A. No, I haven't. The Secretary of the Army comes into the picture only after the current law is changed. Assistant Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned. The Combined Command, the 3rd Army, and the Army Commander, is completed and then the two intervening court reviews are completed—the Court of Military Appeals and the Court of Military Review. The first review is mandatory, the second one depends as one of the factors involved in the determination by the Court of Military Appeals. And only after those three intermediate reviews are completed do we go to the final Court of Military Appeals and the Secretary of the Army with respect to sentencing.

Q. So you probably won't get to do it then before June?
A. Oh, no, that's quite clear.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the defense lawyers at Fort Bragg yesterday charged that your decision with regard to Generals Koester and Young were prejudicial in the case of Colonel Helmut Koester and Young were prejudicial in the case of Colonel Heroes, through inroads? Let's do that, sir?
A. No, I don't think I should— I've consistently taken the position that I shouldn't comment upon trials pending in the courts, and I think it's safer to adhere to that.

Q. When you presume that it was not prejudicial or that it did not indicate command influence?
A. As a matter of fact.

Q. To go back to your first answer— you said the wisdom of our entry into Vietnam could not not be questioned. Could it be that our opponents have a closer knowledge of law, and the facts relative to their entry into Vietnam?
A. Yes, I think I would, but as I say, I'm not myself—I haven't reached any personal final conclusion. I think if we turn it out we achieve our objective—and I think there is a good chance that we still can—namely, that the continuity of the war in Vietnam, and the stability of the government, and then if domestically we recover from our current situation, if we then have a stable government or whatever we get, then I think we need to have a very serious—more serious—impact on the Reserve Components. They would go down a couple of hundred thousand below their currently mandated manpower level.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would you say that over-all in future our country might be better off if our Army did not get involved in another Asian land war?
A. Yes, well, I don't think, again, I think it's terribly unwise to generalize for long periods in the future, but I think certainly one would say that we would weigh much more carefully the use of ground troops in Asia because I think, we see more clearly today the problems, more clearly the difficulties of limited war; but I think one of the things that was done right in the Vietnam War, and was done right in the Korean War, and was limited use of power for a limited objective, which of course turned out successfully in Korea. Korea is, I think, something we are very proud of, the result of our effort there, because today Korea's Gross National Product expands at 10 per cent a year. It has a strong ground force capable of defending themselves against the North Koreans alone, and in South Vietnam we learned from the Korean War and we continued the policy of a limited application of military power. I think the days of short wars are over. I think it's clear that our policymakers have accepted that conclusion, of course, because of the problems of nuclear weapons.

Q. Has Vietnam shown, Mr. Secretary, that our Army possibly cannot win a conclusive victory against a guerrilla force?
A. Yes. Well, I don't think, again, I think it's terribly unwise to generalize for long periods in the future, but I think certainly one would say that we would weigh much more carefully the use of ground troops in Asia because I think, we see more clearly today the problems, more clearly the difficulties of limited war; but I think one of the things that was done right in the Vietnam War, and was done right in the Korean War, and was limited use of power for a limited objective, which of course turned out successfully in Korea. Korea is, I think, something we are very proud of, the result of our effort there, because today Korea's Gross National Product expands at 10 per cent a year. It has a strong ground force capable of defending themselves against the North Koreans alone, and in South Vietnam we learned from the Korean War and we continued the policy of a limited application of military power. I think the days of short wars are over. I think it's clear that our policymakers have accepted that conclusion, of course, because of the problems of nuclear weapons.

Q. The Gates Commission underestimated the number of ascensions required—underestimated by approximately 30 million the number of true volunteers (partly because they did not have the benefit of the experience from the lottery system) and even that number does not differentiate for combat skilled and non-combat skilled personnel.

A. Our ascensions plus the number of true volunteers, computed by the Gates Commission formula, indicate that the cost for FY 1975 will be in the neighborhood of 7.3 billion dollars—although this too is still a very imprecise figure—instead of the 2.7 billion dollars estimated by the Gates Commission.
into the present-day international money mechanism the automatic adjustments reflecting the genuine economic conditions in the world. If U.S. prices are too high, if the economy is saddled with inflation, then a floating dollar would adjust those prices internationally to their real market price. That would help stimulate our exports, as export prices are lower; bring dollars in from abroad, and help to make economic adjustments long over-due.

Congressman Reuss is right. It is amounting to me that his obviously correct proposal is opposed by the Treasury. For the only substitute for it is a controlled market and a controlled price which otherwise highly conservative bankers shun.

What they appear to want is competition, for others, but controlled prices for themselves.

I commend the Reuss position to the Congress and the country. I ask unanimous consent that a short article from the New York Times reporting it and the opposition to it be printed at this point in the Record.

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

**Representative Reuss Would Let Dollar "Float" Down; Resolution Been Endorsed by Wisconsin Democrats**

**Washington**--A resolution calling for the Nixon administration to let the dollar "float" down in international currency markets was introduced by Rep. Henry Reuss, but drew an instant Treasury rebuttal.

The proposal by the Wisconsin Democrat, who presides over the international exchange unit of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, is similar to the view of a number of European financial authorities who contend the dollar is overvalued and should be allowed to drift moderately lower.

However, there has been little thought about such matters in Congress generally; analysts say, and they figure the resolution will attract little interest. A Treasury spokesman said emphatically that Mr. Reuss's proposal "is certainly not the position of the U.S. government".

Secretary John Connally made clear last week in a speech in Munich that "we aren't going to devalue" the dollar.

At present, the dollar is held to a fixed value by the Treasury's practice of paying out gold at the official price of $36 an ounce to foreign central banks wishing to turn in excess dollars. "Only by closing the gold window," Mr. Reuss argued, can the "dollar find a new and sounder relationship" with the Japanese yen and other undervalued currencies, thus avoiding "deterioration of our trading position and return to trade saturation."

The dollar is no longer so far out of line against a number of other currencies. Mr. Reuss noted, with Germany, Holland and other European countries, showing their currencies wanting to float up in exchange markets, and with Austria and Switzerland recently having set to float up in exchange markets, and with Japan's exchange markets.

"This would be a good thing for the U.S., for the world monetary system, and in the end for Japan, too," he said.

---

**Tribute to Audie Murphy**

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on Friday, May 26, a tragic airplane incident took the life of one of America's most distinguished soldiers. Audie Murphy was only 20 years old when his heroism stunned America and gave each of us a country to be proud of. During World War II, a war of unprecedented bravery, Lieutenant Murphy was our most decorated serviceman. In and out of the theaters these decorations had little meaning—a piece of metal, a scrap of cloth. He gave them to most of them away to children. It is the fact that each of these medals represents some heroic act, a risk of life and safety, the fact that Audie Murphy was our most decorated hero. He was our bravest hero. Of 235 men in his original company, only he and a supply sergeant survived the struggle from Khy to southern France.

It is Audie Murphy's selfless courage that serve as an inspiration to all Americans, young and old, their altruistic willingness to lay down one's own life for his country. Audie Murphy was our bravest hero. Of 235 men in his original company, only he and a supply sergeant survived the struggle from Khy to southern France.

It is Audie Murphy's selfless courage that serve as an inspiration to all Americans, young and old, their altruistic willingness to lay down one's own life for his country. Audie Murphy was our bravest hero. Of 235 men in his original company, only he and a supply sergeant survived the struggle from Khy to southern France.

---

**The Solar Energy Alternative**

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, we all recognize the fact that we, as a nation, are facing a grave energy crisis. A rising population with increasing power needs must have energy supplied in a manner which will not leave us with a seriously damaged environment.

Among the alternatives which must be considered to meet long-range power needs is solar energy. Certainly, more resources must be directed toward research and development of this nonpolluting form of energy.

The International Solar Energy Society recently held a conference at the NASA-Goddard Space Flight center near Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the keynote address of Dr. Manfred Altman, of the University of Pennsylvania, be printed in the Record.

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

Address by Dr. Manfred Altman

A keynote speaker is to be a fighter. He is to set the tone for a meeting not unlike the football coach who inspires his team to go out and conquer.

Unfortunately there is also another kind of keynote speaker—namely the one who comes not to praise Caesar, but to bury him! Some of my remarks may suggest the latter, but please believe me when I tell you that I really mean to be the former—just a little patient with me.

Very long ago one of my friends told me the following story.

His little daughter had just received many beautiful Xmas toys—much to her delight.

A visitor, a neighbor, came to see the toys. The little girl was extremely happy, but the visitor came to the point. He said, "Look at the price of those toys..." The little girl was stunned. After a few moments she said, "But. they are big. They make us happy."

In some ways this little story reminds me of solar energy proponents and the public mind which is quickly informed but does not share its energy. They are the people who think, "Why?"

I am first of all reminded of a conversation I had with a gentleman who was somewhat of an Rector Utility which shall remain nameless. We talked about the aerospace industry and its poten-