

discharging their obligation to the Nation and to the Senate in such an outstanding manner.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the able senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the pending bill reads, in part:

The proposed North Cascades National Park and the Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas encompass an array of alpine scenery unmatched in the United States. Deep glaciated canyons, more than 150 active glaciers, hundreds of jagged peaks, mountain lakes, and plant communities characterize this section of the Cascade Range.

It was 30 years ago that a comprehensive study was first undertaken by agents of the Government of the United States with respect to the possibility of creating a park in California's sister State of Washington. The able Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] indicated earlier in his comments to the Senate that the proposal encompassed in S. 1321 is a regional one rather than one for the benefit of a single State alone. I agree.

I want to say for the people of the country and those who follow that this is a week in the U.S. Senate when history surely will have been made. The two Senators from Washington have introduced legislation which not only obtained unanimous approval by the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but was received with enthusiasm by all of us who listened in committee to the testimony of those who came forward to speak in behalf of the bill.

Yesterday the Senate approved the creation of a majestic redwood park for all the people of the country. Today the Senate is about to approve a park of similar majesty for the benefit of the American people now and hereafter. I merely wish to spread on the Record, as one who sits on the minority side, that this is the kind of action that surpasses any partisan or political concern. I am honored to stand beside my colleague, the chairman of the committee, for this brief moment to urge speedy approval of the bill which he and his colleague from Washington have introduced.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, once again I wish to express my deep appreciation for the leadership and support that have been provided by the able senior Senator from California in the work of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with special reference to the preservation of our great natural resources. I must say that the bill passed yesterday and the bill we are considering today, and a long list—and I think it is an impressive list—of national park, wilderness area, and recreation area bills, have been made possible by the special efforts of the ranking minority member of our committee.

We have been able to report these bills on a purely bipartisan basis, and the bills have been thoroughly reviewed and

carefully examined. The result has been that our votes in committee, with scarcely an exception, have been unanimous.

The able chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] has done yeoman work. He has had to carry the brunt of long and tedious hearings.

Mr. President, it has been the policy of our committee in connection with the establishment of such outdoor areas as national parks, recreation areas, and seashores, to hold hearings in the affected areas. This is not an easy task. As I say, the senior Senator from Nevada has carried the brunt of that requirement that has been laid down by the committee. We have in each instance had the benefit of the testimony of witnesses from the involved areas. I think this has made for better legislation.

Among the results of field hearings has been, in many cases, special provision to take care of people who have cottages or homes in the areas to be included within a national forest or recreation area. This has come to be known as the Cape Cod formula. The very equitable result has been that people who have lived in these areas for a long time are able to continue their habitat as long as there is no change in the use of the property which is contrary to the purposes of the established area.

This policy has been worked out as the result of a special effort made by the able senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I have very much enjoyed working with my able counterpart on the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I think this Congress and previous Congresses can take great pride in the long list of constructive bills that have been passed that will affect millions of Americans for generations to come by virtue of Congress having adequately preserved and set aside areas that should be set aside for national parks, recreation and wilderness areas.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

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

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and

to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes."

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has significantly enhanced the cause of conservation during the past 2 days by adopting two measures establishing national parks; the redwoods yesterday, North Cascades today. Both of these achievements represent outstanding additions to the already exemplary record of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. As the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs his consistent support for programs that would preserve this Nation's unspoiled beauty has been characterized with strong advocacy and tireless devotion. The Senate is deeply grateful for his efforts.

Of course, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the ranking minority member of the committee, deserves similarly high praise. Particularly with regard to the passage yesterday of the redwoods bill, but no less so when North Cascades was before the Senate today, Senator KUCHEL demonstrated his effective skill and keen ability. He deserves the Senate's highest commendation.

Others joined to assure the Senate's successful endorsement of these national park proposals. Noteworthy were the efforts of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

The Senate is grateful also to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who, yesterday—with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and others—did not agree entirely with the committee's version of the "redwoods" bill but nonetheless allowed the Senate to vote its will freely and expeditiously.

Again, to Senator JACKSON, Senator KUCHEL, and to all of the committee members goes the sincere appreciation of the Senate for again exhibiting their unstinting dedication to the preservation of those areas of our Nation whose beauty we cherish—a beauty that can be cherished by future generations because of their efforts.

#### ABM DEFENSE SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the October 28, 1967, issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., publishes a commendable article entitled "Don't Be Half Safe." In this editorial Mr. W. D. Workman, Jr., discusses the debate on the antiballistic missile and points out the shortcomings of the "thin" ABM defense system designed primarily to protect the United States against Red China.

This editorial points out Secretary McNamara's fundamental error in believing that the Soviets will never strike the United States first. The Secretary be-

lieves that our assured destruction capability will prevent such an attack. Mr. Workman carefully reminds us that the Communists do not always behave rationally, and that there is an urgent need for America to stand on guard against irrational behavior of all Communists, no matter where they are.

In this regard the State newspaper warns that we should produce not only a limited ABM system, but that we should also proceed to the construction of a missile defense that will deter all of our enemies, not just the Red Chinese.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

#### DON'T BE HALF SAFE

Now that we've all had a chance to consider Defense Secretary McNamara's proposal for a \$5 billion anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system, it's time to look dispassionately at what has actually been decided.

We're to have a "thin" ABM defense system designed primarily to protect us against Red China. Such a system will, at length, prove better than nothing—but not much, as we observed last month.

More to the point, now that a good deal of the flak has dispersed, is that were not to have a defense system designed to protect us against Soviet Russia.

Anthony Harrigan, of the *Charleston News and Courier*, points out in the current *Washington Report* of the American Security Council:

"Development of a thin ABM line seems highly dangerous. When a free nation has the strongest possible defenses—defenses that inspire respect—there is little danger of attack by an aggressor. But a light line of defense always has aroused the ambitions of an aggressor. This was the case in the 1920's and 1930's, when advocates of arms limitation insisted that cutting down the size and number of American naval cruiser guns would create conditions of parity with Japan and cause that country to desist from its aggression. The effort had precisely the opposite effect."

The Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee has estimated that Red China may have an operational ICBM sometime before 1972. But the Soviets have operational ICBM's right now.

Moreover, the Soviets have multistage, solid-fuel, anti-ballistic-missile defenses already installed around Moscow.

Secretary McNamara's fundamental error is this: He believes the Soviets will never strike us first. He believes that "the assured destructive capability of both countries deters any nuclear exchange."

But Communists don't always behave rationally. Their thought processes aren't akin to ours. Often, they take risks that no normal Western man would take.

America needs to stand on guard against the irrational behavior of all Communists, whether they be Chinese, Russian, or Cuban.

A limited ABM system ought to be deployed, yes; but Congress ought to pressure the Defense Department into making it more of a deterrent to all our enemies—not simply the Red Chinese.

#### AIR WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently, the *Washington Post* newspaper published an editorial criticizing our military leaders for their testimony before the Senate Preparedness Investigat-

ing Subcommittee hearings on the air war in Vietnam. In particular, this editorial criticized retired Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, USAF, for his outspoken criticism of the administration in its conduct of the war.

It is refreshing to note in the October 30, 1967, issue of *Aviation Week & Space Technology* magazine an editorial in support of General Meyers. Editor Robert Hotz commended General Meyers for speaking out and highlighting the dangers of gradualism, targeting restrictions, sanctuary, and technical restrictions. General Meyers took direct issue with earlier testimony by Defense Secretary McNamara on the military value of targets recommended by the JCS but not approved by the White House. He pointed out the fallacy of comparing the output of Vietnam industry with U.S. industrial standards. It is significant to note that an attack on Phuc Yen, the main Mig 21 base in North Vietnam, was authorized by the administration only a few days before the public release of General Meyers' testimony.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues and further recommend a careful study of the entire report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on this vital subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

#### AN AIRMAN SPEAKS OUT

For the past year there has been a rising tide of criticism over the ineffectual way that U.S. airpower has been applied in North Vietnam. Initial complaints came from Air Force and Navy pilots who were flying what they termed politically-dictated missions against targets they regarded as militarily useless. During the past year, we added our voice to this criticism in two editorials—"Protecting the MIGs" (AW&ST Apr. 10, p. 21) and "An Ineffectual Strategy" (AW&ST May 15, p. 17). In the waning months of last summer, a succession of top-ranking military leaders testifying to Congress confirmed most of the facts recited in both editorials.

Now, the most devastating expose of this incredible politically-dictated military strategy for the air war over North Vietnam has been provided by the man who was deputy commander of the 7th Air Force in Vietnam for 16 months—Maj. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers. Gen. Meyers' testimony was given to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee last August. But it has just been released publicly after passing through a Defense Dept. censorship mill. Gen. Meyers revealed a wealth of new specific details on the policies and procedures that have hamstringed the effective employment of air power over North Vietnam. His testimony goes far beyond anything on the public record to date. He confirms the earlier claims of many combat pilots that their comrades were being killed unnecessarily because of these restrictions and that these White House-directed policies have increased the cost of the war in blood and money and stretched its duration.

Gen. Meyers was able to present such a frank and devastating indictment of these policies primarily because he has retired from the Air Force and is no longer subject to the type of reprisal that has been inflicted on other dissenters still in uniform. We believe that Gen. Meyers' testimony is one of

the most important views to be given the Congress and the American people on what has really been transpiring in the air war over North Vietnam. For that reason, we intend to publish it in full in the next issue of this magazine. In the meantime, here are the main points that Gen. Meyers stressed in his Senate testimony:

**Gradualism:** He detailed the slowly graduated pressure with which U.S. air power was applied during the past two years, beginning with strikes against only two targets a week in the southern panhandle of North Vietnam. Only in the past few weeks have the key targets that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended in 1966 been attacked. Gen. Meyers said this politically-dictated policy of gradualism had blunted much of the effect of U.S. air power by allowing the enemy sufficient time to build a vast air defense system, develop alternate supply methods and convert sanctuary areas into major operational bases.

**Targeting:** He detailed how targets were released to field commanders from Washington in two-week batches, with very little regard for local factors such as weather, surprise or military effectiveness. He confirmed that Washington limited the sorties for each specific period, regardless of local conditions. Whenever a major target category, such as powerplants or rail lines, was authorized for strike, it was released in piecemeal targeting spread over periods too long for the attacking aircraft to inflict significant damage.

**Sanctuaries:** He noted that throughout his tenure, U.S. pilots were forbidden to attack well-defined zones surrounding Hanoi and Haiphong, a buffer south of the Chinese border and MIG airfields. He said the enemy used these "zones" as sanctuaries to protect vital military equipment and operations.

**Tactical restrictions:** Gen. Meyers confirmed that U.S. pilots were long prevented from attacking MIG fighters on the ground. They were only allowed to engage them defensively in the air, where the enemy had all the advantages of altitude and surprise. He also said that U.S. airmen were not allowed to attack SAM sites unless they could provide photo proof that actual missiles were at the sites. Since this photo-release process took an average of 12 hr. and the North Vietnamese could move the SAM missiles in 4 hr., it became impossible to keep the SAM threat under control. He also testified that the political restrictions imposed on airmen included direction and angle of attack and a stereotyped repetition of attack patterns that enabled the enemy to concentrate his defense in key areas and inflict higher casualties on U.S. aircraft.

**Value of targets:** Gen. Meyers took direct issue with previous testimony by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara on the military value of targets that had been recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for attack but not approved by the White House. He noted that applying U.S. industrial standards to Vietnam conditions is a great mistake. He cited tire factories with a very low output by U.S. standards that are vital to keep the North Vietnamese fleet of supply trucks moving and a battery plant that built equipment to power the Viet Cong field command radio network as military targets that should have been attacked. He also said that permission to attack the MIG airfields was denied until a few months ago despite repeated pleas by Air Force and Navy commanders. Approval to hit the main MIG-21 base at Phuc Yen was given only a few days before the public release of his testimony on its high military target value.

We recommend to our readers a thorough perusal of the full text of Gen. Meyers' testimony. We believe he has done a great service