer countries lots of money. It gave weaker peoples lots of help. Above all, it was a very moral country. It never told lies and it always kept its promises. Which is very important if you wish to be loved.

Oddly enough, it was loved. Oh, some older countries said laughingly that it was little naive and unsophisticated. And some younger countries said enviously it was little vain and insensitive. But most people thought it was truly a pretty wonderful country. And to many it represented, in quite a real sense, the hope of a better world.

But, of course, now that the wonderful country was rich and strong and full grown, it had to go out and deal with other countries as an equal. It found that other countries sometimes told lies. And sometimes broke their promises. And were always trying to push you around. In fact, it was kind of a dog-eat-dog world.

At first, the wonderful country said this was awful. It would, it said, devote itself to making this a better world by "winning the battle for men's minds." It would teach people to be good by its shining example. And it would never tell lies, break promises, or push people around. Because that was the best way to make a better world.

But this proved very difficult. And pretty soon, as the wonderful country grew older, it began telling little lies. Like, "That wasn't our spy plane flying over your country." And it began to break its promises. Like, "We pledge never to interfere in the affairs of our neighbors." And it began to push people around.

At first, because it still wanted to be loved, the wonderful country tried to justify what it did.

"Golly," it said, "sometimes even we have to lie a little and cheat a little, but it's in a good cause. And when we send our soldiers into other countries, we're doing it for their sakes, not for ours."

But this proved difficult, too. And it became clear the wonderful country would have to choose between being loved and pushing people around. It did. It said, "What's so great about being loved? Who gives a fig what others think? It's a dog-eat-dog world and we've got to be hard-nosed realists and act in our own self-interest."

Which worked fine. Because when you act in your own self-interest, you can lie and cheat and push people around all you want.

Moreover, with its shining rivers and fruitful plains and nice people, it was still a wonderful country. Of course, it wasn't the hope of the world any more.

Moral: If you have a neighbor who says he doesn't give a fig what other people think of him, count your silverware.

WH ~~DE~~ Brewster THE OAS IN SANTO DOMINGO

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the entire world has its eyes on the Dominican Republic, and is waiting and hoping that the OAS will be successful as it seeks a peaceful solution of the crisis that has shaken that small island nation.

President Johnson averted much bloodshed by landing American troops in that strife-torn land. Now, however, American troops are being withdrawn as the OAS develops its inter-American force.

Recent editorials published in the Washington Post and the New York World-Telegram and Sun are typical of the support the President is receiving from the Nation's press. I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1965]

THE OAS PEACE MISSION

The new OAS peace team which has left for Santo Domingo has a mission of great im-

portance to the whole Western Hemisphere. Not only the future of the Dominican Republic but also the evolution of the American peace system will be influenced by its work. Officially this three-man body has been assigned the task of collaborating with OAS Secretary General Jose A. Mora in seeking a peaceful solution of the Dominican crisis. But it also reflects a broader hope that ways can be found to help small, volatile countries in this hemisphere in the achievement of stability, peace, and freedom.

President Johnson made it clear in his news conference the other day that the United States has no interest in imposing any particular kind of regime on the Dominican people. The interest of this country in our small Caribbean neighbor is not imperialistic. Rather the aim of this country and the other American governments which have joined in sending a peace mission to Santo Domingo is to arrest the spread of chaos and the threat of communism and to keep the door open to Dominican control over Dominican affairs.

The task of the mission would be a simple one if the hostile Dominican factions were disposed to forget the past and cooperate in a provisional government which could prepare the way for fair elections. But nothing approaching a consensus on the composition of such a government has emerged. Unless some understanding can be worked out, it may be necessary for the OAS to conduct an early election or plebiscite to ascertain the will of the people. Certainly the peace mission will have to let the factions know in no uncertain terms that the issues between them must be settled by ballots rather than bullets.

If a democratic and stable government can be established in Santo Domingo with the aid of the peace mission, it will be an event of truly great significance. We do not minimize the difficulties that will be encountered in reconciling hostilities, satisfying constitutional requirements, and conducting an election free from violence, intimidation, and fraud. It is a challenge of immense proportions. But it is also a rare opportunity to point the way toward a new dimension in mutual helpfulness among the American Republics.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram and Sun, June 3, 1965]

THE OAS IN SANTO DOMINGO

In the Dominican Republic the first job was to stop the fighting and assure the safety of all Dominicans, as well as others present.

The second job is to get the country's economy working again and then to arrange for elections at which the Dominicans can decide how they wish to proceed.

Meanwhile, some type of temporary administration has to be in effect.

On all these points, constructive progress seems to be underway, although slowly.

There still is some sniping, off and on, but the inter-American force under Gen. Huga Panasco Alvim, of Brazil, is taking charge and the United States has been able to withdraw several thousand troops. More should come home as Alvim decides.

The United States has poured money, food and medical supplies into the country and the Organization of American States, through the industrious efforts of Secretary General Jose A. Mora, is working on economic recovery.

The OAS has voted to send a team of three ambassadors (from El Salvador, Brazil, and the United States) to help Mora with the political problems. While both sides in the revolution have complained about Mora, they may yet agree to OAS supervision of the eventual free elections—the only way, under the circumstances, the elections can be assured of being free.

13570

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 17, 1965

The OAS even has persuaded the leaders of the military junta to promise that none of them will run in the elections.

Both sides in the civil war probably will continue to drag their heels whenever they can, but firm action by the OAS gradually will overcome that handicap. At the moment, even though the situation remains serious and difficult, the prospects are brighter than might have been expected a few days ago when confusion was in command.

For this, on reflection, we can thank the original decisiveness of President Johnson in sending U.S. troops—which undoubtedly prevented an even worse slaughter of Dominicans than occurred. And the patience and persistence of Mora and his OAS associates in negotiating the understandings now seemingly being achieved.

THE WASHINGTON, D.C., MEETING ON OCEAN SCIENCE AND OCEAN ENGINEERING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a most outstanding 4-day meeting has just concluded here in Washington. The meeting was remarkable for two reasons: first, it was concrete evidence of a great surge of activity in a field of primary importance for all Americans; and, second, because in spite of its significance, it passed almost unnoticed.

The meeting was on the subject of ocean science and ocean engineering, with dual sponsorship by the Marine Technology Society and the American Society of Limnology and Oceanography.

The Marine Technology Society is new—less than a year old. Its remarkable growth and achievement in less than a year are a tribute to its officers and directors, but—even more important—also to the fact that it has filled an important void in national organization, by providing an organization and forum for those who are concerned, not solely with obtaining knowledge from the seas, but with putting that knowledge to use in practical engineering terms.

The American Society of Limnology and Oceanography has a longer, but equally successful, history, and is devoted to the advancement of science in these fields. Perhaps some Senators find "limnology" a new word, as I did.

It is perhaps most conveniently defined by simply stating that a limnologist is to fresh water what an oceanographer is to salt water.

The chairman of the joint conference was the distinguished former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, and chairman of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., now president of the Scientific Engineering Institute.

The meeting was significant because it provided a meeting ground for scientists, engineers, and managers from the academic world, from private industry, and from Government. The subjects ranged from detailed studies of a single aspect of science or technology, such as "Variability in Marine Benthic Communities off Georgia" and "A Free Diving Oceanography Buoy," to broad topics, ranging from an assessment of mineral resources of the sea to a full day's discussion of the role of nuclear energy in the sea.

It was my privilege to be invited to participate in a panel discussion, on Wednesday evening, on "Organization of Oceanography and Ocean Engineering in the United States." My fellow panelists included such distinguished scientists as Dr. Roger Revelle, of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, who has been director of the famed Scripps Oceanographic Institute, and scientific adviser to the Secretary of the Interior; Dr. Paul Fye, director of the equally famous Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute; and Dr. Wilbert Chapman, of the Van Camp Foundation. Industry was represented by Capt. H. A. Arnold, of United Aircraft Corp.; and David Potter, director of the General Motors Defense Laboratories. Other panelists were Representative PAUL ROGERS, of Florida, an articulate and informed champion of a forward-looking, national program for development of the oceans; and Dr. Wakelin. The moderator was one of the most energetic and imaginative men of my acquaintance—the distinguished scientist and engineer, Dean Athelstan Spilhaus, of the University of Minnesota.

A great deal of the discussion centered on the role of the Federal Government in ocean development; and when my own time came for a summation and final comment, I asked for a show of hands from those supporting each of three points of view that had been expressed during the evening:

First. No further action by the Government is necessary, in addition to that already being taken.

Second. A self-liquidating commission should be established of a composition that would enjoy the confidence of the Executive, Congress, industry, and the academic community. The commission would be charged with proposing a national policy in ocean development, together with the plans and suggested organization for carrying it out.

Third. The Government should move as once to establish an appropriate agency or other entity for ocean development.

I should note that the second proposition is consistent with a bill introduced in the other House by Representative Rogers, and the third is consistent with a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. In my view, the two approaches are not at all incompatible. Among the attendees, there seemed to be a substantial body of opinion that the kind of entity proposed by Senator Magnuson was realistic, coupled with a view that the step proposed by Representative ROGERS was a desirable preliminary, in order to refine definitions, problems, and the role of the organization to be created.

On the show of hands, only a sprinkling of attendees—about 10—expressed the view that government need not take further action. The majority preferred the establishment of a commission or other study group, representative of all major constituents of an ocean program, to conduct a preliminary examination in depth, and to make recommendations for a positive policy and for an action program. Those who preferred immedi-

ate establishment of a new Federal agency for ocean development were a close second in number.

I do not regard any of this as definitive, but I think it is indicative of a lively interest in the future of the oceans. If there was a single point of consensus, it was that America must move forward in ocean development, and that this is a joint responsibility of Government at all levels, industry, and the academic community.

It is also important to note that several discussants sounded a note of caution, as follows: We should not move forward without first defining our goals and examining all the implications of those goals. Vast as the seas may be, they are not an endless resource, unless husbanded. We must be not only energetic and skillful, but also wise in our approach to the coming age of ocean development. We must foresee the consequences of our actions.

My own views on this point are clear. It was with this cautionary approach in mind that, on May 7, I spoke to the Senate about the possible establishment of sea-grant colleges. We did not know how to use the land profitably for agriculture until the great age of agricultural development in science and technology was spearheaded by the mixed scientific and technological approach of the agricultural institutions. I believe—and many of the others present at the meeting seemed to agree—that we must create a similar mechanism for the transfer of knowledge into practical applications, before we can exploit the oceans in a similar productive manner, while maintaining the principles of conservation.

Within a short time, I intend to introduce proposed legislation designed to meet this need. Meanwhile, my own State of Rhode Island already is looking ahead, thanks to the foresight, skill, and imagination of our own land-grant college, the University of Rhode Island, in developing courses in ocean science and engineering specifically designed to meet the State and national need.

VIETNAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the situation in Vietnam continues to require calm and deliberate patience and perseverance on the part of the people of the United States, as we continue to give our aid and assistance against aggression which threatens the people and security of the world.

Recently, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY made at the National War College an outstanding speech in which he called for patience and persistence on the part of all Americans, and said:

Liberals must learn that there are times when American power must be used, and that there is no substitute for power in the face of a determined terrorist attack. Conservatives must learn that in defeating a Communist insurgency, the use of military power can be counterproductive without accompanying political effort and the credible promise to the people of a better life.

In a speech last week at Michigan State University, the Vice President dealt with the "curious misconception"