

The Soviet Union and China have turned to Canada and Australia to fill the embarrassing grain gap which repeated 5-year plans, crash fertilizer programs, and one Great Leap Forward have left unfilled.

The Soviet Union, with vast agricultural resources relative to her population, has imported as much wheat in the past three years as India.

Communist China is using nearly 40 percent of all her foreign exchange earnings to import food and fertilizer. China's annual population growth of 15 million persons means it must find food for "another Australia" each year, good weather or bad.

Latin America's per capita calorie supply slips backward slowly but relentlessly. Omnibusly, sheer numbers seem to thrive best where agricultural production stagnates.

In such a world, food and the means to produce it have become important instruments of foreign policy. As good as dollars for aid if carefully used; more powerful than arms if strategically planned—America's food must be used not simply to meet the margin between subsistence and famine, but as the powerful force it can be for food production and rural development abroad.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES SUCCESSFUL IN FIRST VITAL TRIAL IN SOUTH VIETNAM—PEOPLE DESERVE CREDIT FOR THEIR COMMITMENT TO CITIZENSHIP THROUGH USE OF THE BALLOT—OUR OWN NATION HAD ITS EMERGING TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, many of my colleagues have spoken of the heartening news of the apparent success of the recent elections in South Vietnam. I, too, am impressed and optimistic at the size of the voter turnout in the face of terrorist activities and real and threatened violence.

Although the healthy, and—according to news releases—clean elections do not necessarily mean that this Asian nation is now finally on firm internal footing, it is an indication that the help we have been giving, in men, arms, material goods, and lives, has not been given in vain.

Among the editorials I have read, the commentary appearing in the Tuesday, September 13, issue of the New York Daily News sums up in cogent terms the results of these elections and their meaning for the people of South Vietnam and our own country.

Mr. President, I have been among the supporters of the administration in its efforts to assist the Vietnamese toward a stable, self-sufficient and democratically oriented government. The path which the past three Presidents have chosen is a difficult one for them, and for us. But many of our paths have been difficult, since our inception born of the most difficult step of all—rebellion against our own "motherland," England, which began in earnest with the Battle of Lexington-Concord on April 19, 1775.

The editorial to which I refer draws some parallels between voting in South Vietnam and in our Republic. But I think other parallels can be drawn—and those have to do with our Revolution, and our emerging as a democratic constitutional republic.

I have mentioned that our Revolution began in 1775. It continued, Mr. President, for 8 years—ending in 1783. Then, as we all know, there was still work to be done by our forefathers in building the kind of government which we have today, and through which we have become a great nation. The Founding Fathers met to draft our Constitution, first on May 25, 1787. But it took many months before their work was done, and still longer for ratification by the several States. It was 3 years later, May 29, 1790, before Rhode Island ratified the Constitution of our Republic, thereby giving it full and binding force, on all of us.

In the months and years ahead, while the South Vietnamese delegates struggle with the momentous task of framing their own governmental system, Mr. President, let all of us remember our origins. Let us not expect of them any more, or less, than is written of us in our own history. Let us wish them wisdom in their counsels, calmness in their deliberations—and let us remain with them for whatever time it takes, rather than giving them just so much time, and no more, in which to perform their tasks.

For there is no greater task, Mr. President, no more serious responsibility, than that of framing the principles by which a people shall be governed. Our contribution to the people of South Vietnam now must be patience, understanding, and continued support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the New York Daily News be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

A SMASH VIET VOTE VICTORY

Sunday's election in South Viet Nam were an overwhelming victory for the government headed by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, and a humiliating defeat for Communism as represented variously by the Viet Cong, North Viet Nameese Boss Ho Chi Minh, Red China, and Red Russia.

The Viet Cong tried every kind of terrorist tactics from murder on down to scare voters away from the polls.

Premier Ky would have considered a 60% voter turnout a victory. Instead, about 80% of those eligible to vote went to the polls and cast ballots—though some of these may have been blanks.

It's sensational—especially when you recall that in our 1964 Presidential election only 62% of our total voting-age population saw fit to vote.

The Sunday South Viet Nam elections produced a 117-member Assembly which is to write a constitution for the strategic Southeast Asian nation. Premier Ky calls the event "the beginning of the end for the Communists."

That may be over-optimistic. But the victory at least indicates, we think, that it is time to junk any notion that the Viet Cong are 10 feet tall or that their terrorist hold on large parts of South Viet Nam is unbreakable. It is time, too, we believe, to get on with winning the war as soon as may be, ignoring the home-front Vietniks and all foreign kibitzers in the process.

The South Viet Nam elections strongly indicate that the great majority of South Viet Nameese want Communism rooted out of their country. Let's help them, to the best of our ability.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY VICTORIA ASARE, OF GHANA

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, school children in Ghana were recently offered a prize for the best essay on "Democracy: What It Means To Me" in a contest sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency and the Ghanaian Ministry of Education.

The winner, out of 4,500 entries, was Miss Victoria Asare, 19. Her essay was published in the September 10 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Since this essay gives each of us an opportunity to see how one young African views democracy, I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor
 Sept. 10, 1966]

**DEMOCRACY AS SEEN BY A GIRL IN GHANA
 (By Victoria Asare)**

Democracy is such a wide and diversified concept that to my mind it defies definition. However, although it may seem impossible to capture its essence in one neat phrase, one can say that democracy rests on a trinity of permanent values; liberty, fraternity, equality.

The latter two fall easily into line but how can one and the same system incorporate liberty and equality since liberty of its very nature would seem to demand diversity?

Edward Lindeman puts it like this: "Where conformity is imposed as an external discipline, liberty is by definition excluded."

But to my mind it is this very tension between liberty and equality that gives democracy its vital force. It leaves room for a fruitful clash of ideas resulting in new developments. Edmund Burke, believing that liberty was "the dearest of the democratic graces" more or less ignored the idea of equality.

On the other hand, Rousseau held that since men were by nature unequal, it was the work of society to make them equal.

What exactly he meant by making them equal I am not sure, but, it seems to me that under a democratic regime all should have equal opportunities to develop whatever talent they may possess since all are equally worthy of respect on account of their dignity as human beings.

All through the ages men have been searching for a way—a system of living that would set them free, help them to live in harmony with their inner selves and with other men.

Plato, Rousseau, Lincoln, Aggrey are just a few of the apostles of democracy. With each of them the ideal became more and more fully realized till today there is hardly a corner of the world which is not in love with freedom.

Africa is no exception, nor is Ghana. The very fact that "Animal Farm" was once confiscated in our schools shows that the youth were wide awake but applying the moral too closely to home!

BATTLE CRY TWISTED

The trouble about democracy is that it is something which has to mature over a long period, otherwise it loses its roots and withers. No one will deny that the battle cry of the French revolutionaries was "liberty, fraternity, equality," yet in their fanatic pursuit of their ideals their cry was turned into "licence, fratricide, inequality."

The quest for liberty, fraternity, equality must be a patient one and the leader of a democratic government must be prepared for many false starts and disappointments.

"Instability, tension, and immaturity are inevitable when people are just beginning to face collectively and individually, a wide range of new situations and problems" (Adrian Hastings in his article "The Second Revolution"—New Blackfriars, March, 1966).

And to try to make everyone follow "the party line" just because one thinks it the best for them is to invite disaster as we have already seen here in Ghana. There must be a democratic approach. A leader must be willing to see his plans only partially realized.

There must be give and take and it is here that Africans have an advantage over more developed countries. Living close to the soil and living with its slow, peaceful rhythm, most Africans can wait patiently for growth. The large and extended family system, too, gives every opportunity for give and take.

It is futile to argue that a newly independent country "cannot afford" to be democratic. A one-party system may seem to be the inevitable choice for a developing country which has to build up its economy, give an illiterate population much guidance, and do in 10 years what other nations have taken hundreds of years to do.

This may seem on the face of it very wise indeed, but recent events in our country have shown it to be a short-sighted policy. The 80 percent illiterate population soon tired of the forced "guidance." They were not willing to be led by the nose forever.

FAMILY FRAMEWORK

This goes to show that people who thought that democracy was not practicable in a country like Ghana were all wrong. They seemed to imply that we ought not to try out democracy until we had become wise and good under dictatorship. What folly! Any man who resolves never to get into the water until he has learned to swim will indeed wait forever and never learn.

We could do worse than base our teaching of democracy on a framework which we know already—the family. If I mention family, it includes not only my father, mother, brothers and sisters, but the extended family or group of relatives living in single or in neighboring communities. We are under the leadership of the elder men of the family, one of whom is popularly acknowledged as the head.

I remember once there arose the problem of sending to a secondary school one of the girls whose parents were dead. All the relatives met together and discussed how they were going to do this. It was finally decided that three of the uncles who were fairly well-off should contribute a certain amount of money each month.

Though the head died, this system continued to operate because once they had given their opinion and come to a satisfactory agreement they considered that out of loyalty to the family and respect for the head their promises must be kept.

This being the normal family's way of dealing with problems, it should not be hard to get people to understand democracy on a larger scale.

Besides, they are already familiar with democratic government, though not consciously so. I am referring to chieftaincy which holds in embryo almost all the essential features of democracy.

TENURE WITH STRINGS

A chief is made eligible for office by his birth into the royal family, but his ultimate selection to community headship depends upon the clear recognition of his acquired abilities to lead, by three powerful groups: first, by the members of his own family, then by the council representatives of all the other families in the community, and finally and most democratically, by the individual members of all the families who register approval or disapproval through their own representatives.

His tenure, like that of the family head, depends upon his behavior. If he fails to please, out he goes, to be replaced by another member of the royal family who can gain the necessary approval. In this way autocracy is prevented.

Nowadays, we find that the claims of the native chiefs are often unduly overlooked when native questions are being dealt with. The chief was formerly a man of very great importance. But his present position is anomalous. Both his rights and duties are ill-defined, and, as a natural consequence, he has lost a great deal of self-respect.

I think that it is the duty of any democratic government to endeavor to restore the native chief to his former position of trust in the community. He must be given real power, definite responsibilities, and definite rights and duties.

If this is done I feel sure we will be developing along lines of natural evolution instead of substituting for our own laws and customs, a system that we think is better just because it happens to be in force in Great Britain or Russia.

Improvement on, and not mere imitation of the views of the Western democratic credo, whether in morals, manners, and customs, or in dress, art, or industry is the trade keynote of civilization throughout the world.

If democracy is to have the proper environment in which to develop there must be a stable economy and more and varied educational opportunities.

"In general the economy is not developing comparably with education and there is a real danger that higher education—especially if it is incomplete will come to put people out of a job, rather than into one.

"This is especially true as so little of the educational effort is directed toward a trade or craft. It is academic, geared to professional work or to the white-collar jobs of an advanced industrial society, but that society hardly exists yet in Africa" (Adrian Hastings). Therefore, there is need for more emphasis on technical training so that there will be skilled workers to fill the jobs made available by an expanding economy.

But preparing people to fill posts is only a minor part of education. Democracy is not just a form of government, it is an attitude of mind and in educating people for it there are many factors to be considered. I shall deal with only two extremes.

First, there are those whose ideas of freedom have been so blunted that they may have to be shaken out of a servile frame of mind. To such people it must be pointed out that they have a right to speak their mind, to fight against injustice, to vote for whomsoever they please and in secrecy.

They have a right to education, a just wage, free time, consultation with their employers and so on.

A LESSON IN LIMITS

Then there are the others, a greater number I think, whose ideas on freedom need to be corrected. They are the people who criticize everything destructively but who fail to realize that they are not exercising liberty here, but taking liberties, which is entirely different (Adrian Hastings).

Among those who offend against liberty are many of our young students. Since democracy is a way of walking and not of talking, we must have opportunities to live it in school. There is already the prefectorial system which teaches that positions of honour and trust bring their own responsibilities and duties.

But not all young people appreciate that the responsibilities are at least as important as the privileges, if not more so. Let me illustrate this point.

In a certain boy's school the students were continually clamoring for more democratic treatment. They felt they should be consulted and have a say on the drawing up of the menu for meals.

The headmaster eventually decided to teach them a lesson. He allowed the students' food committee to take over completely the ordering of provisions. They were to be entirely responsible for handing out the food to the cooks and hardest of all for keeping within a fixed budget. The experiment failed.

After a week the boys tired of the extra work involved, and, worse still, half the school was reporting at the dispensary with stomach-aches!

But the committee had learned at least this: That democracy is not all shouting for rights.

Freedom has limits and we should all respect each other's. What makes a society is a common aim; and to have a solid, lasting society there should be rules and some basic moral standards. What should be learned is that we are what we are today because of our neighbors, their personalities, and the influence of all those we have ever met.

Therefore, we should respect the ideas of other people and accept and bear our own mistakes if we are in the wrong, for we are all fallible.

EDUCATED MINORITY

People who have recognized their freedom, its limits, and their fallibility form a free state. A man of a free state is bold enough to stand by the light given him. This means he is able to bear witness to the right and wrong he sees. He need not close windows and doors in order to talk about the government, religion, or a frivolous book on politics found in the library.

This does not mean that he may always criticize the government if it intervenes in certain of his affairs. There is no use in its giving me a full scholarship while I sit down at my desk enjoying the breeze. The head of my school, acting in the government's interests, has a right to withdraw that scholarship.

To conclude, we know that only love, goodwill, friendship, and spiritual togetherness can secure the well-being, prosperity, and progression of our nation.

Above all, I feel strongly that as far as we Ghanaians are concerned, we shall be depending for a long time to come on an educated minority. Let them be truly educated then. Let them put away all thought of personal gain and advancement and be men of sympathy, imagination, and above all men of patience.

For "all this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will be finished in the first 1,000 days . . . nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin" (President Kennedy in his first inaugural address).

HISTORY DIDN'T REPEAT—FAILURE OF AGGRESSION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, some people do not seem to learn that it is impossible to stop aggressors by giving them what they seek at the moment.

This unfortunate, potentially tragic, failure to recognize the aggressor's nature is the theme of a forceful editorial in the Indianapolis Star.

Because the message implicit in the editorial is well worth serious deliberation, I intend to ask that it be printed in the Record in full at the close of my remarks.

It is my understanding that the editorial, entitled "History Didn't Repeat," states the policy not only of the Indianapolis Star but of the other newspapers published by Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam in Indiana and Arizona.

Quite obviously, it supports the view of President Johnson and strongly endorses our stand against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

The President has declared again and again that we do not seek any territory or any special rights in Vietnam. Likewise, he has made it very clear that we are fighting the cause of liberty for the South Vietnamese and, in consequence, for all men.

The President has warned the Communists that we will not quit and that we will stay until peace is achieved at the conference table or until the aggression is halted.

The editorial to which I previously referred goes back 30 years to reinforce its case. Certain events of that period are written on history's darker pages.

In 1936 France decided not to challenge Hitler's remilitarization of the Rhineland. By the time it became apparent that he would never stop, Hitler had marshaled a mighty army, a fleet of marauding U-boats, and a powerful air force.

Hitler stacked up his dominoes, as the Indianapolis newspaper recalled. They consisted of Austria, the Sudetenland, then all of Czechoslovakia, and ultimately Poland, the Netherlands, Norway, the Baltic States, the Balkans, France, and North Africa.

Parenthetically, it should also be pointed out that during those years Mussolini's Italy subjugated Ethiopia, and Japan penetrated farther and farther into Manchuria.

With the rest of the world, many Americans also looked upon these invasions with the illusory hope that the aggressors would soon be satisfied.

But now we choose to resist. The history of three decades ago is not repeating. We are determined to stem the Communist tide before it overruns all of southeast Asia. Responsible Americans realize that giving in to aggressors cannot stop them. That, we are reminded in this perceptive editorial, is why we are fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Aug. 14, 1966]

HISTORY DIDN'T REPEAT

France in 1936 chose not to fight Adolf Hitler when he remilitarized the Rhineland. Most French leaders thought he would stop there.

By the time they realized he would never stop—that it would take superior force to stop him—he had all of the trump cards, a lightning war land army, a fleet of U-boats and a powerful air force.

The United States today chooses to fight Asian Communism as it applies armed force to seize South Viet Nam. We aim to stop the Red tide before it overruns all Southeast Asia.

The peaceniks today do not consider Viet Nam to be the Rhineland of our generation. The appeasers of the 1930s did not consider the Rhineland of 1936 to be a crucial issue for their generation. They scoffed at the "domino theory" of Winston Churchill and other tough-minded, realistic men.

Hitler began stacking up his dominoes—Austria, the Sudetenland sections of Czechoslovakia, finally all of Czechoslovakia, ultimately Poland, the Netherlands, Norway, the Baltic states, the Balkans, France, North Africa.

The chief peace advocate of that tragic era was Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, who after pleading with Hitler at Munich not to start a war, and offering Czechoslovakia as appeasement, flew back to England and announced to the world it was assured of "peace in our time."

Responsible American leaders realize today that you cannot stop aggressors by giving in to them. That is why we are fighting in Viet Nam.

But the peaceniks go on believing, as Neville Chamberlain believed, that you can stop aggressors by giving them what they seek at the moment. Some people never learn.

EXCLUSION OF PIECE RATE FARMWORKERS FROM WAGE AND HOUR BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement indicating why I intend to support the motion that will be made tomorrow by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to instruct Senate conferees on the wage and hour bill to insist on the Senate provision for the exclusion of farmworkers who are paid on a piece rate basis.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, announced yesterday he will support a move to be made in the Senate this week to send the Fair Labor Standards bill back to conference for exclusion from coverage of hand-harvest workers who are paid on a piece-rate basis.

"On Wednesday, the Senate plans to act on the conference report on the wage and hour bill," said Senator ROBERTSON. "Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, will offer an amendment to instruct the Senate conferees to insist on the Senate provision for exclusion from coverage of piece-rate farm workers.

"In Virginia, that would apply primarily to those who are paid by the bushel to pick apples, but the definition would be for all piece work.

"If the Prouty motion is adopted, the House conferees would probably ask for instructions from the House, and the House may approve, although the motion made in the House on May 26 to recommit the bill to eliminate completely the coverage of agriculture, was defeated by a vote of 231 to 168.

"The inclusion of thousands of agricultural workers will, I believe, only lead to further mechanization of farms with a resulting loss in job opportunities.

"And, as was pointed out by Senator HOLLAND, it is a forerunner of a move to apply the minimum wage to all farm-workers, to be followed, of course, by their unionization.

"More and more, the Government is encroaching upon a rather unique and vital principle of our representative democracy—private enterprise. The framers of our Constitution in embodying private enterprise in that great document intended that the Government would be only an umpire of fair play between management and labor. The pending bill is an evidence of a modern trend in the direction of a managed economy—a poor substitute for private enterprise and doomed to failure when it controls management but not labor."

FLY ASH: A WASTE PRODUCT THAT CAN CUT COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, has written a revealing and thoughtful article in the September 15 edition of Public Utilities Fortnightly on a project sponsored by Federal funds involving the use of coal fly ash. Senator BYRD has explained the great value of reusing this waste product which now represents a costly disposal problem for our public utilities.

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

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

(By the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. Senator from West Virginia)

Last year when I amended a bill to add \$275,000 to Office of Coal Research funds for the purpose of constructing a pilot plant at West Virginia University to produce building brick from fly ash, a colleague on the Senate Appropriations Committee remarked:

"I would vote that amount just to find places to get rid of the stuff."

Disposing of fly ash has been a growing problem since piles of cinders from beehive ovens began to blight areas of West Virginia and Pennsylvania in the latter part of the last century. In more recent years, as the electric utility industry developed equipment to capture fly ash before it leaves the stack, the dilemma has spread to every area where there is a coal-fired power plant. Today fly ash is being used to fill swampy land and old quarries; it is dumped at sea and in any place where it can be hidden.

Slowly, American industry is waking up to the fact that wanton discard of fly ash is not only costly; it is also wasteful.

The value of fly ash was first recognized by the Romans, who used volcanic ash and lime to make hydraulic cement for the construction of their buildings. While a great deal of experimentation took place through the years, the use of the material in modern times did not begin on a large scale until after World War II, when electrostatic precipitators came into wide use to remove solids from the flues of coal-fed steam plants.

For some time it has been known that fly ash could be used as a mixture for concrete, but the extent of this utilization has been entirely too limited. Probably no more than 5 per cent of the 20 million tons collected last year was put to constructive use. With the addition of electric generating capacity this year and in the years ahead, the accumulation will spiral upward, especially because of increased efficiency in the arrest of particulate matter in the boiler plant operation. Modern precipitators can trap as much as 99.5 per cent of the fly ash that occurs in combustion. Used advantageously, this material can help defray the cost of expensive air pollution control equipment.

Costs of disposing of fly ash are estimated at from 50 cents to \$2 a ton, depending largely upon the distance it must be hauled. Mere eradication of this expense can bring important savings to electric companies; when demand for the by-product is established, sales will further reduce operational costs and, in effect, strengthen coal's competitive position in the utility market.

The brick-making project at West Virginia University appears to have outstanding potential. In planning a production of 1,000 cured bricks and 8,000 uncured bricks per eight-hour day, the university will demonstrate the value of the process to commercial firms. Experimentations to date have indicated that the coal-based bricks can

meet or exceed all standard requirements, and the cost of producing them will be reasonable and competitive.

HOW FLY ASH MAY BE USED

Whatever the outcome of this project, however, there are already numerous proven uses for fly ash, but the value of the product is not likely to be quickly recognized without proper marketing stimulus on the part of the coal and electric industries.

A unique pamphlet published by the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company points out that, when fly ash is mixed with cement, the end product contains these features:

Improved Workability. Concrete in the plastic state flows more readily and finishes better when it contains fly ash. It is more cohesive and plastic and is less prone to segregation and bleeding. Less vibration is required when concrete contains fly ash.

Better Appearance. Smoother surface with less cracking. Fewer voids and sharper edges.

Lower Permeability. Fly ash concrete shows less susceptibility to water penetration. This is of particular importance when concrete is in contact with sea water.

Improved Chemical Stability. Many tests have shown that fly ash concrete resists the action of sulphates and sulphuric acid.

Less Heat of Hydration. Fly ash concrete demonstrates as much as 25 per cent less temperature rise when compared with concrete that does not contain fly ash. This feature is of considerable value in mass concrete.

Lower Shrinkage. Fly ash concrete shows less tendency for cracking during the initial setting and drying.

Continued Strength Gain. The pozzolanic action of fly ash concrete continues over many years and insures higher ultimate strength than all cement concrete.

More Uniform Color. The presence of fly ash in a concrete mix produces a more uniform color.

Resistance to Thermal and Chemical Effects. Fly ash concrete is more resistant to freezing and thawing and to salts used as ice removers.

Fly ash has been used as a concrete reinforcement in the construction of some of the world's largest dams. It has added years to the life of the concrete highway. It serves as a mineral filler in asphalt paving. The Santa Fe Railway is using it to stabilize its roadbed.

GREATER UTILIZATION IS FORTHCOMING

J. P. Capp, chemical engineer at the Morgantown (West Virginia) Coal Research Center, U.S. Department of the Interior, foresees a multimillion-ton outlet for fly ash in lightweight aggregate, which currently accounts for more than one-third of fly ash consumption in this country. Consolidated Edison Company is operating a lightweight aggregate sintering plant in New York City, and another such plant is in operation near Detroit Edison's River Rouge facility.

Smaller sintering plants are producing on a semipilot-plant scale in Detroit and Philadelphia.

The potential would seem almost unlimited, yet activity in fly ash utilization continues uninspiring. In an effort to spur its use, I have recently appealed to the Secretary of Commerce, who is authorized under the Appalachian Development Act to require each participating state, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives for purposes of research and development in the construction of highways and roads. The initial results are encouraging and hopefully will prompt states outside Appalachia to take advantage of fly ash availability at generating stations within proximity of the highways they are building or planning.

Earlier this year Robert E. Lee Hall, vice president of the National Coal Association,

told the Electric Club of Los Angeles that use of coal by southern California utilities will open the way for utilization of fly ash in that area's building industry. He predicted that introduction of fly ash to West coast industry will begin as soon as the Southern California Edison Company plant in Clark county, Nevada, goes into operation.

The economic benefits of fly ash may have been established nationally when the Clark county station goes on the line four or five years hence. But, meanwhile, neither coal nor the utilities should be satisfied with the present pace of fly ash sales. Experience indicates that proper promotion would more than pay for itself.

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with an alarming increase in the crime rate in the country, as reflected by the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it is reassuring to read of a citizen's pride which results from respect for law and order.

That pride is expressed in an article, entitled "What's Happened to Respect for Law and Order?" written by Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia and appearing in the September 1966, edition of *Future* magazine. The magazine is published by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

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

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

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER?

(By Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, West Virginia)

A serious domestic crisis is facing our Nation today. I refer not only to the crime crisis as it appears in widely publicized statistics and to the fact that the rate of serious crime has increased six times faster than the rate of our population growth since 1958. I refer to the dangerous breakdown of respect for law and order sweeping this country today which recently has shown itself in the demonstrations in "protest" of the foreign policies of our Federal government, specifically giving aid and comfort to the Communists by opposition to our military efforts in Viet Nam.

The freedom to protest has become, at the least, a means of cheap exhibitionism for restless, unoccupied adolescents; and more fearfully, a way of denigrating our carefully conceived national policies and a cause of suffering and death.

With respect to those who counsel and perpetrate unlawful acts, Americans must react with vigilance, sternness, and speed in the dispensing of just and legal action for the offender. I made reference above to the fact that the traditional American right to protest is losing its significance and its respect. Other rights—greater rights—are also losing respect and significance. Recent events have emphasized that there has been a violent breach of two cardinal principles of our American society—the respect for law and order and the recourse to orderly process of law to seek redress of wrongs.

A line from the creed of the U.S. Jaycees affirms, "That government should be of laws rather than of men." I am sometimes led to wonder whether the people—most of them quite young—who are attacking this country, its laws, and its foreign policies have heard of Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini, if they have any conception of the kind of government that would result if they were suc-

cessful in their attempts to undermine the laws, to discredit the men who endanger their lives to enforce these laws, and to cause doubt and disaffection among those men who stalwartly serve in support of our Nation's military commitments. The government of men inevitably follows the failure of the government of laws.

The time has come for the lawabiding citizens of this country to realize that law and order are as vulnerable as they are valuable, and with this in mind, to put their full weight behind the laws and those men who enforce them. The members of the progressive organization, the United States Jaycees, are ideally suited to show the way. The Nation needs your help.

I have been very interested to learn about the Jaycees' statewide project in Wisconsin to rally public support behind the police. I understand this project is extremely successful, and that other Jaycee organizations are considering initiating similar ones. I would strongly encourage them to do so.

At one time, a suggestion was advanced in the District of Columbia that a campaign be undertaken to enlist the active support of the business and professional community in combating crime, in the belief that this could make an immense contribution to justice in the community.

It is my belief that, on a national scale, an intensive effort toward encouraging support of and cooperation with the police and other law enforcement officers would be an effective element in the prevention of crime. Moreover, I believe that if the Jaycees would so desire to undertake the organization of such effort, and could campaign to increase public support for law observance and greater responsibility of action in support of duly constituted authority, they would prove to be a truly independent and effective voice in encouraging decency of public action and in protecting the civil rights of all, the majority as well as the minority.

The U.S. Jaycees represent the very opposite end of the pole from these dangerous and irresponsible elements of society about which I have been talking. Your goal is service, to the community and to humanity. We need more people in this country today who equate freedom with responsibility, or we will soon be in danger of losing both.

Western civilization cannot endure without preserving its basic principles of justice and humanity for all, and our American society cannot endure if it drifts into lethargic acceptance of breaches in the strong body of our law, as based on our Constitution.

When we reach the stage where some people can break the law without punishment in the name of individual freedom, then it is obvious who will be the loser. The loser will be John Q. Citizen—you and me, our wives and children, old and young, black and white, in cities and hamlets all over America. The law is the buttress of individual freedom, the citadel of civil rights, the bulwark of the private citizen against tyranny, and the firm foundation upon which our Republic rests.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SOUTH VIETNAM ELECTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the most encouraging participation of the South Vietnamese people in Sunday's election has drawn wide notice, as indeed it should. That this was a triumph giving rise to the hope that a government which can stand the most critical test of its legitimacy is quite clear.

Among the notices given this promising turn of events in Vietnam were the editorials of the three daily newspapers of Washington. I ask unanimous consent

that the editorials published in the Evening Star and the Daily News of Monday an in today's Washington Post 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.) Star, Sept. 12, 1966]

THE VOTE IN VIETNAM

The turnout in the South Vietnamese election—some 80 percent of the eligible voters—is being hailed with ample justification as a victory for the Saigon government and, indirectly, for the United States.

It is a victory because the Viet Cong tried, and failed, to so intimidate the voters that they would stay away from the polls. To a lesser degree it is also a victory because Buddhist elements tried, and failed, to persuade the people to boycott the elections. Most observers, in these circumstances, would have been satisfied with a 60 percent turnout. Anything in excess of that can properly be regarded as a welcome bonus.

It is too early, of course, to know what the heavy vote means in terms of support for or opposition to the Saigon government and its conduct of the war. The purpose of this election was to choose members of a constituent assembly which is expected to draft a new constitution by next March. After that will come the selection of a legislative assembly to restore civilian rule to South Viet Nam. These are the significant tests of what the shape of the political future will be.

None of this, however, detracts from the importance of the response by the South Vietnamese to this opportunity to demonstrate their interest in making a political choice. Had the voter turnout been small, that would have been seized upon as evidence that the people were fed up and wanted nothing more than to be left alone. Certainly this is what Hanoi hoped for in its effort to keep the voters away from the polls. That it didn't happen, that the people turned out in record numbers despite the years of war, privation and oppression, is a heartening indication that the South Vietnamese believe the future holds something better for them than submission to the agony of Communist domination.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 12, 1966]

SMASHING VICTORY IN VIETNAM

What took place in South Viet Nam yesterday was the most reassuring, progressive and promising thing that has happened there in years. Surpassing all predictions, over three-fourths of the country's registered voters went to the polls to elect a national assembly. The enormous turnout means a smashing victory for the Saigon government, and a clear defeat for the communists.

For weeks communist agents, following Hanoi's line, had been calling on South Vietnamese to boycott and "crush" the "sham elections," and backed up their demand with threatened, and actual, terror attacks. The militant Buddhist monks also tried to undercut the elections by urging on followers "non-co-operation" toward the balloting.

The names of yesterday's winners won't be known until later this week, but the massive turnout, witnessed and verified by a host of foreign observers, means a government victory. By that we don't mean, necessarily, a victory for Prime Minister Ky and the ruling generals. We mean a declaration of loyalty to and faith in those men in authority who, for all their faults and shortcomings, represent the non-Communist alternative.

We have long believed the South Vietnamese people are basically against the Viet Cong, because they know their aims and their methods. Despite many disappointments, they are disposed to look to Saigon

for the answer to the communists. That is what this election means: that millions of Vietnamese overcame their skepticism and apathy—and fear of Viet Cong retaliation—to register their faith in a non-communist future for their country.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 13, 1966]

SOUTH VIETNAM'S ELECTION

The large vote in the South Vietnamese elections is a triumph for the government, more complete than anyone would have dared predict in advance. If the country were as completely dominated by the Vietcong as some critics have alleged, such a turnout would have been impossible.

The big vote, in the face of Vietcong terror, is at once a revelation of the weakness of the dissidents and a vindication of the political awareness of the rank-and-file of the people. The world has learned enough about so-called "elections" in Communist and Fascist states, to know that elections can be managed. It is sufficiently familiar with electoral frauds to know that elections in which voters have no alternative to a dictated slate may not be a meaningful index of the extent that democracy prevails.

In this election, however, the fact of voting in itself disclosed something about affairs in the country—whatever the voters voted for or against. To participate in the election at all was to defy the Vietcong, to repudiate its methods and to opt for the alternative offered by the government.

It is what the elected Constituent Assembly does that will fix the place of this election in history, of course. The opportunity now exists to establish in South Vietnam a government with the priceless endowment of legitimacy. No Communist critic can challenge successfully or convincingly the credentials of this elected body. It has a better claim to sovereignty than critical governments where the voting has been by bullet and not by ballot.

It will be difficult for the Constituent Assembly to perfect a constitution acceptable to all the people, or to an overwhelming majority of them. It will be hard to get a new government, functioning under the constitution, launched in the midst of war and rebellion. But the people of South Vietnam have made a brave beginning that is a credit to them.

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR ERVIN TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD TRIAL COUNSEL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on August 22, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] addressed the National Association of Railroad Trial Counsel in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. He was introduced by our mutual friend, Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga.

Mr. Bloch's introduction of Senator ERVIN was a well-deserved tribute to one of the most outstanding and dedicated Members of this body, whose vast knowledge of the law and unswerving allegiance to sound constitutional government have served the Senate and the Nation with great distinction for many years.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bloch's introduction of Senator ERVIN be printed in the RECORD.

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

If there ever was a time in the history of the American Republic in which leadership was needed, it is now.

And, if there was ever a man fully endowed and equipped for such leadership, it is our speaker this morning.

Essential qualifications for such leadership are (1) Birth and heredity which have familiarized the man with the fundamental principles of American government; (2) Courage; (3) Integrity; (4) Intelligence; (5) Experience.

Seldom are such characteristics combined in one man. If and when they are, there should be your leader.

Born in Morganton, North Carolina, graduated from University of North Carolina in 1917, SAM ERVIN, Jr., son of a distinguished North Carolina lawyer, served in France with the famed First Division in World War I. Twice wounded, twice cited for gallantry, he returned to complete his legal education at Harvard and to marry his boyhood sweetheart, who is here today. Practicing in the place of his birth, as A.D.C. of Southern Railway Company for one of his clients, he served his country in the North Carolina Legislature and as a Superior Court Judge; then his district as a Representative in Congress; then for six years as a Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina. On June 11, 1954, he was appointed U.S. Senator from North Carolina. Reelected that autumn, and again in 1956 and 1962, today he serves his State and Nation as U.S. Senator and as a member of its Judiciary Committee and Chairman of its Committee on Constitutional Rights. He has been cited by the American Legion for "devotion to the Constitution"; by the Patriotic Order of Sons of America "for great and inspiring public services"; by the U.D.C. for defense of Constitutional Rights. I, to you, cite him as the outstanding American of today, possessing to a unique degree those essential characteristics of leadership America so sorely needs—my dear friend, U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina.

WIRTZ SUPPORTS WAGE GUIDELINE ADJUSTMENT FOR COST OF LIVING

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. President, I was delighted to notice in this morning's New York Times that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, has formally and publicly committed himself to an adjustment of the wage-price guidelines to include the increase in the cost of living.

This is mighty welcome news. To my knowledge, the administration has not previously recognized the inequity that the wage-price guideline represents for the workingman who is held to a wage increase that may be exceeded by the rise in the cost of living.

At yesterday's House hearings on wage-price guidelines, Economist Gerhard Colm suggested that part of the increase in the cost of living be permitted above the strict productivity guideline, but not the entire cost.

Mr. President, it is most important for the President and Congress to recognize the present wage-price guideline inequity for two reasons:

First, unless we do recognize it, the injustice of the present administration of the wage-price guideline will kill the whole concept. This would be unfortunate. Since President Kennedy instituted the concept, it has served the country well, in spite of the severe criticism it has suffered. In a period of tight de-

mand, falling unemployment, rising utilization of plant capacity, it has kept the rise in the cost of living, well below what it was in the years prior to its conception.

Second, the guidelines as presently administered represent a clear inequity. The worker producing more will actually receive less in real wages if prices rise more rapidly than the guideline. Even if the cost of living rises less rapidly, it erodes the productivity increase the worker has earned.

Secretary Wirtz' suggestion would meet this weakness and correct it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times, reporting Secretary Wirtz' commitment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GUIDEPOST CHANGE BACKED BY WIRTZ—COST-OF-LIVING RISES WOULD BE FACTOR IN PAY RAISES

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz endorsed today a basic change in the Administration's anti-inflationary wage-price guideposts. The change would recognize a rise in the cost of living as a valid basis for union wage increases.

Mr. Wirtz told a House government operations subcommittee that he subscribed "completely" to the idea that the guideposts should be amended to take consumer price increases at least partly into account when determining what a fair wage increase was.

Union leaders have generally argued that the guideposts should allow wage increases that fully reflect increases in consumer prices, plus the improved productivity of workers.

Productiveness is the only guidepost test now.

The proposal for a cost-of-living amendment to the guideposts was made by HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, who conducted the subcommittee's hearings on plans to improve the guideposts.

Mr. Wirtz received no support for his view from the other Administration official who testified at the hearing—Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. On the other hand, Mr. Ackley did not express disagreement either.

Instead, he begged off any discussion of revisions of the guideposts in language that suggested—but did not clearly say—that the Administration might be considering a cost-of-living amendment.

"The price increases, Mr. Ackley said, "that have raised the workers' cost of living have undeniably made it more difficult to ask—and surely more difficult to expect—organized workers to refrain from seeking not only wages that would be consistent with cost stability but something more to offset all or part of the rise in consumer prices.

"However, I know that you will not ask me to discuss whether we may contemplate proposing any temporary departure from the pure productivity standard for wage increases in the face of this rise in living costs."

The reasoning behind a partial, but not complete, recognition of cost-of-living increases in the wage guidepost formula was outlined by another subcommittee witness, Gerhard Colm, chief economist of the National Planning Association.

The guideposts, he said, "were formulated under the assumption that price stability could be maintained," but "price stability has not been maintained."

"By allowing partial—not complete—adjustment to actual and prospective increases in the cost of living, [unionized]

workers in any one industry are not made to bear the full burden of society's failure to stabilize prices," Mr. Colm declared. "But they are also not permitted to pass this burden on entirely to other groups in the population with less flexible incomes."

PRICE INDEX RISES

The discussion of the cost of living occurred as the Labor Department was reporting that the index of wholesale prices rose again in August for the fifth straight month. Increases in the Wholesale Price Index are generally followed by increases in consumer prices a few months later.

The rise in August was an unusually large one, four-tenths of a point, and brought the Wholesale Price Index to 106.8, with the average prices of the 1957-59 period taken as the base of 100. The index was nearly 4 per cent higher than in August a year ago.

The rise in August was entirely confined to foods and farm products, which rose 1.4 points to 111.3.

Although food price increases affect consumer budgets, they are often caused by purely seasonal factors or such noneconomic influences as drought. Economists, therefore, tend to look more at industrial prices in determining whether there are general inflationary pressures in the economy.

The index of wholesale prices of industrial commodities remained unchanged in August, at 105.2, marking the first month since last December that this index did not rise.

The hearings before the government operations subcommittee today focused mainly on a plan to make the wage-price guideposts more effective, rather than ideas for amending them.

All the witnesses expressed some doubt about legislation sponsored by Mr. REUSS and Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, which would give Congress a hand in deciding the size of wage increases to be permitted under guidelines.

Except for Dr. Carl H. Madden, the chief economist for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, all the witnesses said they thought it would be desirable for Congress to hold hearings on the guideposts annually, in the interest of public education and to give labor and management their say on the subject.

However, Mr. Ackley and Mr. Wirtz agreed that there were defects in the idea of permitting Congress to revise the President's guideposts.

Dr. Madden expressed fears that Mr. REUSS's proposal would lead to making the guideposts mandatory, not voluntary as they are now. He said Government reliance on the guideposts to control inflation had led the Government "to shirk its responsibility to do something about the cause of inflation—overspending."

THE AMERICAN INDIAN—ONCE FIRST—NOW LAST

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in heading its September issue editorial, the Plainsman magazine, published in Omaha, Nebr., states:

Our "Earliest Americans" really might deserve a bit more attention than they now receive.

The editorial kicks off a most interesting and enlightening discussion of the problems confronting the American Indian. The editorial; an excellent article by Robert Savage, entitled "The Proud, Fierce Sioux: Where Are They Today?" and an interview with Indian Affairs Commissioner Robert L. Bennett by Washington correspondent Kenneth Scheibel constitute an important documentation of the victimization of the

Indian by the white man when his lands were taken and the tribes were shunted off onto reservations.

That part, of course, is well-known history, but it is worth recalling over and over to demonstrate that there is a continuing obligation on this country to take whatever steps are required to achieve the equality of opportunity which has been denied for so long. This record should also warn us all against too much paternalism by the Federal Government and the devastating consequences of suppressing the initiative and circumscribing the freedoms of any race or any segment of our society.

With respect to that obligation, the interview with Mr. Bennett, as well as Mr. Savage's assessment, outline some of the steps which are being taken and review some of the possibilities which are available or which can be developed to help the Indians help themselves.

Mr. President, in my capacity as the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of the Interior Matters, I am familiar with the programs and the effort which have been and are being made for the Indians of America, of which a large number reside in my State of South Dakota.

Some of these activities have originated with officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, some have been developed from ideas presented by the Indians and their tribal officials, other recommendations have come from the membership of our Appropriations subcommittee itself, as we all strive to move forward in this problem of vital concern.

To those who serve on the subcommittee, the articles to which I invite the attention of the Senate are familiar subjects. Those who do not serve on the subcommittee or on other committees which have a relationship to the problems of the American Indian will, I believe, find in these articles information of great interest, and I am pleased to bring them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, the article, and the interview printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial, article, and interview were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plainsman, September 1966]

OUR "EARLIEST AMERICANS" REALLY MIGHT DESERVE A BIT MORE ATTENTION THAN THEY NOW RECEIVE

The American Indian, who represents a widely-neglected minority race amid several years of hue and cry for civil liberties, for equal rights and opportunities among Negro Americans, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, has been chosen for study in some depth by the Plainsman since we feel that his story often has been ignored, in at least three of our so-called long, hot summers.

The Indian people, representing the tribes that we know so well in the Great Plains, have not participated apparently in the sit-ins, sit-downs, the chain-ins, marches, the flag waving, speech-making and even rioting that has erupted so violently and so fearfully in the major cities of the North.

Perhaps this is due to three factors:

First, the Plains Indian is not in a large measure a city dweller, where much of the racial turmoil has inspired continual and decidedly dismal headlines.

sharply criticized by George Baldanzi, International President of the United Textile Workers of America, in a speech to some 250 delegates from 75 locals at the union's annual Southern conference, held Sept. 9-11 at the Mountain View Hotel.

Noting that Rep. CURRIS is one of four U.S. government advisers to the Kennedy round of tariff-cutting talks now in progress in Geneva, Baldanzi called on the Johnson administration to "repudiate CURRIS's views as contrary to U.S. policy and to do everything possible to protect the American textile worker and the American textile industry against unfair foreign competition rooted in greed, exploitation and substandard wages."

"If the Curtis program is adopted," Baldanzi said, "thousands of American textile workers will lose their jobs. The scrapping of international agreements would intensify the drive of the American textile industry, in its struggle to survive against foreign competition, to introduce automated methods of production in a haphazard manner, without proper planning, the chief victim of which would be the American textile worker."

Baldanzi, who is also a member of the Management-Labor Textile Advisory Committee, which advises the Government on matters concerning the cotton textile industry, noted that in the speech in which Rep. CURRIS proposed that all international textile agreements be terminated, the congressman suggested that the American industry export some of its know-how and capital to lesser-developed countries to produce textiles for sale there. Such a movement, Mr. CURRIS said, would mean that these American firms could remain prosperous, pay high dividends to their stockholders, contribute to the development of needy countries and promote more economic use of world resources.

"Nowhere," Baldanzi said, "does Mr. CURRIS express any concern for the American textile worker. Apparently he is to be abandoned and thrown out of work, while industry sends its know-how and capital to other countries where it can take advantage of the substandard wages available there."

"It is no secret," Baldanzi said, "that textile machinery of the latest design is available to everyone. The raw materials needed in the manufacture of textiles, specifically cotton, are available to everyone at the same price in the world market. Expert knowledge is likewise universally available. Thus, given equal access to machinery, raw materials and technical information, the foreign manufacturer has just one advantage over his American competitor—the substandard wages he pays his workers. Is it these substandard wages that Mr. CURRIS finds so attractive when he suggests that American industry export its know-how and capital?"

"We believe that the American textile worker and the American textile industry can compete with any textile worker and any textile industry anywhere in the world, provided they do not have to compete with low wages. If wages elsewhere were raised to American levels, then the American textile worker and the American textile industry could withstand competition from any source.

"The United Textile Workers of America would agree to the abolition of all restrictive tariffs if a world-wide system of equitable standards were established. But under present conditions the only way to protect the jobs of American textile workers against unfair foreign competition is through the establishment of quotas by category for every branch of the textile industry—cotton, wool, synthetics, etc."

Baldanzi said that if the Curtis program were adopted, "and apparently the Congressman does not confine his proposals to the textile industry, perhaps millions of American workers would lose their jobs, and this could lead to serious economic and social

unrest. This no American worker—whether organized or unorganized, whether in the textile, or any other, industry—will tolerate."

Delegates to the three-day conference represented members of the United Textile Workers of America in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. Speakers, in addition to Baldanzi, were International Secretary-Treasurer Francis Schaufenbil, regional and legislative directors of the union, and representatives of various federal and state agencies. The members of the union's Southern organizing and administrative staff also participated in the conference.

I cite the entire news release to emphasize the high character of the participants and the time given to labor's involvement, and sense of responsibility to the textile industry—the problems of which are a standing concern of this Senate.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that while this is sharp language and very emphatic language, I agree with the tone and the essence and the content of that release. I hope that those who represent sections of the country which do not have the economic problem that we have experienced in Rhode Island would read and reread and give some heed to the statement made by Mr. Baldanzi.

In States like mine where vital textile mills have been closed and thousands of textile workers have been put out of their jobs—even when other American industry was enjoying a boom—this matter of textile imports and foreign textile competition, in general, pose a threat to peace of mind, certainty of a job and security of the home—let alone the security of a nation to which textiles is second only to steel as a defense essential.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the critics of our commitment in Vietnam have sought to convey the impression that little support exists for this commitment elsewhere in the world.

That this is clearly untrue has been made evident many times. In fact, it often seems that foreign observers view events in Vietnam with more real understanding of the stakes in that conflict than do many American critics.

In a recent editorial, entitled "This Is the Third World War," a leading English magazine, the Economist, describes the reason for standing firm in Vietnam and making it clear, at this time and place, that aggression will not be permitted to succeed:

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 acceptable form of society, have little choice but to fight it on its own terms: that is, by a land war.

The Economist points out that it is not "the right war, in the right place," and notes that "Defensive wars seldom are." If Vietnam were to fall to the Commu-

nists, this would simply initiate similar attempts at power throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America. To critics of the American commitment, the Economist poses this question:

The deal the Americans cannot reasonably be asked to strike is one that threatens to sell the pass to the whole 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?

I wish to share this important article with all Senators, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

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 (see page 719) 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 defence 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 (see page 721). 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

skills are very high in Indian men as well as women, and I think this represents a very fertile field for the electronics industry and other industries that are looking for this particular kind of talent.

Question. In other words, this is a burgeoning opportunity for industry?

Answer. Yes, the Indian people have the natural talent so that their production is good and their quality of work is good.

We have one industry on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota at Wright & MacGill (fishing lures). They now have found greater production among Indian men and women and also they ship products directly to the wholesale houses because it is not necessary to screen the work for imperfections.

Question. Is the American Indian today generally distrustful of attempts to help him?

Answer. Well, I believe that they like to take a look at any offers of help, because a lot of well-intentioned people who want to help Indians may not really be helping them as far as the Indian people are concerned.

Question. In other words, there seem to be some do-gooders who tend to rub the hair the wrong way?

Answer. Yes. We have some people with good intentions who are not really helping the Indian people. Of course, this is not true generally. Indian people more and more like to have a say in their lives and this is true, whether it is the Government or anybody else who offers to aid them.

Question. In other words, their pride is a factor in the situation of helping the Indian or trying to help him?

Answer. Yes, I believe this definitely has a bearing on the decisions that Indians make. I believe that there is a growing tendency among Indian people to make their own way.

Question. Here in Washington, your office is a few blocks from the White House, a few blocks from the Capitol—and a few hundred yards from the banks of the Potomac River. Indian problems sometimes come into the stream of political life of this city, as you well know.

How does President Johnson regard the Indian problem? Is he aware of the scope of this situation? Is he interested in it?

Answer. The President definitely is personally aware of the situation and he made public statements at the occasion of my swearing-in ceremony in which he definitely mentioned not only the resources of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Interior Department, but he directed all Federal agencies that have any kind of program which would have an impact on the Indian people to see to it that the benefits of their programs were made available to the Indian people.

Question. What about Congress? Do the Indians have friends in Congress?

Answer. The attitude of Congress toward the Indian people generally is very good. Indians have received sympathetic consideration. There is legislation by the various committees, and I believe that we have the responsibility to keep Congress more informed about the Indian situation.

Congress as this time is engaged in many international problems, so it has to depend upon the Indian people themselves and agencies like ours to keep the Government up to date and informed on the Indian situation.

As you know, we do have an Indian representative in the Congress from South Dakota, Mr. BEN REIFEL, of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

Question. Could you pick out any state or delegation in Congress and say that this group does more to help the Indian than any one else?

Answer. Well, this would be very difficult to do because every Congressman who has

Indians in his district is looking out for their welfare.

I would say the chairman of a subcommittee and full committees, as well as members of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, are very sympathetic toward the Indian situation.

Question. Just a couple of more questions, Mr. Commissioner. You mentioned the assets to industry a few minutes ago. Are there any other strong points the Indian has?

Answer. Yes. I believe there are many cultural traits which they have that I certainly admire. One is their concern for each other upon which is based a concept of sharing.

In other words, they share what they have with their neighbors. This came about, I believe, as a part of their built-in "social security system" which existed as a part of their Indian way of life.

For instance, Indian children in their society know who their next mother and father will be in case something has happened to their parents.

Whereas—our system of taking children and putting them into foster homes, to the Indian seems a cold-blooded way of handling children. So they have a built-in social security system.

Question. In other words there are things the white man could learn from this?

Answer. I would say this is true.

Question. What would you say are the major weaknesses of the American Indian?

Answer. I don't know if you should call it a weakness, but it is a definite problem. They have to understand our economic system so to speak, so that they can participate in it.

Our economic system is based upon production, whereas their economic system is based upon consumption—since they depend upon nature to provide them with the necessities of life.

Since this is no longer true, they have to undergo a radical change in their own thinking to participate in our economic system.

HENRY PALM, SYMPATHETIC DIRECTOR OF ASSOCIATION LOAN DIVISION, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, much of the excellent work performed by Federal Government officials seldom receives public attention. It is a pleasure for me, therefore, to call attention to an article which praises the fine, sympathetic performance by Mr. Henry Palm, Director of the Association Loan Division of the Farmers Home Administration, in handling an appeal for special help from a small community in my State.

The Indianapolis Star, on September 4, 1966, published an article under the byline of Ben Cole that reflected the human side of the Federal bureaucracy. The devastating Palm Sunday tornadoes that raked the Midwest over a year ago left the town of Russiaville, Ind., in shambles. Because this town of approximately 2,600 Hoosiers was unincorporated, it lacked a major qualification for participation in Federal programs. The town had no central water or sewer system, and the prospects for rebuilding the town into a prosperous community were indeed dim.

Town leaders labored in vain to locate Federal programs that would provide the assistance needed for its reconstruction.

It was because of the situation of unincorporated communities such as Russiaville that I included a section in my comprehensive disaster relief bill, S. 1861, which would allow such communities to qualify for Federal assistance.

Fortunately, Henry Palm sympathetically took steps to expedite their application for assistance from the Farmers Home Administration when the town achieved incorporated status.

Russiaville is indeed grateful to Henry Palm for his understanding and cooperation in this matter. Because of this meritorious service, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Cole be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star-Sun, Sept. 4, 1966]

RUSIAVILLE GETS SYMPATHY PLUS CASH FROM CAPITAL'S BUREAUCRACY

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—When the Palm Sunday tornado cut through Russiaville, Ind., in 1965 it created a unique disaster relief problem.

The Federal agencies that flew to the aid of other Indiana cities gave Russiaville the cold-shoulder. The little town was unincorporated, and being so could not obtain Federal credit to rebuild its broken water and sewer system, or restore other community services.

Town attorney Bob Kinsey came to Washington and went from door to door in the government office buildings, trying to get a hearing.

At last, Kinsey discovered Henry Palm, the chief of the loan and grants division of the Farmers Home Administration.

Palm is one of those patient, understanding Federal officials whose sense of duty goes beyond merely what is set out in the code of agency regulations.

"Now, let's see," he began. "Hmm. I think we can work this out . . ."

Palm helped Kinsey figure out how the Farmers Home Administration could assume jurisdiction over Russiaville's destruction. Last week after a year of red-tape cutting, Palm notified the town that he was making a \$103,000 grant and \$445,000 loan to enable Russiaville to put its water and sewer systems back into operation.

WORKERS OPPOSE TERMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, recently a news release emanated from the Southern Conference of the United Textile Workers of America, which was held at Mountain View Hotel, Gatlinburg, Tenn. I should like to read the news release because I think it makes sense. It is cogent and relates to a matter that has been discussed time and again on the floor of the Senate. It is a matter which affects jobs in my own beloved State of Rhode Island. The release expresses the American view of the highest value—the bread-and-butter view of the textile worker on the job.

The release reads:

A recent proposal by Rep. THOMAS B. CURTIS (R., Mo.) calling for the termination of all international textile agreements, was

September 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21435

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 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 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.

Senator Fulbright, for instance, has not taken direct issue with the policy for Asia that President Johnson spelled out at White Sulphur Springs on July 12th. He preferred to argue that the President ought to have consulted Congress first. It is an argument that would have carried more weight if Mr. Truman had consulted Congress before deciding that the Americans must take over the job of defending Greece and Turkey—the "Truman doctrine"—in 1947. 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 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?

THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. MARCOS, OF THE PHILIPPINES, WILL VISIT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, President and Mrs. Ferdinand Marcos, of the Philippines, are to pay this Nation a state visit this week. Our two countries have traditionally close ties, dating back to 1895, and the Philippines in 1946 was the first Asian country granted its political independence by a large power.

Americans vividly recall the role played by the people of the Philippines in World War II. President Marcos, the sixth popularly elected Chief Executive of his country, is known as the most-decorated Philippine soldier in that conflict.

President Marcos received 27 decorations for his heroism. A survivor of the Bataan death march, he joined the U.S. Army as a lieutenant. He was wounded five times, captured by the enemy and escaped to return to battle. His decorations include the U.S. Silver Star and the Distinguished Service Cross, and he attained the rank of a full colonel.

President Marcos is a man not only of physical bravery, but of outstanding in-

lectual ability. As a law student, he was brilliant in his studies and passed the bar examination with record high marks. He has served in both branches of the Philippine Congress and in numerous official positions for his country.

The visit to this Nation comes almost 11 months after President Marcos was elected to head his government by a 600,000-vote majority over his opponent. Both he and his lovely wife are active in state affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the September 11, 1966, issue of Parade magazine, which tells of the many fine accomplishments of this visiting First Lady, be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMELDA MARCOS: THE FIRST LADY OF ASIA—THIS BEAUTY AND HER HUSBAND, PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES, WILL PAY US A STATE VISIT

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Imelda Romualdez Marcos, the brunette wife of the president of the Philippines, who is about to visit the U.S. comes on strong. Besides magnificent honey-colored skin, eyes of fiery topaz and the figure of a beauty queen, she has brains and energy to boot.

When President and Mrs. Johnson get their first look at "Meldy," as 32 million adoring Filipinos call her, they will discover why she is regarded in some quarters as the First Lady of Asia. Her style, cultural flair and interest in much needed welfare projects, set against the backdrop of the young democracy her husband leads, have earned her comparison with Jacqueline Kennedy and Eleanor Roosevelt.

"It's a privilege to be associated with them," Mrs. Marcos said in rippling silk accents—her folk singing on the campaign trail helped elect her husband—"but I would rather be myself."

At 36 Mrs. Marcos, mother of three is the glamorous teammate of 49-year-old Ferdinand E. Marcos, World War II hero and political wonder boy, who was elected the Philippines' sixth president last November, ousting incumbent Diosdado Macapagal. Overcoming her early distaste for politics, she barnstormed for her husband by plane, car, jeep and outrigger canoe.

"He's hired a movie star," a political foe charged after Mrs. Marcos had enchanted voters by singing in Ilocano, the tongue of her husband's province in northern Luzon, and in her own Visayan dialect. In pointed heels and bright Philippine *terno*, the traditional floor-length dress with butterfly sleeves, she hiked back the rutted road to prove she was really the candidate's wife.

Now she is official hostess at Malacañang, the rambling white presidential palace set among acacias and circled by a wrought-iron fence, in teeming, humid Manila. The Palace was formerly the residence of Spanish and U.S. governors. Choosing their private apartment there was a problem, Mrs. Marcos recalled humorously, "because in one wing of the Palace all the presidents died, and in the other all the presidents lost."

Finally they settled on a four-bedroom suite. There, in endless, animated private talks, they mull over plans for their current effort to renew Filipino pride in a national heritage tracing back to 3000 B.C.

"You're in charge of culture and welfare," the president told his wife at his inaugural, an event attended by Vice President and Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey.

In a nation still battling poverty and corruption, the assignment might seem stag-

gering to anyone but "Meldy," who in less than a year has launched a flurry of projects which have captured the popular imagination, inspiring the "haves" to dig deep into their pockets for her causes.

Her kickoff for a 35-million-peso cultural center raised the first million in a single night. She managed the feat by gathering political and social leaders together for a gala benefit of *Flower Drum Song* with an all-Filipino cast. The remainder of the money was collected from private sources in four months, and construction on the combination theater, library and museum is scheduled to begin shortly.

Now Mrs. Marcos is boosting a national market for Philippine art and handicrafts. In addition, she is up to her eyelashes in promoting tourism, selling beautification and coordinating a cradle-to-grave welfare program for which private and government agencies equally share the costs. Children, juvenile delinquents, unwed mothers, prisoners, the mentally retarded and the aged, all are due to benefit.

"When you are First Lady, you can work yourself to death, or you can sleep," contends Mrs. Marcos. "When I lie down even for a minute, I tell myself I could be helping a hundred, perhaps a thousand people, in that time."

A BEATLE BOO-BOO

Filipinos respond with a fierce loyalty. In July the Beatles, given the red carpet treatment on their arrival in Manila, were lucky to get away alive after affronting the First Lady by failing to keep a Palace luncheon date. Shouts of "Scram!" "Get out of our country!" and a score of unprintable curses were hurled by the angry crowd. The mop-haired troupe was pushed and shoved, and one of their party was kicked to the ground. Police protection and other courtesies were withdrawn.

Mrs. Marcos's warmth and charm are lavished on friend and critic alike. When the Philippine congress voted to send troops to fight beside the U.S. in South Vietnam, pro-Communist demonstrators picketed the Palace. President Marcos called in the leaders, but his wife ventured outside to wave and smile to the pickets. Applauding, they departed quickly.

Public life is not new to this First Lady. She is a member of the Romualdez family of Leyte, a powerful political clan which has produced senators, congressmen, ambassadors, a Supreme Court justice, governors and bank presidents. Her father was Dean of Law at St. Paul's College, where she earned a bachelor's degree in education and later won a music scholarship and worked at teaching and writing. Her younger brother, Benjamin, is the newly named ambassador to the U.S.

"MISS LEYTE"

Imelda grew up in Manila. She was sent there to study after her mother's death. She was then 8 years old, and she lived with her uncle, the Speaker of the Philippine House, who served as her guardian. At 18, her good looks, lyric soprano voice and 36-23-35 measurements won her the title of "Miss Leyte." At 24, her whirlwind romance with Marcos was a national sensation.

The love story began when Imelda and her aunt visited the capitol during a late session. Marcos, a young congressman who had emerged from the war with nearly every decoration bestowed by the Philippine and U.S. governments, was in the thick of battle again—this time fighting the administration on its budget.

Although 13 years Imelda's senior and considered Manila's most eligible bachelor, Marcos succumbed after one look and sought an introduction. But "Meldy" refused to give him her telephone number. Undaunted, Marcos pursued her to Baguio, the summer capital, where the courtship flourished.

Eleven days after their first meeting, they were married in a civil ceremony. To the bridegroom's surprise, Mrs. Marcos refused to enter the hotel suite he had reserved, until a church wedding could be arranged 10 days later.

To this day the presidential pair believe 11 is their lucky number. As Mrs. Marcos explains it, "My husband was born September 11. We were married after 11 days of courtship. We had our first child, Maria Imelda, about 11 months afterward. We were sure we were going to win this election because this is the 11th year of our marriage."

Most evenings the president takes time to help his children, Maria Imelda, 11, Ferdinand Jr., 7, and Irene, 5, with their studies in Tagalog, the official Philippine language, as well as English and Spanish.

Then, at the end of each day, Mr. and Mrs. Marcos enjoy comparing notes.

Besides Philippine styles, she wears slacks, Paris frocks, Italian knits and American suits but seldom dons her fabulous jewels. The president describes his wife, who dances the frug and jerk, as "irrepressible." She describes their marriage as "out of this world."

"Whatever I am, I am Ferdinand's creation," the First Lady claims. "He has helped me to grow with him, not side by side, but a little behind him."

PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY TO NAVY SEABEE MARVIN GLEN SHIELDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was proud and honored to be present at the White House today as the widow of Navy Seabee Marvin Glen Shields, of my State of Washington, received the Congressional Medal of Honor in his behalf posthumously. Mr. Shields, a native of Port Townsend, Wash., is the first member of the Seabees to receive the Medal of Honor. This heroic young man, who died in the service of his country, receives this highest of awards on the eve of the 25th anniversary of the Navy Seabees. A construction mechanic, third class, his honor is a tribute to the more than 300,000 Americans who have served in the Seabees since its inception in 1942.

I wish to point out also that Marvin Glen Shields is the first Navy man to receive this award in the Vietnam war. Four Army men have won the Medal of Honor in Vietnam. Significantly, Army Special Forces 1st Lt. Charles Williams won a Congressional Medal of Honor in the same action at Dong Xoai in South Vietnam on June 10, 1965, that took the life of Marvin Shields and posthumously won for him the Medal of Honor.

Lieutenant Williams, who was present at the presentation of the Medal of Honor to Mrs. Shields at the White House today, asked for a volunteer to accompany him in an attempt to knock out an enemy machinegun emplacement which was endangering the lives of a besieged special forces, Seabee, and Vietnamese camp at Dong Xoai. Williams and Shields, in a heroic effort, were successful in silencing this Vietcong weapon, and Shields, whose mission at this camp was in construction, lost his life.

I am also proud of the 8 other Seabees who fought with the 11 special forces men in that incident at Dong Xoai. Of these nine Seabees, eight won Purple Heart medals. All nine won awards for

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR DESALTING PLANT

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant off the Orange County coast in southern California.

This project will be constructed on an artificial offshore island. It will utilize two nuclear reactors with an electrical capacity of about 1,800 megawatts and a sea water desalting plant which will produce 150 million gallons daily of distilled water—enough to supply a city the size of San Francisco.

The total capital cost of the dual power producing and desalination project will be \$400 million of which the Department of the Interior is being asked to participate in the amount of \$57.2 million.

A very detailed study of this proposal has been conducted by an independent engineering firm, and it shows the project will have a very high level of return in comparison with the initial expenditure. It shows that large scale desalting is economically feasible, and that the excess power produced by the reactors can be used to help fulfill our ever-growing need for electrical power.

The project has the support, both in terms of capital and cooperation, of two of the Nation's leading private power companies—Southern California Edison Co. and the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. These companies have further agreed to purchase all the excess power produced.

The Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District, which distributes water throughout southern California, has agreed to support and cooperate in the project. One of the main points in favor of the project is that it is a water source independent of the flow of river and aquaduct systems, and, in an emergency, it might well prove more valuable than any of us are now predicting.

This will be the world's largest desalination plant. It will be a showplace of great interest to the people of the many areas around the world, and in our own country, who are in need of water and power, and to those who see the day rapidly approaching when this need will arise.

The President of the United States has asked Congress to approve this project. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has agreed to introduce a companion measure. It is my hope that we can act with dispatch and thereby assure the earliest possible completion of this most worthy project.

THE VIETNAM ELECTIONS

(Mr. CRALEY (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to

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

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday we witnessed a very significant stage in the development of democratic government and national independence in South Vietnam. I was impressed with the healthy and enthusiastic turnout for the elections, a support for the electoral process that exceeded the most optimistic expectations.

Much remains to be done in building a secure and stable government in an area for centuries dominated by stronger neighbors. I think the Saigon government is to be congratulated on the achievement of this first and important step. I should like to wish every success to the new constituent assembly in their constitution making. I believe the American people in their support for this struggling nation have rendered important help at a crucial time.

The New York Times carried an editorial commenting on the election which I shall include here in the RECORD:

AFTER THE ELECTION

The natural sequel to the successful election in South Vietnam on Sunday is to try to calculate what effect it may have on the efforts to bring about negotiations and an ultimate truce or peace.

Logically, the results should convince Hanoi that the Saigon Government now has an enhanced and legitimate status of its own as a national entity. Whatever government finally comes out of the long process of constitution making, congressional or legislative assembly meeting, will not change the general picture insofar as the prosecution of the war is concerned. If there is to be a change it has to be on the North Vietnamese side and this is not going to be an overnight development.

But the election may lead in time toward a better balance of the forces within the two Vietnams. Marshal Ky was understandably elated by the results, but he was much too optimistic in saying, as he did yesterday, that "we now have the conditions for final victory." The sort of victory he contemplates—or certainly always has in the past—is military. It comprehends the defeat of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, plus the acceptance of that defeat by Communist China and the Soviet Union. This, of course, will be a very long journey from Sunday's election that could not embrace all of the South Vietnamese and that did not immediately make South Vietnam militarily stronger or her enemies militarily weaker.

So far as the United States is concerned, just as many American troops, planes and as much materiel are going to be needed as before, because the war is as tough and costly as it ever was.

What has happened provides some hope that a government can be organized in Saigon in the course of the coming year or two which will have a good deal of popular support. The militant Buddhist opposition should not now be able to cause anything like the trouble it did last year. And though Vietcong naturally will refuse to concede the fact, the election was hardly a demonstration that they enjoy the support of South Vietnam's population outside the regions they control.

Since no war lasts interminably, the Vietnamese conflict is going to end some day. The problem is to create the conditions that will permit it to end as soon as possible. A military victory is unlikely. Sooner or later the end will come around a negotiating table. It will, in effect, be a political solution. The election in South Vietnam is one step toward

preparing the stage for an eventual settlement.

INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

(Mr. O'BRIEN (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, as further demonstration of the economic growth and industrial progress in the U.S. Virgin Islands, another great bank opened its doors there yesterday, September 12. I salute New York's First National City Bank and wish good luck to Mr. Robert Eastham, manager of its new bank in Christiansted, St. Croix.

As it opens its doors for business, this bank has every reason to be confident of the future.

The island of St. Croix has experienced a tremendous economic growth in recent years; most recently noted by the establishment of a \$50 million alumina plant and a multimillion dollar petrochemical complex now under construction. Tourist trade in 1965 was \$54 million, an increase of \$6 million over the previous year. St. Croix, the largest of the U.S. Virgin Islands, has a population of around 20,000 people with a per capita income of \$2,000, by far the highest in the entire Caribbean area.

Linked to the mainland and other Caribbean islands by several airlines and boat services, St. Croix is destined to be one of the most important commercial centers in that area. Among the reasons why New York's First National City Bank is starting operations in St. Croix, is their desire to help in the island's development, and to show the faith it has in the future of the Virgin Islands.

Heading the list of distinguished banking executives participating in the opening ceremonies was Mr. George C. Scott, senior vice president of the First National City Bank in New York. Mr. Robert Eastham, manager of the St. Croix branch, was host to the industrialists, businessmen, and high government officials from the Virgin Islands present at the inaugural ceremonies. Virgin Islands government officials participating included Hon. Ralph Palewonsky, Governor of the U.S. Virgin Islands; Hon. Ciry King, Government Secretary; and Hon. Dr. Aubrey Anduze, Administrative Assistant for St. Croix. The new First National City Bank branch in St. Croix, marks Citibank's first entry in the Virgin Islands market, although it has been operating in other parts of the Caribbean for several years. Among the countries where First National City Bank now operates in the Caribbean area are, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Trinidad, and the Bahamas.

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

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

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam continues to arouse the gravest anxiety among people here and abroad who are earnestly concerned with building peace and order in the world.

The President has repeatedly stressed that our objectives in southeast Asia are limited. The assistance we are rendering does not give us license to dictate the political destiny of the South Vietnamese. This is a point which must be reemphasized, and which must be made credible to the Asian peoples. The President has reaffirmed that American forces are in Vietnam to help the Vietnamese defeat aggression and defend self-determination. This can only be interpreted as a carefully prescribed engagement. As a foreign power on the Asian Continent, we should resist the tendency to escalate both the commitment and the means of military self-defense.

Several weeks ago, Premier Ky was quoted as welcoming an invasion of North Vietnam and an eventual confrontation with Red China. Although this statement has been subsequently modified, militarists may be setting their sights far beyond the expressed aims of our own Government, whose interest lies in insuring that the South Vietnamese people can freely choose their political and social course. There can be no ambiguity on this point; we must consistently disavow professed ambitions which outrun the American purpose in Vietnam.

Those who understand the limited nature of our stand in Vietnam must not be tempted into arguing blithely for some wider war which, supposedly, can more speedily produce what is described as "victory."

The world must know that American policy, despite the deployment of over 300,000 men, aims at a peaceful solution of this conflict.

It is doubtful as to whether the bombing of North Vietnam, and the continuing increase of American manpower, can alone bring about the conditions conducive to negotiation. Indeed, the truth may be that escalation breeds counter escalation, and that a broader military employment strengthens the resolve of the North Vietnamese. Because these questions, in terms of the future, cannot be answered with surety, the United States must redouble its efforts, through all available channels, to find the path to peace.

One recent, welcome development was the proposal of Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, sponsored by the Governments of Malaysia and the Philippines, for convening an Asian conference on Vietnam. This was envisaged as a gathering of the noncombatant Asian states to discuss various means toward bringing the war to a close.

As one who has consistently asked for greater efforts in reaching a diplomatic settlement of this war, by urging our Government to declare its willingness to

reconvene the Geneva Conference, and to press vigorously for a more effective United Nations role, I feel that this suggested meeting, emanating from Asian states, could make a major contribution. I urge that our Government officially and relentlessly pursue this proposal with Asian statesmen.

Whatever the extent of our involvement in South Vietnam, the effects of this conflict are and will be felt in Asia. Thinking of the future, the United States cannot ignore or become divorced from vital currents of opinion in Asia with respect to its policies there. We should make every attempt to encourage the governments of Asia to discuss collectively the American presence in Vietnam, and endorse their initiatives toward finding the basis for a peaceful accord of the war.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEABEES, AND THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a measure in this body yesterday to authorize the striking of medallions in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions—Seabees—and the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Navy Civil Engineer Corps—CEC.

The Engineer Corps anniversary will occur next year on March 2 and the Seabees anniversary on March 5.

I rise today to call attention to my bill because I believe it to be a most fitting occasion. This morning at the White House, the first Seabee in the illustrious history of the organization was awarded, posthumously, the Medal of Honor by the President.

Marvin Glenn Shields, CM3, of Port Townsend, Wash., died on June 10, 1965, from wounds received while members of his unit, Seabee Team 1104, were assisting in the defense of the Special Forces camp at Dong Xoai against an attack by the Vietcong. The attack began late the previous night.

While assisting a wounded Army officer to a safe position, Shields sustained wounds about his face, neck and back. Despite these wounds he continued steadfast in fighting against the Vietcong, both by means of his rifle and by throwing hand grenades.

When light broke on the morning of the 10th, Shields readily volunteered to assist in destroying an enemy machinegun emplacement. Though he had never used a 3.5-inch rocket launcher before, he performed the job well and was instrumental in destroying the position while under heavy enemy fire.

In returning to his previous position machinegun fire struck his right leg, nearly tearing it off. Though mortally wounded, he was able to move to a sheltered position and received aid. Throughout the remainder of the morn-

ing he was instrumental in keeping up the spirits of the defenders by laughing and making jokes.

Shields died that afternoon shortly after being evacuated by helicopter.

Construction Mechanic Shields is survived by his wife, Joan, an infant daughter, and his mother, Mrs. Victoria Cas-salery, all of Port Townsend. The first Seabee Medal of Honor in history was presented this morning by the President to Joan Shields. It was also the first Medal of Honor to be awarded a Navy man in the Vietnam war.

Construction Mechanic Shields received his training at the U.S. Naval Construction Battalion Center at Port Hueneme, Calif., "Home of the Pacific Seabees," which is located in the district I have the honor of representing in this body. From there he went forth to his death in defense of his country, in an act of bravery "above and beyond the call of duty," earning for him the Nation's highest military award.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in my remarks at this point the text of two issues of Seabees in Action, which is published by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command. The first of these is entitled "Story of the Seabees: World War II to Vietnam" and the second is entitled "The Dong Xoai Story, June 9-10, 1965."

STORY OF THE SEABEES—WORLD WAR II TO VIETNAM: THE SEABEE TRADITION
(By LCDR W. D. Middleton)

The Navy's Seabees were less than six months old when their first unit came under fire early in World War II. Only three weeks after the Marines assaulted the beaches of Guadalcanal in August 1942, Seabees of the Sixth Naval Construction Battalion followed them ashore to begin the difficult job of converting a muddy former Japanese landing strip at Henderson Field into an all-weather airfield capable of supporting anything from fighter aircraft to Army B-17's.

The construction job was tough enough, but to make matters worse Henderson Field was under almost constant attack by Japanese artillery and aircraft, and great craters were torn in the airfield every time a bomb or shell scored a hit. As if all this didn't give them enough to do, the Seabees had to be ready to take up positions in the defensive perimeter in the event of Japanese landing against the narrow beachhead.

Typical of Seabee ingenuity at Guadalcanal were the "crater crews" that rushed to repair the damage after every hit on the airfield. Quickly learning from experience, the Seabees stockpiled Marston matting (the pierced steel planking used to surface the field) along the runway in bundles sufficient to repair an average sized hole. Construction equipment and trucks, already loaded with enough sand and gravel to fill a bomb or shell crater, were placed under cover at strategic points along the runway.

Whenever Japanese bombers approached or artillery opened up, the Seabee "crater crews" raced from their foxholes, tore away damaged matting, backfilled the craters, and quickly laid down new matting. Before long the Seabees were doing the job so rapidly that forty minutes after a bomb or shell it was impossible to tell that the airfield had ever been hit.

Throughout the three-month battle for Guadalcanal the Seabees performed construction miracles to expand Henderson Field and to keep it open, at one time continuing work even when Japanese troops had pushed the Marine front line to within

valor in the performance of a daring exploit on the lower Delaware in 1777. With four small boats he had cut out an armed British schooner without the loss of a man, and captured at the same time a number of transports and a large quantity of supplies destined for British troops.

Barry then volunteered for duty with the American Army and participated with distinction in the Trenton campaign. He was then given command of the *Raleigh*, 32 guns, with which he fought a gallant and obstinate battle against superior forces, finally being obliged to beach his ship, but saving most of his men from capture.

His most successful cruise started in February of 1781 when he sailed from Boston for France commanding the *Alliance*. He captured the privateer *Alert* en route. He put down a mutiny, and then captured the privateers *Mars* and *Minerva*. After a fierce engagement he forced two British brigs, the *Atlanta* and the *Trepassey* to strike their colors. Barry was severely wounded in the action.

To Barry belongs the distinction of having fought the last naval action of the War for Independence. Aboard the *Alliance* he arrived at Martinique early in January of 1783 and found orders to proceed to Havana. Leaving that port he encountered the *Sybilie*. His first mate, John Kessler, wrote as follows about the engagement:

Two of the enemy's ships kept at a distance on our weather quarter as if waiting to ascertain about the French ship, while the other was in our wake with topsails only and courses hauled, as was also the case with the *Alliance*. The French ship approaching fast, Captain Barry went from gun to gun on the main deck, cautioning against too much haste and not to fire until the enemy was right abreast. He ordered the main topsail hove to the mast that the enemy (who had already fired a bow gun, the shot of which struck into the cabin of the *Alliance*) might come up as soon as he was abreast, when the action began, and before an half hour her guns were silenced and nothing but musketry was fired from her. She appeared very much injured in her hull. She was of thirty-two guns and appeared very full of men, and after an action of forty-five minutes she sheered off. Our injured were, I think, three killed and eleven wounded (three of whom died of their wounds) and one sail and rigging cut. During all the action the French lay to as well as the enemy's ships.

As soon as the ship which we had engaged hove from us, her consorts joined her and all made sail, after which the French ship came down to us, and Captain Barry asked them why they did not come down during the action. They answered that they thought we might have been taken and the signal known and the action only a sham to decoy him. Their foolish idea thus perhaps lost us the three frigates, for Captain Barry's commencing the action was with the full expectation of the French ship joining and thereby not only be able to cope, but in fact subdue part, if not the whole, of them. The French captain proposed, however, giving chase, which was done; but it soon appeared that his ship would not keep up with us, and the chase was given over.

Years later, in 1794, when the Congress of the United States ordered the construction of six frigates to combat the depredations of the Algerian pirates,

Barry was named senior captain and placed in command of the *United States*, being, as was said:

Of all the naval captains that remained . . . the one who possessed the greatest reputation for experience, conduct, and skill.

During the hostilities with France, Barry was placed in command of all the naval forces in West Indian waters, remaining there until the beginning of May 1799. In December of that year he escorted the American envoys to France. On his return he took command of the Guadeloupe station in the West Indies, a position he retained until 1801. He died 2 years later at the head of the U.S. Navy.

On this anniversary of his death, we salute the memory of a great man, a great naval leader, and a great Irish American, Commodore John Barry.

More Harm Than Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although the House has rejected Mr. PATMAN's proposal for controlling the interest rates, I believe the editorial in the *Detroit News* for September 1, 1966, entitled "More Harm Than Help," is of special significance.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

PATMAN'S PLAN TO CUT INTEREST RATES:
 MORE HARM THAN HELP

The furor over high interest rates is reaching a fever pitch. Rep. PATMAN, Texas Democrat, self-styled friend of the "little man" and arch-foe of the "bankers," has proposed a bill cutting the interest rate banks pay on certain time deposits. The proposal is more senile than sensible.

PATMAN wants to impose a 4½ percent interest rate ceiling on certificates of deposit. These CDs, now paying a maximum 5½ percent, are special time deposits which, it is claimed, have attracted funds from savings and loan associations paying lower interest rates.

As a device to cut interest rates, the bill is clearly nonsensical. It would make bank credit more difficult to obtain than it is now, and the cost of borrowing would rise still more. Bank lending capacity depends on the volume of deposits. If new deposits are obtained, more loans can be made. But if banks lose deposits because they cannot pay a competitive return, bank lending quickly dries up.

PATMAN deludes himself and others by arguing that the interest rate rollback would return funds to the savings and loan associations, relieving the ultra-tight market for home mortgages. The general level of interest rates is now so high that neither the 4 percent paid by federal savings and loan associations nor the proposed 4½ percent offered by banks would be able to attract funds. Instead, savings would move into into bonds and other financial paper which continue to pay higher and more competitive rates.

While PATMAN's bill would do nothing to help the savings institutions, it might have

an unfavorable effect on banks. Forced to pay below-market rates, the banks could experience a rapid exodus of funds and find themselves in a squeeze. The monetary authorities would have little choice but to rescue them by easing the supply of money. And in turn, this would refuel whatever inflationary fires tight money has been able to extinguish.

If PATMAN, or any of his supporters, wants lower interest rates to help the "little man," there is only one way to get them. Take enough excess demand out of the economy so that tight monetary policy is no longer the sole policy bulwark against inflation. This can be done only if Congress cuts spending or increases taxes.

Since the "little man" must pay taxes along with everyone else, his congressional friends might show their affection by putting a ceiling on government spending instead of pursuing fruitless battles with the bankers.

**Honolulu Advertiser Editor John Griffin
 Writes Firsthand Report on Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am a firm supporter of the view that there is no adequate substitute for actual experience. Our late President, John F. Kennedy, must have had this in mind when he asked his military commanders to parade before him a division of men—just so that he could see for himself the size of a division.

Unfortunately, time and circumstance do not always permit us the benefit of real experience, so we must rely on secondary sources of information to bring us as close as possible to actual experience. I should therefore like to share with my colleagues a recent newspaper article which, in its sweeping coverage of the Vietnam war, could readily serve as a vicarious substitute for those of us who are unable to make an actual study of the situation in that country.

Written by Associate Editor John Griffin of the *Honolulu Advertiser*, the front page article is a "must" for those who wish to know what is going on in Vietnam. Of particular interest, in the light of announced troop increases, is Editor Griffin's comprehensive account of troop commitments in the various parts of Vietnam. His discussion of the military zones—the four corps areas—provides the reader a clear and up-to-date picture of the war in Vietnam.

I am pleased to submit the *Honolulu Advertiser* August 24 article for inclusion in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*:

[From the *Honolulu Advertiser*, Aug. 24, 1966]

IN SOUTH VIETNAM, THE ENEMY IS EVERYWHERE

(By John Griffin, associate editor, the *Advertiser*)

(Fourth of a series)

SAIGON.—It would be vastly unfair to many talented and brave men and women to claim any "war correspondent" expertise on the basis of a week's revisit to Saigon with a

labor market which is constantly upgrading its educational and technical requirements, spells a serious dilemma indeed.

Problems of urbanization

Other "costs" of population growth are found in the rapid process of urbanization: slums and overcrowding, inadequate educational facilities, congested traffic conditions, air and water pollution, the deleterious effects of increased internal migration on intergroup relationships—just to list a few examples.

To ignore the problems of our cities, or to close our eyes to such issues as chronic unemployment or rising welfare costs, could well be the road to economic suicide. As businessmen, we must participate actively in constructive programs on all such fronts. This participation will prove to be helpful only if we approach these problems armed with the facts. That's why the proposed research in depth on population problems by the National Industrial Conference Board appeals to me so strongly.

Rapid population growth not necessary to economic health

One point should be heavily emphasized. A rapidly growing population is not a necessary precondition for the continued development of our economy. A declining birth rate need not have an adverse effect on business. Although the traditional assumption in this country has been that a rapidly growing population leads to increased demand and, hence, stimulates investment, a careful analysis of the world situation, as set forth above, shows that rapid population growth may and frequently has operated to inhibit economic development.

If it is surmised that there will be developed a twenty per cent increase in purchasing power during the next five or ten years (certainly not an outrageous assumption), the effect on the growth of the economy would offset a considerable decrease in the rate of population growth. To be sure, rapid population growth in our own economic history and in the history of the West in general seems to have stimulated economic development. But in these instances, unlike the situation in many developing countries, the man-land ratio was low and a greater population was needed to achieve the economies of large-scale production. Today, however, the situation is very different. We no longer live in a traditional frontier society. We are living, however, on an entirely new kind of frontier.

The American business system will continue, most assuredly, to be characterized and propelled by inventiveness, imagination and enlarged appetites and interests. Mankind has thousands of unmet needs and, in the future, we will learn to express and fulfill needs of which we are at present unaware. Increasing productivity to meet such new and diversified needs is the future to which we should look. Our economy no longer requires the stimulation of rapid population growth to keep it healthy.

V. THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN VALUES

In closing, I respectfully submit that business should never become so involved with statistics as to lose sight of the importance and dignity of the individual.

Whether we are talking about population problems here in the U.S., in the developing countries, or in the world at large, we must never forget that we cannot measure progress simply by aggregate statistics reflecting per capita living standards. We must also strive to see that each person is assured the opportunity to possess the ingredients of a full and satisfactory life. These include not merely the basic necessities such as food, housing, health, and education, but also the satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men. Only in this way can we meet the

need and responsibility to supply moral leadership in a tormented world.

If we truly accept this responsibility and sincerely and thoughtfully become concerned with the quality of life, we have no choice but to be also concerned with the quantity of life. Since we are growing to believe in the right to die with dignity, perhaps we will eventually espouse a comparable belief in the right to be born with dignity. It seems that we might well endorse the current proposal to add a fifth freedom—freedom of the right of everyone to make intelligent choices as to parenthood and the birth of children.

Whatever may prove to be the ultimate resolution of this essentially moral question, we in the business community must work together with government and private groups to forge a common point of reference in this most sensitive area of human behavior. We must find a high and feasible principle which can be embraced by all people regardless of economic or ethnic background and religious belief. In all probability we will not live to see this work fully completed, but we will know that it has been begun.

Prayers in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the proposal to amend the Constitution to permit prayers in the public schools. In this connection, I think an article by Mr. Clifford B. Ward in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel expresses the views of many people, and I include it herewith:

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, determined to get a Constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in public schools, must feel that the ground is being cut out from under him by some strange people, namely clergymen of the major faiths, who are opposing him.

Yet the Senator, as a politician close to the people, feels rather strongly that most of the common people up and down the United States are in favor of his amendment.

The odd thing about those who argue that prayer in schools, even voluntary prayer, will break down the wall between church and state, is that they do not contend there was even the slightest breaching of the wall during the 150 years in this country when such prayer was legal. Nor do they contend, at least not yet, that it is any breaching of the church-state wall, for a chaplain to open each daily session of the Congress.

One of the arguments used against voluntary prayer in schools is that a very tiny minority of children of atheistic parents should not be embarrassed in school by an exercise in which they do not take part. If all rights come from God, is there a right not to worship God? Not a right in my book, but a free will, if you wish.

MOST PEOPLE BELIEVE

Actually, and in spite of Supreme Court decisions, this is a country in which the majority of people believe in God and show that belief in almost everything they do. Few are those who are completely secular. They baptize. They hold Bar Mitzvah. They marry before ministers, priests and rabbis.

And they insist upon religious services at their funerals. Atheists are as uncommon as trees in a desert.

The greatest religious influence in this country undoubtedly comes from within the family unit, which in turn draws its inspiration from the organized fonts of religion, which are churches, temples and synagogues. Yet the family can not do the job completely when its sphere of influence is limited in a society such as ours, where all members of the family are for many hours of the day separated from each other.

No child of course should be compelled by government to say a prayer. But government should, under the First Amendment, provide the opportunity for a free exercise of religion without harassment. Voluntary prayer in schools is the provision of such an opportunity.

DENIAL OF BAN SILLY

There are those who say that the Supreme Court has not banned the Bible in public schools. This to my mind is a quibbling over words in a childish manner. The Court has banned readings from the Bible in public schools in any manner that admits the nature of the Bible as a religious work. It may be admired as a literary work only. It may be admired as an example of the printing art, or the bookbinder's art. But it may not be used in any way that would suggest that it is something inspired by God.

It is difficult for most ordinary persons to follow the reasoning of church leaders who suddenly see a danger in voluntary prayer that never existed for one hundred and fifty years. Unless religion is to be departmentalized to a point where it is only operative inside the walls of a home, then voluntary prayer in schools makes sense.

Commodore Barry Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 163d anniversary of the death of Commodore John Barry, the "Father of Our Navy."

Bicentennial observances of events of the Revolutionary War will soon be upon us. John Barry's great contributions to the victory of American arms in the conflict that won us our national independence from British tyranny must never be forgotten. His valor and his victories must be acknowledged in the bicentennial observances that will take place in the future, and they must be recognized today on the anniversary of his death.

He was born at Tacumshane, County Wexford, Ireland, went to sea as a boy, and about 1760 settled in Philadelphia, where he eventually became a prosperous shipmaster and shipowner. In 1776 he showed an Irishman's enthusiasm for the cause of the Colonies against British oppression and was placed in command of the brig *Lexington* by the Continental Congress. On April 17, 1776, he captured the British tender *Edward*. This was the first capture in actual battle of a British warship by a regularly commissioned American cruiser.

Barry received the personal congratulations of General Washington for his

quick trip to the 25th Division's base camp at Cu Chi, some 20 miles away.

But it is possible to better see the rough outlines of a military war that cannot be envisioned in terms of traditional fronts.

It is best viewed as a series of minor and major explosions across a countryside that ranges from swamp to sand dunes, flat flooded ricelands to grassy highlands or jungled mountains, from isolated hamlets with a dozen huts to busy cities.

As countries go, South Viet Nam is a small one, about as long as California and half as wide.

But it makes a vast battlefield, with over 1,200 miles of coastline to be patrolled and 1,000 miles of often wild and ill-defined land border that is often used as both an entry and escape point by the enemy.

That enemy—termed by a top U.S. commander as "the best guerrilla fighter the world has ever known"—is everywhere.

Total enemy strength is now estimated at about 300,000 (compared to perhaps 15,000 five years ago). Some 50,000 are said to be North Vietnamese troops, infiltrated down to the South mostly over the past year.

About 110,000 of the overall total are fighting in regular North Vietnamese or Viet Cong "main force" regiments from the South. A number of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong regiments are being integrated.

Fighting with and supporting these more traditional units are 120,000 or more guerrillas who operate in their home areas, perhaps 8,000 combat troops and over 40,000 political cadres or civilian leaders from North and South.

Against this tough and growing enemy army of 300,000 are close to a million military men on the South Vietnamese government side.

Included are about 290,000 Americans (only about half combat troops, the rest clerks, drivers, mechanics, etc.), South Vietnamese army forces, a variety of paramilitary regional and police forces, and relatively small but effective military units from South Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

There are many kinds of battles going on in South Viet Nam, but basically they break down to variations of two kinds of warfare: 1) Small to medium scale guerrilla actions where enemy units attack patrols, outposts or towns, and 2) Limited regular war with major battles involving upwards to 15-20,000 U.S. troops at a time.

Indications are we are doing well in the second kind of fighting but still have a long way to go meeting the equal threat of the guerrilla.

There are several ways to envision the sweep of the war. Inevitably some parts get overlooked, like the contribution of the Navy and Coast Guard. This would include 7th Fleet carrier operations, not just pilots but tens of thousands of men who serve yet never see Viet Nam, or the 12,000 men who patrol the coast in everything from seagoing artillery for troop support to lumbering junks to sleek new fiberglass scout craft and hovercraft that probe the rivers and by-ways of the Mekong Delta.

PROFILE OF WAR

One of the easier ways to review the war in the South is with the geography of the military war zones, the four corps areas.

The accompanying map shows those zones; each tells something about the war.

I Corps is the narrow portion of the country right under the 17th parallel and the thin demilitarized zone that makes up the border with North Viet Nam.

"Eye Corps," as it is called, is the preserve of the 76,000 U.S. Marine troops in Viet Nam.

Headlines early this month told of grim fighting in Operation Hastings, a helicopter assault that put 8,000 Marines and 3,000 South Vietnamese troops into major battle

with North Vietnamese units that had infiltrated across the 17th parallel. It was a tough, bloody victory.

But Hastings was not typical of the war the Marines have fought. Early last year they landed, and the struggle has been a slow, painful one to spread out from the populated coastal region back into the fertile valleys and rugged mountains that have been VC strongholds.

Now it's conceded they haven't been able to link up enclaves at Da Nang and nearby Cu Lai and Phu Bai and properly pacify the area. Estimates now are that 100,000 men are needed for that job.

II Corps is the biggest of the four areas with the least number of people.

For the past year, it has been considered the area of most immediate danger because it was felt enemy strategy was to drive a wedge from the central highlands to the coast, cutting the country in half.

The central highlands have become the scene of the major battles, hundreds of helicopters, thousands of men engaging North Vietnamese units in operations with names like Hawthorne, Paul Revere and Crazy Horse.

REALLY ZAPPED

Some vital victories have been won, but they don't tell all the story, as perhaps is indicated by one incident in Saigon.

I was having dinner with Washington Post correspondent Ward Just (just back after being wounded in Hawthorne). Two young soldiers crowded next to us in the restaurant listened for a while, then one said:

"You guys are correspondents, huh. Well, why don't you tell the whole story. You make everything sound like a big victory. Most of the time we slog around looking. And we get the hell shot out of us sometimes, really zapped . . ."

Despite the important qualifications however, the victories in II Corps have been the equivalent of a successful goal-line stand. Without them, the game would be all but over.

Overshadowed by the inland fighting has been the major contribution of the Korean marines and army units along the II Corps coast at Qui Nhon and Tuy Hoa.

III Corps makes up the area around Saigon, the stronghold of the government and of the Viet Cong.

It is a mixture of most else in Viet Nam—mangrove swamps on the coast, flooded delta ricelands, crowded urban centers, hot, scrubby plains, rubber plantations and jungle.

Even from Saigon it takes little imagination to envision the war:

Over late evening drinks from the top floor bar of the Majestic Hotel you can look across the Saigon River and see planes dropping flares, watch tracers flying and hear the sound of guns . . . "We've been here five years, and we're still fighting on the outskirts of Saigon," says an important U.S. military figure . . .

Even the rumble of bombs from B-52s could be heard in the predawn Saigon darkness as the Guam-based planes blasted a Viet Cong forested hideout 20 miles from the city . . .

There were no terrorist incidents while I was in Saigon. But helmeted guards with guns at the ready in sandbagged positions outside every U.S. installation attest to the fact it is only a matter of time . . .

Estimates are there are 20,000 Viet Cong agents in Saigon, but nobody really knows . . . One of Premier Ky's ministers told a French correspondent that "40 per cent of my staff are Viet Cong men and women" . . . It is that kind of a war.

The big enemy forces, of course, are farther out from the capital. Australians have been fighting them in good-sized battles near the coast in recent days.

ROLE OF 25TH

And the 25th Division from Hawaii is in a vital spot west of Saigon at Cu Chi, not far from where a tongue of land from Cambodia reaches down into Viet Nam.

There on a searing, dusty plain that is honeycombed with abandoned Viet Cong tunnels and emplacements, the division operates, surrounded by barbed wire, sending out patrols and bigger units into a countryside that for 20 years has been virtually governed by the enemy.

Right next door is the infamous Ho Bo Woods, where reportedly the National Liberation Front (the enemy political arm) was formed in 1961. It is still a Viet Cong stronghold.

The South Vietnamese army's 25th Division (still located nearby) was shattered and almost ineffective when the U.S. 25th arrived in January "Not a moment too soon," say military sources.

Progress has been made and units from the 25th operate around the area. But you find few illusions about the tough job that remains.

The artillery in the camp still fires out 360 degrees in troop support, and when I asked one officer what he thought the big accomplishment had been in seven months, he said: "We haven't lost any ground."

Considering the history of the area and its high significance as a threat to Saigon, it is an important statement.

OUR FOURTH FRONT

IV Corps is mostly the famous Mekong Delta, an almost endless expanse of steamy paddyland, swamp and mangrove, cut by a few canals, countless twisting streams and some major rivers.

It holds over a third of the people in South Viet Nam—more than five million—and is perhaps the richest ricebowl in the world.

It is also soon expected to become the "Fourth Front" of the war for U.S. forces.

South Vietnamese forces, of course, operate in the other three corps areas, and in most still carry the brunt of the day-to-day war against enemy guerrilla units.

But the contribution of Vietnamese army units has been downgraded. Quite naturally U.S. military men in statements play up the better side: "They fight well when well led, which is not always true." Some units work and fight well with Americans.

But correspondents and others tell stories of understandable war weariness, high desertion rates, internal political bickering, and reluctance to fire new artillery weapons for fear of attracting enemy wrath.

The delta, unlike other areas, is the sole preserve of the Vietnamese army. There are no U.S. fighting troops there, only advisers, helicopter and navy units helping the three Vietnamese army divisions against 80,000 Viet Cong.

Pressed as it was to fight the enemy in the north, the U.S. was content to let this be. For a time, the official line was that things were going well in the Delta.

Slowly, however, the realization has come through that that is not so. At best, it is viewed as a combination military standoff and hostile gentlemen's agreement with the government holding the major towns and the Viet Cong running much of the countryside, using it as a source of food and military recruits.

Some suggest the enemy is creating diversions further north while it rebuilds popular support in the Delta and prepares for a bitter guerrilla warfare showdown.

Whatever, there are many who might agree with the Vietnamese commander of the area who said: "The war began in the Delta and it will end there."

Reports are that it is now only a matter of weeks and available troops before the U.S. moves into the Delta. It will be a small buildup at first, but the leaked estimates of four divisions or 100,000 men are hardly out

of line with military thinking about how the job should be done.

WALL-TO-WALL TRAGEDY

Nothing so tragically points up the problems of the air war in the South as the way U.S. Air Force jets bombed and strafed a Delta hamlet near Can Tho, killing or wounding more than 100 civilians.

Indications are such things happen far more often than officials like to admit. One can argue that the peasants blame the Viet Cong even more for drawing the bombs to the hamlet, but there is still no doubt that our own misplaced air power can be, and has been, a weapon against us.

It is one thing to hear an air force officer at a briefing say "we can put wall-to-wall napalm down on any area of the country, right in front of our troops." It is something far grimmer to envision that weapon broiling innocent villagers trapped with the enemy.

There is, however, the tremendously positive side of air power's contribution to the war. Some feel that in the critical months last year it was the difference.

Certainly it is an impressive operation: Day and night bombers circle in the sky; they can be over a target almost anywhere in the country in 15 minutes, usually less. * * * At night lumbering DC-8s, converted into combination flare ships and gun platforms, are aloft, ready to light up and strafe an attacking enemy. * * * A new radar technique can guide bombers in monsoon rains to drop bombs on an enemy attacking the very fringes of an isolated Special Forces camp in the remote highlands. * * * Reconnaissance jets flash over a forest at night, taking infrared photos that show the heat from enemy campfires as bright dots; a B-52 strike can hit the camp within hours. * * *

ELEPHANT AND ANTS

There is much more to the Viet Nam war. But it all adds up to a picture of tremendous effort certain to get bigger.

U.S. forces will go well past 400,000 by the end of the year. Despite the flap over what Marine Commandant General Wallace Greene did or did not say at an off-the-record session with newsmen in Saigon, the estimate that 750,000 troops and at least five years will be needed is not shocking in the light of what seems to be Saigon and private Washington thinking today.

In fact, a "realist" in the frame of current thinking might estimate it will take upwards to a million troops (for a limited time) and 15 to 20 years to save and secure South Viet Nam.

And that's if we are winning. There are those who question our approach and whether we'll really be able to outsmart and outlast the enemy on his home ground, no matter what we spend.

This will be touched on in a later article. But part of the point was made by an American correspondent:

"You can't help being impressed with the bravery of our troops and the proportions the buildup will reach over the coming months.

"But after we get the elephant built, I wonder if he'll really be able to step on all those ants."

An American official with long experience put it another way: "This war may not be win-able, but at least we've made it militarily unloseable."

Tim Seward Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like

to insert a poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD composed by my staff on the occasion of the retirement of my faithful friend and assistant, George H. "Tim" Seward.

Tim Seward has been my friend and my aid for 25 years. His leaving creates a void in my office and he shall be missed by my entire staff, by whom he is much loved, and by me in particular.

The poem follows:

TIM SEWARD DAY

We all sat for days in meditation
About a way to show our appreciation
For the many things that Tim has done
To make our life better—and much more fun.
We asked one of our group to try to compose
A poem or a verse in eloquent prose,
And the very best that she could do
As our last and final tribute to you
Is merely to propose a toast
Without being nostalgic or too verbose,
So lift your glasses and drink to Tim
We wish the best of everything to Pike and
him;

And, if after they've left, they try to
remember

This particular day in the month of Sep-
tember.

We hope they'll know that we've tried to say
We have proclaimed this as "Tim Seward
Day."

Faith: The Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, there came into my hands some time ago a compilation of writings by a constituent of mine, Mr. Fletcher Thomas Beck, of Newport, Pa. The collection is entitled "The Taunting Treasure and Other Selected Publications." It includes a number of short stories, essays, and character studies.

I have read the works with a great deal of enjoyment, largely for Mr. Beck's clear style and the worthwhile messages he has woven into his compositions. There is one particular story in the collection which would seem both to typify the author's approach quite well and to appeal to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its title is "Faith: The Secret." It is about an old gravedigger and his philosophy of life. The setting is a most beautiful one in the region of Pennsylvania from which I come.

At a time when national and international crises bear down upon us so ominously—when all manner of problems beset us on every side—it occurred to me this story might provide a source of hope and inspiration. For those inclined to cower under the sheer immensity of our troubles, its last words carry an appropriate reminder that "Faith is the great healer."

The story follows:

FAITH: THE SECRET

(By Fletcher Beck)

Old Kady, the gravedigger, had a philosophy of life incongruous to his occupation.

I met him first on a June day. Sitting on my cottage porch overlooking the village graveyard, I could see his old sou'wester,

rakishly askew, bobbing up and down as he picked away at the substrata of the grave which almost hid him from the world. I decided I would like to talk to such a different-looking person.

As I approached, he shoved his hat back and examined me with his fine brown eyes, alive with kindness and humor. Evidently I had made the grade, for after a moment of silence he drawled with a smile, "Mighty nice to see you, Bub."

We had talked several minutes before I was aware that the kindness and goodness of this mountaineer gravedigger had warmed my heart like rays of a sunrise.

Here was a man, with calloused and horny hands, doing a depressing job—the last person, I thought, to go about singing. "Just around the corner, there's a rainbow in the sky."

When night came he would plod homeward along a winding path among the hills. Tired, as I knew he must have been, he would sometimes sing lustily as if to show the world that we are prone to magnify our anxieties out of all proportion to their importance.

A clear mountain stream went tumbling by his cabin door, while all around violets, laurel, and woodbine bloomed profusely beneath a sky kindling with the magic of summer clouds and glorious sunshine. Catbird and thrush vied for a place of honor, as the bobwhite solemnly called its half-grown brood together for the night.

Here, earth and sky, fragrance and shadow, color and sound blended into one grand symphony which this gravedigger wholeheartedly embraced, gaining from it a precious treasure—peace of mind and peace of soul.

One day I said to him, "Kady, you always have the air of someone who has just discovered a gold mine. How do you get that way?"

"Hey, Bub, see this?" pointing in the direction of the sun, which was slowly sinking behind the blue Juniata Mountain. "The Master Artist who painted that sunset can paint beauty just like it in your soul if you'll give him a chance. And what's in your inners is always reflected through your skin."

It was evident that his gold-mined demeanor had won for him a host of friends. This, coupled with his desire to be of service to his neighbors, made it easy to see why he was so often singled out by his friends with a special kind of greeting: "Hello, Kady! Where do we go today?"

A typical answer: "Just across the hills to see Jim. Hear Banie, the youngest kid, is sick. These oranges may bring her a bit of cheer."

In his response reposed his secret—his philosophy of life. He completely forgot himself in his desire to bring cheer and comfort to a neighbor in need. Everyone understood that beneath his blue denim jacket beat a heart with kindly feeling for his fellow men.

It was not so difficult to understand the esteem of the mountain folk for this unusual little man. Anyone having a birthday was almost sure to receive a greeting in one form or another from Kady. It might be just "Hello, Andy, happy birthday." Or it might be a few choice hazelnuts, a bunch of medicinal herbs, a rare wild flower, or he might come smiling through your cabin door with a string of pike or bass.

Once in a while Kady told a big fish story to crack the ice on the face of some frosty old mountaineer.

"You know," he said, "the last time I was fishing I pulled a big 'un out on the bank and mounted it like you would a bucking bronco. But it just dipped into the water with Kady on its back and away we went lickety-split. The old boy Jonah didn't have much on me. Well, me and that big fish came back—for here I am."

"Yes, Kady," said neighbor Jim, "but where's the fish?"