

### NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward L. Shaheen, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Louisiana, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 28, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 3692) for the relief of William F. Kuhlman, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3692) for the relief of William F. Kuhlman, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Editorial broadcast by radio station KLIK, Jefferson City, Mo., entitled "Not the Farmer's Fault."

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "The Coach," published in the New York Times on April 20, 1966.

### FOR GOOD SCHOOLS TRY LIVE POLITICS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for a valuable insight into the critical problems confronting our primary and secondary schools in our great urban communities, I invite the attention of Senators to an article which was published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "For Good Schools Try Live Politics," written by Richardson Dilworth, former mayor of Philadelphia, and presently the president of the Philadelphia School Board.

Mr. Dilworth, at great personal sacrifice, left private life to take on the arduous job of upgrading and improving the Philadelphia school system.

This article points out some of the difficult problems which confront the school system in Philadelphia, problems which I am sure are identical to those in many other large cities in this country where there are significant numbers of minority group members who are badly in need of a higher level of education than they have been receiving.

I commend my former colleague, Mayor Dilworth, for the dedicated efforts he is making to rehabilitate the Philadelphia school system.

I believe that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will profit from reading this article which outlines some of the problems, and also some of the projected solutions which Mr. Dilworth and his colleagues on the school board are undertaking to provide.

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:

#### FOR GOOD SCHOOLS TRY LIVE POLITICS (By Richardson Dilworth)

(NOTE.—Philadelphia's School Board was chosen by judges, like Washington's, until last year when a successful home rule movement gave the power of appointment to the mayor. The following excerpts are taken from an address here by Mr. Dilworth, a former mayor of Philadelphia and now president of its new school board.)

There are some people who ask why it is necessary to insist upon integrating our schools and their faculties. These people argue that what we should concentrate upon is raising the standard of public education in all of our schools. They assert that focusing attention on integration diverts us from achieving excellence of education.

Such a contention ignores the realities of the situation in the cities. Take my own city of Philadelphia, which is quite typical. The schools in the predominantly Negro areas are the oldest, most rundown schools in the city. And, due to the ironclad teacher seniority system which has developed over the years, these schools, for the most part, have the highest percentage of poorest and most inexperienced teachers. Add to this the fact that about a quarter of these pupils have a family background which has not equipped them to receive the standard public school education, and you have a shambles in which hardly any of the children in the school get educated.

Today, in our city, approximately 40 percent of the total school population is in parochial and private schools. The result is that while only 30 percent of our city's population is nonwhite, 57 percent of our public school pupils are nonwhite. And, today there are more white children in the parochial and private schools than there are in our city's entire public school system.

If this trend continues, and it is the trend in all of our cities, then 20 or 25 years from now, our big cities may find themselves with public school systems almost entirely nonwhite, and with parochial and private school systems at least 90 percent white. I cannot think of a greater blow to our democracy, or to the success of the urban civilization in which we find ourselves.

The broad picture is that our big city public school systems have for the most part been neglected and starved—ever since the end of World War I. Although we have splendid work being done here and there, by and large, our big city school systems no longer serve us well.

Big city teachers have been among the lowest paid. The result is that our city school systems have tended to become static and in-bred. New ideas and new blood have not been encouraged.

We should also experiment with what we call the magnet school. Let me give you an example: There is great need for a higher level of science teaching for selected youngsters. This indicates the creation of a science high school which offers the finest possible precollege science courses. But that school would also be a comprehensive high school to serve the neighborhood, and the science students would take their other

academic courses right in with the regular high school students.

In short, the specialty attracts teachers and pupils from all over the city, and these specialty pupils take their general academic courses in the other part of the school, which is a comprehensive neighborhood high school. Magnet schools should also be set up for languages, for business training, and for the performing arts, among others.

Supplemental educational centers also show promise, particularly in the field of science. Such a center would serve the entire city, including the parochial and private schools, and also suburban schoolchildren. The center would offer all manner of special equipment and training not found elsewhere.

The expanding interest in education suggests that we begin to rethink the way we manage our schools. The conventional wisdom has it that we keep schools out of politics, and, of course, in the narrow sense of the word we must all agree. However, good education is and must inevitably be a vital political issue. The issue of a quality integrated education is as live a political issue in our cities as any issue can be. No bureaucracy can solve that issue. Failing the magic solution acceptable to everyone, enlightened and courageous leadership at the board level is essential if the cities are not to retreat from the challenge.

### VIETNAM: LESSONS AND HARD CHOICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when Senators returned home during the Easter recess, I believe that many found the people to be deeply concerned about two problems: Vietnam and the rise in the cost of living.

Mr. President, in deference to the millions of my constituents in the State of New York who have these feelings, I should like to take a few moments to express my views on the most pressing of these matters—Vietnam.

While I believe that there still remains a very real majority support in the country for the President's policy on Vietnam—namely, the application of limited American means to the attainment of a limited American purpose—I also believe that the very same people who participate in that support are very gravely concerned about the future; where we are going and what we should do. I believe, moreover, that the people of New York State are against the escalation of the struggle in Vietnam beyond the present order of magnitude. They are opposed to the bombardment of heavy civilian population centers such as Hanoi and Haiphong.

There is no denying the extent and the effects of the present political crisis in Vietnam. The situation is grave.

But this is not a time for political sniping nor a time to hunt for scapegoats; it is a time for reevaluation and a time to face hard choices.

As we make this reevaluation and face these choices, we should heed the lessons to be learned from the political crisis itself; lessons that will be vitally important in the weeks to come.

First. We should have learned by now to control the impulse to involve ourselves in the internal political affairs of a nation we are trying to help, but we apparently have not.

Second. We should have learned by now that military successes and even overwhelming power on the battlefield

April 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8279

anniversary of the origin of Poland as a Christian nation. The occasion of this millennium is being celebrated by the people of Poland throughout the year 1966 and honored with worldwide observances during the same period. Very few countries can boast of being in existence for a thousand years, and being civilized during that period of time. Our own continent was not even discovered then, and our own cultivation of civilization did not begin until the last 400 years. In that August 28, 1966, will mark the date in which many celebrations will be held in recognition of the proud heritage and love of freedom and God possessed by the people of Poland, it is fitting that appropriate recognition of the millennium of Poland should be accorded by the citizens of the United States on that date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 156) to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim August 28, 1966, as Polish Millennium Day, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF WAGNER-PEYSER ACT, RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 551

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 2974, a bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act, that is currently before the Employment, Manpower and Poverty Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

S. 2974, introduced by Chairman CLARK brings long sought improvements to this Nation's employment service system. Senator CLARK has recognized, as has the administration, that a system so important to the smooth functioning of our economy must be modernized and improved if it is to fulfill its role of efficiently allocating our precious manpower resources.

One of the major barriers to the efficient working of the labor market is inadequate information. A lack of information by potential employers of the men and skills available to them, can result in economic decisions that may be detrimental to the firm and the growth of the economy. Similarly, when job-seekers are unaware of the full range of opportunities open to them they may remain unemployed or underemployed. In essence, the efficient allocation of men and jobs in the labor market demands a greater awareness of the options existing in the market. And as the labor market operates more perfectly, we are more assured of economic growth and stability.

The U.S. Employment Service was established to facilitate labor market activity. Its modification at this time is a recognition that we are now in a position to bring new procedures and new technologies to better the Services operations.

Section 7 of S. 2974, entitled "Labor Market Information" instructs the Secretary of Labor to collect, analyze and store all labor market and manpower information among employers, labor organizations, private employment agencies and the like. To carry out these responsibilities, the Secretary is authorized to employ the most modern and efficient automatic data processing equipment.

The directed use of the computer and other information systems in our employment service is to me one of the most promising aspects of this legislation. We have already seen the benefits of the computer in business establishments. And in government, these systems have revolutionized our methods of information gathering, made our space efforts possible and are contributing to the effective administration of our health and welfare programs. Because of my belief in the enormous promise of these systems, I am currently engaged in studies that hopefully will lead to the use of automatic data processing equipment for the benefit of State and local governments in their utilization of Federal programs.

The use of data processing systems in the labor market was strongly recommended in the recent report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, established by Congress in August of 1964. The Commission pointed out that most information concerning jobs "passes by word of mouth" through an informal grapevine, and that while the Employment Service is developing increasing amounts of labor market information "there is simply no place in any local labor market, let alone on a regional or national basis, where individual jobseekers or employers can discover the full range of possible jobs or employees available." On the basis of this finding the Commission recommended a computerized nationwide service for matching men to jobs.

While this goal may not be immediately attainable, there is no reason why we cannot begin to bring the computer into the labor market in a way that will demonstrate its full potential.

Accordingly, the amendment I am offering today would direct the Secretary of Labor to establish, in one or more Manpower Services Centers, a model computerized information system to bring jobs and men together in an efficient and productive manner. Such a model would develop specific employment-need information on a firm-by-firm basis. This could be matched by specific jobseeker information, such as skills, experience, availability and so forth. The system would not be limited to a State or political boundary, but could encompass any traditional labor market area or region in which mobility is feasible. Ultimately, we may find that with sufficient information availability, the entire Nation will be a labor market area—for it is my hope that this model will result in the truly national information system contemplated by the Automation Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 551) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

On page 9, between lines 11 and 12 insert the following:

"(c) The Secretary is directed to conduct studies and to undertake demonstration projects to further the use of automatic data processing systems in the national manpower services system. Such demonstration projects shall include, but not be limited to, the establishment, in one or more manpower services centers, of a model labor market information system, on a state or interstate basis, that will provide specific employment information on both employment opportunities and skills available in the labor market to interested applicants seeking placement, and individuals, organizations or institutions referred to in (2) of subsection (a) of this section."

On page 9, line 12, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)".

On page 9, line 18, strike out the word "and".

On page 9, line 19, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and the use of automatic data processing systems."

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1596) to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes, sponsored by my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], my name be shown as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, LONG of Louisiana, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey be added as cosponsors of S. 3097, a bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures, and S. 3098, a bill to promote and coordinate historic preservation activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, other public bodies, and private organizations and individuals, at the next printing of these bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1966, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MOSE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TALMADGE were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3177) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) on April 5, 1966.

April 21, 1966

are not enough to satisfy a people who yearn for peace, for food, and for a sense of human dignity, but we apparently have not.

Third, We shall have learned by now to expect anti-American sentiment in any nation where thousands of our troops are engaged in combat, but we apparently have not.

It is my hope that the people of our country will not become panicked by the political turmoil in South Vietnam; that they will understand that our purpose in being there remains valid and unaltered. We are there, having been asked in by the Government of South Vietnam, to wage a struggle—along with the Vietnamese themselves—for high but limited objectives using necessary but limited military means. We are actively seeking a negotiated settlement that will allow freedom of choice in Vietnam.

But the recent political crisis has brought about a change in the situation we face, even if it has not altered our purpose.

It is within the realm of possibility that this situation could produce a government in South Vietnam that is dissatisfied with our help or with the presence of our forces, or that is unable to continue to carry its share of the battle.

The American people should be prepared for such an eventuality, and the U.S. Government—calling on the lessons of the political crisis—should take every possible precaution to prevent any claim that it interfered in these vital South Vietnamese political decisions in any way.

In the current crisis, this was not always the case. Our Embassy in Saigon apparently allowed Premier Ky the use of U.S. aircraft to transport forces loyal to him to the Da Nang-Hue area, thereby raising the implication that we concurred in the removal from office of the Buddhist General Thi, the commander of Vietnamese forces in the north. And it is generally agreed that the President's personal endorsement of Premier Ky strengthened Ky's image in the United States but not in his own country, and was the first step in the evolution of the crisis.

In the crucial months ahead, we must learn from experience. We must adopt and follow a hands-off policy regarding Vietnam political affairs. This is the first lesson.

The second lesson is that military effort is only part of waging a struggle such as the one in Vietnam. Indeed, the very success of ARVN-U.S. military operations has allowed political differences—which have always existed uneasily beneath the surface in South Vietnam—to flourish. The Buddhist groups, which are avowedly anti-Communist, would not have attempted to topple the Saigon government unless the military situation was becoming more secure. Various political, religious, and tribal groups have been jockeying for power in Vietnam for years. This is bound to continue regardless of the war. We can only hope to keep it from getting out of hand.

Beyond the military struggle and beyond the feuding political factions lies

the real war—the war against poverty and even starvation.

Neither the United States nor the Saigon leaders are waging this battle with adequate resources. The United States plans to spend \$12 billion on the military effort in Vietnam during the current fiscal year. U.S. aid earmarked for the 700,000 Vietnam refugees is a shockingly low figure of \$21 million, of which only \$5.2 million is designated for food commodities. The record of the Saigon government's aid for refugees is equally dismal; its projection for this year is \$14 million. Unless an all-out effort is made by both ourselves and the South Vietnamese on these social and economic fronts, the whole military effort could have been in vain.

The third lesson concerns the inevitability of anti-Americanism in such situations. Whenever a nation as powerful as ours becomes massively embroiled in a foreign war, resentment is bound to ensue. Our troops come in and present a totally unfamiliar, and at times unpopular, life style. The expenditures of U.S. dollars revolutionizes and dislocates the economy. All attention seems to focus on the American presence.

Obviously, it is only a short step for the people of the host country to begin to believe that they are no longer the masters of their own fate. Their frustration invariably turns against those who are there precisely to help them. To prevent these feelings from exploding, it is up to the United States to conduct itself with dignity and restraint.

There is still time to apply these lessons to the Vietnam situation in the critical weeks ahead.

We face hard choices right at this moment.

Should the government of Premier Ky remain in office, or should another government with the same plans for Vietnam assume power and responsibility, the United States can continue to play its part in Vietnam.

On the other hand, if a new Vietnamese government should ask us to leave, we have three alternatives: first, persist nonetheless and virtually take over the governmental operations in South Vietnam; second, withdraw our troops from the Asian mainland; or, third, redeploy our forces to another Asian location.

If we are forced to reappraise our position, I urge that we do so in light of our basic policy to date—that is, we are in Vietnam because the Government of that country wishes to wage a struggle for independence and freedom and desires our help. In no event should the struggle there be carried on by U.S. forces alone. In no event should we "go it alone" in South Vietnam.

Just as I oppose carrying on the effort in Vietnam by ourselves, I also reject complete withdrawal from the Asian mainland. There are still a number of nations in that area which need and desire our help in holding off the Chinese Communists, who still vow to persist in their so-called wars of national liberation—which are actually wars of aggression.

Should conditions force us to leave

South Vietnam, I believe that our best choice is to redeploy our troops in another Asian country. It is my view that our forces should be kept together in effective units and redeployed where they can be available to counter any new aggressive move by Communist China. Northern Thailand is so threatened, and should the Government of Thailand request such assistance, I believe that at least some of our troops ought to be stationed there.

I see no disgrace in redeploying our troops under the above conditions. I believe that we have already demonstrated what we set out to demonstrate: that we are willing to back our commitments. Every nation that wishes to be free from Communist domination has already been heartened by our determination in Vietnam.

In these efforts, however, we cannot guarantee success; we can only guarantee a good faith effort itself. This we have done.

On yesterday, Wednesday, April 20, Secretary of Defense McNamara testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I welcome his testimony as a clear indication that we intend to keep out of Vietnamese domestic politics, that our applications of force remains limited, and that we still seek and are willing to accept freely expressed desires of the Vietnamese people in a national election.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Secretary McNamara's testimony, as reported in this morning's New York Times, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objections, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTS OF McNAMARA TESTIMONY  
 OPENING STATEMENT

The governing principle of our military assistance program has been and is that the vital interests of this country in the defense of the free world are dependent upon the strength of the entire free world, and not merely upon the strength of the United States.

The United States is the focus of power in the free world struggle for national independence and economic progress, but our country can't be everywhere at once and our country cannot and does not do everything the best. The balance of forces and the options necessary in today's world can be achieved only with staunch friends well armed, ready to do their parts of the job.

The whole spectrum of threats remains relevant, from subversion and terrorism through conventional attack to the possibility of nuclear war. And these threats must be dealt with where they cast their shadow.

It would be unbearably costly to this country in both money and human resources to maintain a credible force by itself all along the great arc of forward positions to the west, south, and east of the Soviet Union and Red China.

But the free world cannot leave gaps in that forward arc. And the solution to the problem, therefore, has been a combination of forces, a mix of local forces in the homeland and the United States and friendly forces behind those ready to supply equipment and money and ready to supply additional reinforcement in case of need.

The growth and the increased flexibility of the U.S. part of that combination has been very great indeed. We have increased our mobility, our firepower, and our total

April 21, 1966

strength to the point where we can now have 325,000 men assigned to combat operations in southeast Asia, and do this without calling up our Reserve forces, without imposing wage or price controls on our economy, without material allocations to force diversions of scarce resources from civilian to military use, and with the military budget, which in relation to gross national product is less in this fiscal year and will be less next fiscal year than in any one of the 5 years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, or 1964.

*Strongest nation in history*

No other nation in history has ever been so strong. Never has any other nation—and as a matter of fact, never has the United States in the past—carried such great military strength with so little burden on its society.

Nevertheless, the requirement is as valid as ever for local forces to help hold that forward line of defense. These local forces have some important advantages over U.S. forces. They know more about local conditions; they know more about local terrain; they get much of their support from sources near at hand; they are defending their own families.

The friendly nations along the forward defense arc together contribute more than 3.5 million men to defense, somewhat more than the total number of men in our own military forces.

Would we seriously consider providing U.S. manpower to replace this deterrent strength of some 3.5 million men? I think the answer is "No." Does our own military budget exceeding \$50 billion a year, exclusive of military assistance, make sense without the military assistance program? Again, I think the answer is "No."

In conclusion I'd like to leave this one thought. I think it would be irrational for our country to spend over \$50 billion a year on its own military forces while refusing to help train and equip our friends who share with us the forward defense job and whose capabilities are critical to the success of that job.

The other alternatives, I believe, are clear and severe. The United States either must make up the shortages with U.S. forces or should recast and retrench its foreign policy.

*QUESTIONS*

**FULLBREIGHT.** The only point I wish to make: these treaties or aid programs don't authorize you in any way whatever to intervene in a civil war.

**McNAMARA.** No, that's quite clear.

**SPARKMAN.** Would you follow that up and differentiate this from a civil war?

**McNAMARA.** Yes, sir, I'd be happy to. \* \* \* In 1960, in Hanoi, at the first conference of the Laodong Party, the Communist Party of North Vietnam, it was agreed there would be established a front organization directed to destroy the Government of South Vietnam. That front was established. And later in that year, Gen. [Vo Nguyen] Giap, the Defense Minister, stated that the north is the revolutionary base for the war that will be carried in the south. And that went on through a series of meetings in 1961 and 1962 all of which are documented, all of which point to the direction of the subversion in the South by Hanoi to the point where in 1964, before any U.S. combat troops were introduced in South Vietnam, the 325th Division of North Vietnam was infiltrated to the south.

Lt. Gen. (Hoang Van) Thak, who had been the assistant chief of the North Vietnamese joint general staff, was sent into South Vietnam to command the Vietcong forces and the North Vietnamese armed forces which were sent there and to the best of our knowledge he is currently military commander.

They had infiltrated about 45,000 men from the north including this regular army division by the end of 1964, before we sent U.S. military forces—combat forces—into South Vietnam, and, of course, as you know since

that time the number of North Vietnamese regiments has increased substantially.

We think there are about 11 or more there, some 20,000 regular North Vietnamese soldiers there today.

**Question.** And they are being directed from the north?

**Answer.** In a very literal sense, Senator Sparkman. They are receiving not only day-to-day but hour-to-hour direction of their activities from Hanoi, directly.

**Question.** It's on that basis that you say that it constitutes outside aggression?

**Answer.** Yes, sir, without question, in my opinion.

*Military goals*

**GORE.** Mr. Secretary, the Communists seek to establish a Communist state and I, we resist that \* \* \*. Is it the goal of our military to exterminate Communist influence in South Vietnam?

**Answer.** No, I don't think so. It isn't our goal to exterminate anything. It is our goal to apply sufficient military pressure to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces now seeking to destroy the political and social fabric of South Vietnam to prove to North Vietnam that they can't win by military action in the south, but that doesn't require extermination of the Communist forces.

**Question.** Is it our military and political goal to establish a democratic state or an American-type state in South Vietnam?

**Answer.** It's our goal to allow these people to choose the form of political institutions under which they prefer to live. I suppose you could conceive of them choosing some form other than a democratic form. If they did, we would adhere to that choice.

**Question.** Good. We would be pleased if they choose a democratic form?

**Answer.** We would. We think they will. But we would respect their choice.

**Question.** Now that comes to the role of the military in the process of choice which is now forecast and soon to occur in South Vietnam. What will be the role of the U.S. military in the elections now forecast to occur in South Vietnam?

**Answer.** Well, I conceive no role for our military in those elections. Our role is to support the South Vietnamese military forces in their campaigns against the Vietcong, not to participate in the forthcoming elections.

**Question.** Well, in that campaign against the Vietcong, will the U.S. forces support the Saigon Government forces in trying to prevent the Vietcong from participating in the elections?

**Answer.** Well, I don't believe any procedures for the elections have yet been developed. And I can't really respond directly to your question. It's not conceivable to me that the Vietcong will participate in the elections. As a matter of fact, the most recent experience we've had with elections in South Vietnam—those of a year ago, just about this month—led us to believe that the Vietcong will seek in every way possible to make it impractical to carry out elections.

**Question.** Well, I think I would accept the view that it is likely that the Vietcong will attempt to disrupt the elective processes.

But my question is related to the other possibility. Should the Vietcong, indignant as they are to South Vietnam, make the other decision and undertake to participate, pull off their uniforms and put on their pajamas and vote seeking to exercise their influence there, what will be the role of the U.S. military in supporting the troops of the Saigon Government?

**Answer.** Our role would be, as I said, to carry out military operations against the Vietcong if they're continuing to fight. If they're not continuing to fight, if they're seeking to vote, I'm sure the government of South Vietnam would welcome them as

voters. And surely we would do nothing to prevent that.

**Question.** Then if the Buddhists, the Christians, the Vietcong, the Montagnards, the various sects in Vietnam succeeded through a process of their own choosing in a coalition government dedicated not to our side or the Communist side but neutral or nonaligned, would you interpret that as inimical to the security of the United States?

**Answer.** No, certainly not.

*Comparison with Soviet*

**PELL.** And in conclusion would you be willing to give a rough estimate of the total dollar value of Communist bloc military aid versus U.S. military aid.

**McNAMARA.** Yes, and these are subject to all of the qualifications that one must give to any Soviet figures. But the total we estimate for 1965 was \$277 million in Soviet military aid to nonbloc countries and \$650 million in Soviet economic aid to nonbloc countries. And for the 12 years 1954 to 1965, a period we have collected data for, the total military aid to nonbloc countries is over \$4 billion and the total economic aid is over \$5 billion. Now I want to emphasize that these figures are rough estimates and they include all forms of aid—grant, aid and sales, and so on.

**Question.** But roughly our program would be in the order of six or eight times that of the Soviets.

**Answer.** Well, in comparison with 1965, they had a program of roughly \$900 million, and we had one 3 1/2 times that.

*ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM*

**Mr. GORE.** Mr. President, history has demonstrated time and again that a dramatic turn of events, unexpected and unplanned for, can provide opportunities for the active participants in an encounter. The course of history has sometimes depended on the ability of these participants to react quickly and correctly. Often, through such circumstances, apparent disaster has been turned to good account.

There may be a bare possibility that such a turn of events has occurred in Vietnam. It is yet too soon to determine just what good, if any, may come to the United States out of the recent internal, almost intragovernmental, upheavals we have been witnessing within South Vietnam in recent weeks. It appeared for a few days that utter chaos would engulf that unhappy country, already subjected to subversion, aggression, civil war, and military dictatorship as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVRS].

But now we see the prospect of some kind of election which may begin to move the tragic, dangerous Vietnamese situation away from the course of escalated war and toward stability through a process of self-determination by the people of South Vietnam. In my view, the United States should encourage this.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the United States should and must take what steps we can to help insure the best kind of elections possible under the circumstances. We should help create the best possible conditions.

The first, and perhaps most constructive, step we should take is to assume the initiative in negotiating a cease-fire for a reasonable period for the campaigns and elections, say 2 or 3 weeks.

April 21, 1966

This has numerous advantages, both as to the reality of meaningful elections, and as to our posture before the uncertain body of world opinion.

As to the realities, I think we would all agree that a cease-fire will, while not in and of itself guaranteeing a meaningful election, at least remove a hindrance to broad participation and voluntary exercise of the franchise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes. Perhaps I should make that 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may be granted 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as far as our posture is concerned, a cease-fire negotiated on our initiative would demonstrate our interest in and sincere dedication to legitimate elections, and it would lend credibility to our assertions in behalf of self-determination. We have said—and I am sure it is truthfully said; Secretary McNamara repeated it yesterday that we are in Vietnam only to guarantee the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

Furthermore, the negotiation of a cease-fire, proposed by the United States, will allow us, in a sense, to keep the initiative, to act positively, and not to appear to be merely an agitated observer of events. In the constant propaganda battle which we face with our Communist adversaries, this is important.

Our participation in cease-fires and bombing pauses is not novel. We have participated in three such events in the relatively short time in which we have been openly active combatants in Vietnam.

On May 13 through 18, 1965, the United States unilaterally initiated a bombing pause. The first contingent of Marines had landed in Vietnam on May 6, and the President wished to give the Vietcong and the Hanoi government a chance to think about the implications of our actions.

We participated in the 1965 Christmas truce, more or less formally agreed to insofar as the 2 days, December 24 and 25, were concerned. We then went even further, it will be recalled, and unilaterally suspended bombing operations against North Vietnam through January 31, 1966.

On December 28, 1965, the Vietcong proposed a cease-fire during the Lunar New Year, which was celebrated during the period January 20-23, 1966. The United States went along with this cease-fire on the part of the Vietcong, which was worked out between the VC and the South Vietnamese, with which we cooperated.

Now, Mr. President, I see advantages, and few probable detrimental results, in the United States taking the initiative in proposing and negotiating a cease-fire for a period suitable for a campaign and election. This would lend credibility to

our aims. It is in this spirit that I suggest this course of action to President Johnson.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I strongly endorse the suggestion just made by the Senator from Tennessee, and I hope it will receive the immediate careful and favorable consideration of both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

This is a real opportunity to take a step toward the holding of genuinely fair elections for the South Vietnamese people.

I suggest to the State Department and the Defense Department that they give careful consideration to a number of matters:

First, let us ask for a truce to last for a period of 3 weeks. That is the period the British take for their election campaigns, and it has pretty sound precedent.

Second, let us see if the truce cannot spread through the countryside. Rather than have participation in the election limited to the villages and towns, as now contemplated, we should try to see that the South Vietnamese Government is chosen by the people of the entire geographic area, and that all adults have an opportunity to vote.

Third, let us see if the Catholic minority and the Buddhist majority can join in a cease-fire so that there can be the kind of atmosphere and conditions under which a fair election can be had.

Fourth, let us be sure that a military junta does not dominate the election process, and that the fear of reprisals does not interfere with the right of the people to support candidates of their own free choice.

Fifth, there should be complete freedom of speech, so that candidates can be free to campaign in a climate in which it is guaranteed that reprisals will not be taken against them for exercising their basic political rights.

I believe that the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, with the conditions I have noted, is a most valuable one, and I hope the executive arm of our Government will pursue it.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished and able friend from Pennsylvania.

None of us can be sure that an election is possible under the situation prevailing in that unhappy land. But, since one is to be undertaken, surely we should take every action possible commensurate with the security of our men there to facilitate a effective and popular election broadly based in order that we will have the maximum degree of self-determination.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I endorse the proposals of the Senator—but with certain reservations.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think that we can, off the top of our heads on the floor of the Senate, come to an informed

conclusion on a matter of this character—a military matter in the first instance. Therefore, I know that inherent in the Senator's suggestion is the consideration of security. If those responsible for such matters concur, the proposal will receive my support.

In addition, the proposal should be accepted by the South Vietnamese Government, and efforts should be made to bring about some comparable response from the Vietcong and Hanoi.

Next, I think that Senator Clark said, and I agree with him, that every effort should be made to see that the election is a genuinely free one—free from inordinate pressures by the Saigon Government and free from the terror tactics of the Vietcong—and that the results of this election are accepted by all concerned.

The peace offensive must be continued with everybody, including the Vietcong and the Chinese. We do seek a negotiated settlement and we have announced our intention to foster and abide by a free election.

I believe that our good faith is demonstrated by the fact that we will accept the results of a free election even if there are Communists in that Government.

Mr. GORE. I am grateful to have the comments of the distinguished Senator from New York, along with those of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Unless we are willing to accept the results of an election, assuming that it is reasonably free of intimidation on the part of anyone, then our profession of belief in and dedication to the right of self-determination is void.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has repeatedly said our Nation was prepared to accept that.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has repeatedly assured the Senate in public hearings and assured the American people and the world that the United States would abide by a free election and the choice made by the Vietnamese people in a free election.

Only yesterday I asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, if as a consequence of an election the Buddhists, Christians, the Montagnards, and Vietcong, the various sects and groups of South Vietnam raised a coalesced government, which was a position of neutrality or nonalignment, would that be inimical to the security of the United States? His answer was: "Of course not."

I want to join the Senator in his additions to my suggestions that all security questions be carefully weighed, and any action on the part of our Government must be guarded thereby, and I would make no suggestion contrary to that.

April 21, 1966

Also, I share his view that along with a cease-fire proposal, to make the assurance to the world that we will abide by the process of self-determination being made once again.

I would like to make this further comment to the able Senator. The chances of the Vietcong accepting this suggestion may be remote but let them reject it. Then, we stand demonstrably four square for determination and they are refusing to cooperate therein.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator and I compliment him again on the fine statement he has made.

#### INQUIRY INTO OPERATIONS OF NATION'S SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President on April 7, I urged in this forum that there be Senate inquiries into the operation of our Nation's service academies, beginning with the Naval Academy.

My recommendations were, in part, misunderstood by some persons and were misinterpreted by others. Nevertheless, the extent of understanding, acceptance, and approval of my position is gratifying.

In a letter to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I emphasized that in suggesting a complete investigation of the service academies, I do not have specific allegations to make against either the Military Academy or the Air Force Academy. I added, however, that each of those academies has had crippling experiences in past years—the Air Force Academy only recently. And I noted that their problems may have stemmed largely from conditions similar to those alleged to prevail at the Naval Academy, as disclosed in newspaper articles, principally in the Washington Post, and as discussed in my Senate speech on April 7. Subsequently, I received additional information concerning academic turmoil at the Naval Academy.

So, in consequence, I communicated to Chairman RUSSELL the belief that there might appropriately be a timely emphasis on Naval Academy inquiries and a careful, unhurried comparative study of the whole service academy system. Out of such a study, I suggested, the best elements of each academy's system can be identified and emphasized, while other phases can be deemphasized or eliminated.

Mr. President, I reiterate my assurance to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that I have full faith that the Senate Committee on Armed Services, within its jurisdiction, can and will make or cause to be made the studies of the service academies which seem to be necessary.

I stated to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I repeat: I do not plan to offer legislation in the Senate at this time, either to create an investigating committee or to change existing law relating to the service academies. Only if the Armed Services Committee would so recommend would I urge and support placing elsewhere investigative jurisdiction over service academies.

In the meantime, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee responded to my communication by noting that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, asked my able colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, to conduct a study for that subcommittee of the charges against the Naval Academy. This is a significant development because preparedness is involved. Senator BYRD will perform with his customary diligence and thoroughness.

Senator RUSSELL appropriately noted that, in addition, it seems to him that the subject of concern about the Academy and the practice of limiting the number of failures are properly matters for attention by the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy. He pointed out that, by law, the Board is charged with the responsibility of inquiring into "the state of morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy that the Board decides to consider."

Concerning the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, he called attention to the fact that:

Senator BREWSTER is serving as the designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on the Board this year and the Vice President has named Senators HOLLAND, BIBLE, and BOGGS as the other Senate Members. I understand the Board is planning to visit the Academy on April 29.

In a press release last Friday, I expressed satisfaction that inquiries I have urged are in capable hands, under proper auspices and jurisdiction, and are underway.

I also pointed out that information from my files had been given to the appropriate Senators in support of my belief that plebe indoctrination at the Naval Academy is permitted to be administered in such a manner as to inhibit some first-year midshipmen in their need and their efforts to acquire an adequate academic foundation as they begin at the college level.

Mr. President, I make it clear that I had complaints against the Naval Academy plebe indoctrination system for more than a year, but it was not on the basis of these complaints that I urged the service academy inquiries. These plebe indoctrination misconduct allegations were not, of themselves, sufficiently serious to form the basis for a broad investigation of the service academies. Yet, they are basic to the broader charges of academic grade juggling and rigging which stem from complaints attributed to members of the Naval Academy faculty—a faculty which now appears to be low in morale, inordinately disorganized, and on the verge of being seriously depleted as a consequence of resignations, discharges, and related types of separation.

There is no valid way of comparing the service academies with civilian universities point by point, but it is essential that there be comparisons of the academic requirements and the scholastic grading systems that lead to the awarding of the B.S. degree. Rigging or juggling grades of midshipmen or cadets as

a means to the end of awarding a B.S. degree, or any other degree, with an officer's commission is a fraudulent procedure. This should not be tolerated.

It seems to me that the service academies are attempting to compress too many indoctrination, academic, athletic, and tactical and leadership military training activities into a 4-year period and as a consequence the overloading is compensated for in questionable grading and indoctrination methods which are unfair.

I make it clear that I am not an opponent of the service academy system. Neither am I an enemy of the administrators of the system, nor of those midshipmen and cadets participating in it. The task is difficult and demanding on administrators and participants—probably too demanding on the participating midshipmen and cadets. This necessitates adjustments and changes—perhaps changes of a fundamental nature.

It would not be unexpected if the ultimate finding of Senators and others who will be studying the prevailing problems will be that adequate time cannot be found in a 24-hour day, a 7-day week, and a 52-week year to meet adequately both the academic prerequisites for the B.S. degree and the physical and military requirements necessary for naval, military, and air officers within the framework of the 4-year curriculums of the service academies.

For my part, I prefer and vigorously support changes which would revise the curriculum and schedule to cover a 5-year period.

But I oppose inclusion of the plebe indoctrination technique which, in my judgment, weakens the academic foundation of too many young men making the transition from high school or preparatory school to the college level. My personal preference would be for an expansion of ROTC units and scholarships and a competitive system for selecting from candidates for advanced ROTC those best qualified to enroll at the service academies at the conclusion of the college sophomore year. Then, following a summer of midshipman or cadet orientation, service academy scholastic and advanced military training life could properly and appropriately be stretched over 3 years for completion of what normally would be the junior and senior years. This arrangement would afford more adequate time for advanced military science and leadership training, for physical culture and athletic pursuits, and for scholastic requirements incident to receiving the B.S. degree. Such a system certainly should compensate for any increases in cost by producing much better prepared and better qualified new officers for the three services. Whether or not the same systems would be indicated for the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies is a subject for study and consultation by appropriate officials and legislative committees.

My commendation has been given to Washington Post Staff Writer Leroy Aarons, who authored a revealing and thought-provoking series of articles concerning the alleged state of affairs at the Naval Academy.

given D's and F's. Academic Dean A. Bernard Drought acknowledged that last spring he instituted an experiment controlling the higher grades for plebes, as well as the barely passing and failing D's and F's. In one department, for example, the faculty was instructed to give 15 percent of the plebes A's and 35 percent B's. The system grew out of the so-called practical necessity of graduating reasonable numbers of naval officers each year.

This startling information was disclosed in the course of a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate by West Virginia's Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. Senator RANDOLPH is concerned and rightly so with reports of conditions at the Naval Academy. Primarily he objects to a system which tends to subordinate academics at the Academy in preference to so-called plebe indoctrination with an excess of harassment. While the plebes may be acquiring foundation experience in the traditions of the brigade, in too many cases it is to the detriment of academic foundations.

On consecutive plebe classes—the one which entered in July 1964 and the current fourth class which entered in July 1965—two out of three of Senator RANDOLPH's nominees experienced inordinate difficulties or disillusionment with the Academy, according to the Senator.

There appears to be far too much hazing and time-consuming humiliation of the plebes which allows them little opportunity for actual study.

Senator RANDOLPH believes that unless the Academy officers take proper steps to correct these conditions it will be necessary for the Congress to act. Meanwhile, he has called for a complete Senate investigation of the Naval Academy and a curtailment of appropriations for educational plans at Annapolis until basic changes are made. Senator RANDOLPH deserves the full support of his colleagues in this undertaking.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, Apr. 15, 1966]

#### A NECESSARY INQUIRY

An official investigation of the academic standards at the U.S. Naval Academy was almost inevitable after disclosures of the grading practices there. The task has been handed to Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, and he can be relied upon to go into the problem deeply.

Following a series of articles in the Washington Post, the Academy admitted that it had imposed limits on the number of midshipmen given failing grades regardless of their academic standing in class. Not more than 13 percent of the plebes and only 4 percent of the seniors were allowed to flunk out.

Before BYRD's appointment to make the investigation had been announced—although he and Chairman JOHN C. STENNIS of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee had already agreed upon it, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH took the floor to report on academic conditions at the Academy and called upon the Senate to look further into the matter.

A. Bernard Drought, academic dean at Annapolis, acknowledged that in one department the faculty had been instructed to give 15 percent of the plebes A's and 35 percent B's. He said this practice grew out of the necessity of graduating reasonable numbers of naval officers each year.

RANDOLPH primarily objects to a system which tends to subordinate academics at the Academy in preference to so-called plebe indoctrination with an excess of harassment. While the plebes may be acquiring foundation experience in the traditions of the brigade, in too many cases it is to the detriment of academic foundations.

On consecutive plebe classes—the one which entered in July 1964 and the current

fourth class which entered in July 1965—two out of three of RANDOLPH's nominees experienced inordinate difficulties or disillusionment with the Academy, according to the Senator.

There appears to be far too much hazing and time-consuming humiliation of the plebes which allows them little opportunity for actual study.

Senator BYRD intends to talk not only to those charged with responsibility for the academic program at the Academy but others with specialized knowledge in the field of education. Out of his report may be expected to come some specific regulations for the improvement of what seems to be a situation unbecoming to a Federal educational institution.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Apr. 16, 1966]

#### NO NEED TO FIX ACADEMY GRADES

It's bad enough when parents browbeat teachers and school principals into passing students whom they have flunked, but what must we think when we find the same practice at the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

It seems several civilian professors have flunked students at the Academy, only to have officials at the top changing the grades to pass. The excuse given is that the percentage of failure in each class has to be kept to a certain level in order not to lose too many potential officers. It is argued that the increase in original flunking was brought about by increased academic standards at the Naval Academy.

We presumed that professors at the Academy are capable of making prudent judgments as to a student's grade in the light of the needs of the service. We therefore think it dishonest for the Academy to pass students who have flunked. There is very little difference between this and the student cheating that was exposed several years ago at the Air Force Academy and, before that, at West Point. The only difference is that the dishonest students were dismissed from their schools. At Annapolis, the officials responsible for the changing of teachers' gradings are being praised for their initiative.

It appears to us a strange hierarchy of values. The Navy in the modern world still requires courage, leadership, physical endurance and the like. But it also requires a fully educated man—one well versed in the intricacies of the advance technology of the space age. A naval dunderhead, passed merely to fill a quota, is probably going to be a liability rather than an asset.

Besides—fixing grades is dishonest. The fact that it has official approval, is immaterial.

#### SALE OF A-4B JET AIRCRAFT TO ARGENTINA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we are all aware of the heavy demands and requirements put upon the Navy's inventory of high-performance jet aircraft as a result of the hostilities and operations in southeast Asia. Therefore, I was both surprised and disturbed to learn that an agreement has been consummated under which 50 of the Navy's A-4B Skyhawks have been sold to Argentina under the military assistance program.

I was even more disturbed about this when I learned that the Naval Air Reserve is not to receive A-4B aircraft which had previously been programed for it and is being compelled to accept the substantially inferior A-4A aircraft as a substitute.

I am advised that the A-4B, which is a greatly improved version of the A-4A, has proved to be a highly successful air-

craft and that in it most of the undesirable features of the A-4A have been eliminated.

I do not question the legality of this transaction. I understand that it was worked out and approved as the law provides. However, I do question its wisdom and the policy behind it.

I am not opposed to military assistance as such. However, I do believe that the needs of our own Active and Reserve Forces should and must come first. Thus, I am very much concerned that the Naval Air Reserve has been compelled to lose some of the A-4Bs scheduled for it and to replenish these losses with the obsolete or nearly obsolete A-4A. It distresses me to see that the requirements of our own Reserve Forces come last when we are engaged in a shooting war.

I must also add that, since the future requirements of our southeast Asia operations are so uncertain, it seems to be both unwise and imprudent to dispose of any high-performance jet aircraft at this time. The aircraft which we have agreed to sell to Argentina may very well be needed for our active Navy Forces in coming months.

This appears to be only part of the picture of the relatively low priority given to our Reserve Forces. The Chief of the Office of Reserve Components, at a hearing before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee a few weeks ago, told us, to my great surprise and dismay, that our Army Reserve components have a lower priority than do military assistance program commitments in the distribution of Army equipment which is in Army-wide short supply. In other words, as far as the distribution of equipment in Army-wide short supply is concerned, the requirements of our Reserve Forces are met only after completion of requirements for Active Duty Forces and military assistance program commitments.

On April 1, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense about this matter. I asked that he inform me as to the accuracy of the information which had been furnished me, as well as justification for the transaction if the facts are accurate. I also asked him to inform me whether the sale of these planes to Argentina is irrevocable, because, based upon the information I now have, I believe that this transaction is not in the best interests of our national security posture.

In this letter I also expressed to the Secretary of Defense my apprehension and concern about the relatively low priority which our Reserve Forces apparently have in the distribution of equipment at this time.

I have not yet received a response from the Secretary of Defense to my letter of April 1. I hope that he will be able to give me a satisfactory explanation of a situation which I find very difficult to understand. If the facts are as they have been represented to me, then I believe it is a matter which requires attention at the highest echelon, and I intend to pursue it thoroughly.

#### ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have followed with interest the colloquy be-

April 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8285

In a news analysis in last Monday's issue, Mr. Aarons wrote, in part:

The administrators (at the Naval Academy) take the position that they are aware of the problems and are earnestly seeking to solve them. At the same time, they could seek to minimize their seriousness, saying that the problems are a natural outgrowth of the changes that have been taking place.

This is partly true. But, as they (the administrators of Naval Academy affairs) may be learning from experience, no matter how impressive it looks on paper, change can create more problems than it solves. What change? How much?

If a military school is to recruit a new wave of civilians, how much voice can it afford to give them?

How far should one stress "academics" in a military school in the light of other demands?

On the other hand, to what extent do military and athletic requirements actually contribute to naval leadership?

Can an institution seek to create "the whole man" within a prep school world of spit shines, curfews, and on-campus restrictions?

Recent events at the Academy indicate that these questions cannot be answered with partial solutions or the promise of good intentions. Perhaps a broad rethinking of the Academy's role is in order. \* \* \*

The schism between the military and academic missions has other implications. The midshipmen, torn between the demands of a strengthened educational program and stringent military and athletic requirements, is caught in the middle. Something has to be sacrificed, and often it is his studies.

Over the past 10 years the Academy has added 139 young civilian faculty members to its staff \* \* \*. These young teachers brought vitality, idealism, and new ideas to an institution that for years had enjoyed a relaxed clubby atmosphere \* \* \*. Now a large segment of this group is demanding changes \* \* \*. In effect they want the Academy to act more like a university.

This catalog of problems cuts across the whole spectrum of the Academy existence, with implications for the other service schools as well. The answers are not easy and cannot be found in 5 days or even 5 weeks. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, obviously recognized this when he called for an exhaustive study of the service academies last week.

In response, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, his colleague from West Virginia, has been assigned the limited task of "reviewing" academics at the Academy. In addition, Senator DANIEL BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland, will lead a team to the Academy later this month on the regular annual tour of the Board of Visitors.

Their findings, along with the report of an accrediting team that studied the Academy last month, will be influential in determining whether or not a more searching, long-range analysis is to be made.

In its issue of April 16, 1966, the Washington Evening Star reacted somewhat differently. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.), Evening Star, Apr. 16, 1966]

## REPORT ON THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities can hardly be accused of indifference to proper academic standards. Consequently, a preliminary report by one of the association's evaluation teams, which

praises the Naval Academy for its efforts to achieve a good balance in the demands placed upon the midshipmen, should help to clear the air in the current flap over the Academy's grading and teaching practices.

After all, the Academy is not a typical liberal arts college. Its basic function is to train young men who will be equipped to function effectively as officers in the Navy or Marine Corps. This calls for heavy emphasis on discipline, physical fitness, and education in the art (if this is the right word) of fighting a war. It is significant, or so it seems to us, that the Naval Academy is not noted for its peaceniks: for campus demonstrations, or for midshipmen who think they have a right to march around with placards featuring four-letter words. There must also be some significance in the fact that there is an active demand in industry and other civilian pursuits for Academy men after they have retired from military service.

It would be wise to await the final report of the Middle States Association. Meanwhile, on the basis of the draft report, it probably is safe to assume that things have not really gone to pot in Annapolis.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Evening Star editorial seems to dismiss as inconsequential a serious or potentially serious problem at the Naval Academy. I do not propose to be satisfied entirely with any report of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities unless it can be proved that the team from that organization probed comprehensively into Naval Academy affairs over a longer period than 5 days. The task is impossible of adequate comprehension in such a short period of time.

I prefer to view the problems of the Naval Academy as being present, serious, and soluble. In this light, I agree with the Washington Post editorial entitled "Evaluation at Annapolis," in the April 18, 1966, issue.

Also, I believe it is appropriate to invite attention to editorial reaction in my home State newspapers to the call I have issued for inquiries into the affairs of the service academies. I am grateful for the understanding and support which several of our West Virginia newspaper editorial writers have accorded to our speech of April 7 and to the designation of my colleague, Senator BYRD, to make the Naval Academy inquiry for the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the Washington Post, April 18, 1966, "Evaluation at Annapolis"; from the Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., April 9, 1966, "RANDOLPH JOINS BYRD in Turning National Spotlight on State"; from the Wheeling News-Register, Wheeling, W. Va., April 12, 1966, "The Naval Academy Under Fire"; from the Fairmont Times, Fairmont, W. Va. April 15, 1966, "A Necessary Inquiry"; and from the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va., April 15, 1966, "No Need To Fix Academy Grades."

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1966]

## EVALUATION AT ANNAPOLIS

Disturbed by criticism of academic policies at the U.S. Naval Academy, Congress has

decided on not one, but two, inquiries into policies and procedures at Annapolis. There is no scandal here. There is, however, a serious question to be answered as to how well Annapolis and the other service academies, are performing their mission.

That mission is to train young men to become career military officers. Past achievements and past heroes are not relevant, despite the justifiable pride in them. The role of the military and of military officers has changed dramatically in the last two decades. Today's officer ought to be as well educated as his civilian contemporaries and should have a broad range of knowledge and interests if he is to serve his country well. The best place to stimulate the potential officer's intellectual growth is at the service academies.

It is up to the Naval Academy's Board of Visitors to undertake an evaluation of the curriculum and grading practices when it meets in Annapolis later this month. The dean and superintendent of the Academy are both committed to improving the educational program, but a strong mandate from the Board and from Congress might lead to more sweeping revisions sooner. Change has come slowly and has been strongly resisted in the name of tradition. Let the Board seek the views of faculty and students at the Academy, then consult academic and military leaders throughout the Nation with the aim of laying before Congress a bold blueprint for the future of the service academies.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Apr. 9, 1966]

## RANDOLPH JOINS BYRD IN TURNING NATIONAL SPOTLIGHT ON STATE

West Virginia's Senators are keeping their State in the national spotlight.

First, it was Senator BYRD, whose exposé of shocking welfare abuses in the District of Columbia paved the way for a measure, if only a slight one, of improvement on a national scale.

And now it is Senator RANDOLPH, with his demand for a thoroughgoing Senate investigation of the various U.S. service schools, with emphasis on the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Citing a series of articles in the Washington Post and information he personally had gathered from midshipmen, Senator RANDOLPH charged in a Senate speech the other day that "grave questions are raised as to the quality of education (at Annapolis) and the products of that education; namely, the officers being graduated and being presented to the Senate en bloc each year for rubber-stamp confirmation."

These are serious charges, reflecting most unfavorably on institutions which historically have enjoyed in the public mind a place of high esteem both as educational instruments and examples of honorable behavior. They should be either established or disproven. The indictment cannot be permitted to hang in the air. The probe Senator RANDOLPH proposes would seem to be an appropriate means of getting at the truth.

West Virginia may be small, but her voice is not feeble, whether heard from the Senate or the House, where four Democrats and a lone Republican keep the Nation aware of this corner of Appalachia.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Apr. 12, 1966]

## THE NAVAL ACADEMY UNDER FIRE

What are we coming to when the U.S. Naval Academy admits that it has had limits on the number of midshipmen allowed to be flunked despite their grades?

According to Naval Academy officials, at present, not more than 13 percent of the plebes and 4 percent of the seniors can be



April 21, 1966

tween the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on the elections in South Vietnam.

I agree with the sentiment expressed that this country should maintain the initiative in pushing for a peaceful solution of the dilemma in which it finds itself in southeast Asia. I believe we all agree on that. Perhaps this offer of a cease-fire for a limited period might contribute to this peaceful posture and purpose.

I believe that from a pragmatic standpoint elections are inevitable. The Ky government would have fallen before today if this agreement had not been reached. Any realistic observer must agree to that.

If the resulting government, established as a result of any election, is unwilling to carry on the struggle against communism, the aggression from North Vietnam, and the aggression supported by Red China and Russia, then surely we must make an agonizing reappraisal.

It would surely result in a serious retrenchment to certain enclaves at the least and probably a total withdrawal from South Vietnam.

Let us assume the adoption of this proposal for a cease-fire. As the senior Senator from Tennessee pointed out, he has no assurance or idea that the Vietcong will accept the proposal. If they do accept it, do we have any guarantee that they would live up to it? They did not live up to the Christmas cease-fire. They did not live up to the lunar cease-fire.

If they do accept the proposal, it means that it serves their purpose. Otherwise they would neither accept nor abide by the agreement.

Last night I saw on the television news excerpts showing the senior Senator from Tennessee questioning the Secretary of Defense. He asked:

Suppose the Vietcong change their uniforms for pajamas during this election period, disappear as a military force, and become a force for drumming up votes for their side.

This could indeed happen. Even the North Vietcong regiments and regulars now in South Vietnam could change their uniforms for civilian garb and spend 3 weeks electioneering in that 60 percent of the area now virtually controlled by the Vietcong.

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I believe these are questions that we must study and answer. I am sure that the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the White House staff, and the President himself will carefully consider and study these questions. Yes, the initiative of offering the cease-fire might well be helpful in once more demonstrating the sincerity of the United States and its people in finding a peaceful solution. It might be worth the risks entailed.

It seems to me that we have made it clear that we want to go to the conference table, that we have no design for 1 acre of the territory of North Vietnam. I believe that the world understands this.

If a further gesture is needed, well and good. I hope that the five points so eloquently outlined by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania can be attained. However, it seems to me that, in the realities of the present situation, it is difficult to understand how in August we can have what I would term to be a genuine election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Extorted Elections—Buddhist Protests Questions," written by William S. White, and published in the Washington Post of April 21, 1966.

I am not in agreement with all of Mr. White's observations and conclusions, but I do feel that he very eloquently expresses apprehension as to the true significance of the pending election.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1966]

#### EXTORTED ELECTIONS—BUDDHIST PROTEST QUESTIONED

(By William S. White)

Far too much hopefulness is being raised by the promise of elections in South Vietnam that has been extorted from the military regime there by the Buddhists.

Though it may be akin to making rude noises in church to say as much, the unhappy truth is that this is going to be a very dangerous experiment. How a nation under invasion by Communists from the north and endlessly assaulted from within by the fifth-column Vietcong can carry out genuine elections is quite a question.

Never before have armed Communists allowed any truly free political expression so long as there was the slightest prospect that it would go against them. Various administration officials are undoubtedly correct that given a fair choice the South Vietnamese will never choose armed communism to lead them. They point to past provincial elections to support the estimate.

But local elections are not national elections. Moreover, attempts to compare the chaos in South Vietnam with the growing pains of the early American Republic strike this observer as well-intended moonshine. To equate the protest of the Buddhists with, say, a Thomas Jefferson-Alexander Hamilton debate on democratic principles is surely to give the Buddhists a status they don't have.

The early Americans were politically sophisticated and educated men with a tradition of self-government and self-restraint brought from Britain. Nor were these American debates conducted while armed invaders were attacking Philadelphia and their local accomplices were kidnapping and killing people who did not agree with them.

Indeed, the alleged legitimacy of "Buddhist protests" looks dubious in the extreme on any detached analysis. Is it a legitimate exercise for a powerful group in a country savagely torn by guerilla warfare to put a pistol at the head of its leadership, unselected though it be?

If these Buddhists are in fact reasonable men why could not they have withheld their demands for elections at least until their land was fairly secure from Communist marauders?

Every Communist "war of liberation" beginning with that in Greece long ago has demanded free elections—particularly while the country concerned was in torture and while the Communist assailants were losing ground militarily, as they have been in Vietnam.

That Premier Ky had to submit to the Buddhists is beyond debate. He could not do otherwise unless he was ready to see the war effort torn apart; but those who see this Buddhist squeeze play as only a splendid example of "democracy in action" or some such cherished slogan are putting forward an odd notion.

Though free elections are everywhere desirable, granted some peace and order and a guarantee that they will indeed be free, it is quite obvious that these preconditions do not prevail in South Vietnam.

Those who are not bemused by sloganizing, therefore, can only hope that this unavoidable risk may be run with minimum gain to the Communists, who always resort to so-called democratic means precisely when their real tactic of shooting their way into power is being least successful.

South Vietnam's elections, in all the present state of affairs, are far more likely to serve those here and abroad who want us simply to get out. For if the Communists by terrorism can pervert this election just enough to cast any doubt, however spurious, on the central anti-Communist resolve of South Vietnam a readymade excuse to the cut-and-run forces here at home will be at hand.

They will only need to say that the South Vietnamese themselves no longer welcome our "interference." The U.S. Government, of course, could not do anything to alter Ky's reluctant decision, even if it wanted to do so. It would be instantly charged with some form of "imperialism"; and most of all by the home critics of prosecuting the war to the end. The Buddhists know this; indeed they have undoubtedly been emboldened in their demands more by an American minority than by anything else.

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

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I very much admire the Senator from Kentucky, and I especially admire his understanding of the mechanics and need for a bipartisan foreign policy. He has spoken very characteristically in this regard.

I am glad that the Senator endorses this proposal. It is very important.

The Senator knows from his great experience that we do not expect that the Vietcong will necessarily observe this truce. However, I do think that something can be said for the idea anyway. It evidences our readiness to abide by the will of South Vietnamese people themselves.

I believe that what worries the people of the United States is that we might go beyond our present limited objectives.

We want to afford them an opportunity to express themselves. When they do express themselves, we will abide by their expression. It is vital, moreover, that we continue to base our presence in Vietnam on the fact that we are there at the invitation of the Saigon government, and that should this government no longer desire our presence, we have no alternative but to withdraw.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I could not agree more. I have publicly stated time after time that if they do not want us there, obviously we cannot stay. That would be an untenable position, completely out of character with the traditions of this great Nation.

The point I was trying to make is that it just is not as easy as trying to implement the five points developed by the Senator from Pennsylvania. The proposed election has many complications. Certainly we do not want our men in uniform to start electioneering or participating in the election. A ceasefire is a great gesture, and we are not going to violate a ceasefire if one is negotiated, but it could free some 500,000 Communist trained men to shed their uniforms and do nothing but spend 3 weeks in electioneering.

This is one of the possibilities that I think must be considered before we implement or put forward this suggestion; and I think the Senator from New York was eminently correct when he pointed out that certain precautions in the nature of security should be taken. I further think because of the possible political consequences in Vietnam a cease-fire proposal must be carefully studied before such a proposition is officially put forward by this Government.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

#### U.S. BUSINESS AND THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EFFORT—TWO VALUABLE INITIATIVES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a sponsor of numerous measures to insure equal employment opportunity which led to the enactment of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and of S. 3092 in the present session to improve and strengthen the provisions of title VII, I have repeatedly emphasized the need—along with effective regulatory efforts of government at all levels—for a massive effort to involve business, industry and labor in voluntary programs for training members of minority groups and giving them motivation. The power of American business has yet to be fully unleashed in the gigantic task of catching up after a century of lag among Negroes.

Two forward-looking initiatives by business and industry in this field and the related field of slum eradication have recently come to my attention, and I believe they should be given national notice. They are the type of activity which it should be the policy of government to stimulate and encourage.

One of these programs is conducted by P. Ballantine & Sons, brewers of Newark, N.J., and involves a series of management seminars on equal employment opportunity held in cooperation with the Urban League of Essex County. The second is an urban rehabilitation pilot project in Harlem conducted by the U.S. Gypsum Co. Both appear to be excellent initiatives in a direction which I believe has enormous potential for good for our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point materials describing the two programs.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

P. BALLANTINE & SONS,  
Newark, N.J., March 31, 1966.

HON. JACOB JAVITS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: May I call your attention to the enclosed brochure which outlines the objectives of a series of seminars currently being held here at P. Ballantine & Sons, Newark, N.J., in cooperation with the Urban League of Essex County?

This first management institute on equal employment opportunity in business and industry is, in essence, an educational experiment to provide supervisory personnel with greater insight into potentials available in the Negro labor market today, and to assist company managers in setting up and maintaining a continuing program of equality of opportunity for every job applicant.

Conceived and organized by the Urban League, the institute is being conducted by James A. Pawley, executive director of the league, and Godfrey C. Henry, institute director.

We here at Ballantine are enthusiastic about the program which includes guest lectures, problem solving, reading assignments, and group discussions and other dynamic activities, and we join the league in the hope that other companies and communities in New Jersey will encourage similar seminars.

Your comments and suggestions would help us in our efforts to gain widespread visibility for the program and to interest other companies in participation.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. FARRELL,  
President.

#### MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

(Organized and directed by the Urban League of Essex County; sponsored by P. Ballantine & Sons, of Newark, N.J.)

"The broad objectives of the Management Institute on Equal Employment Opportunity in Business and Industry is to assist, through providing the material for a learning process, in the implementation of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which makes unlawful discrimination in all areas of employment practices.

"The institute, a 12-month project, will run for 60 hours and over a period of 3 months for each full program. Two 2½-hour group discussion seminars will be held weekly.

"Our aim is to provide essential information which would facilitate a reassessment of the Negro's capacity for participating in American business and industrial development."—JAMES A. PAWLEY, executive director, Urban League of Essex County.

Management institute seminar group discussions will focus on:

1. A brief but substantive review of the African background of the Negro American as a guide to better understanding and assessing his economic and cultural potential.

2. The economic and cultural beginnings of the Negro in America.

3. The Negro's contribution to American economic and cultural development; emphasizing the historic development of Negro business from the establishment of National Negro Business League in 1900, and the development of Negro song, dance, literature and theatre in the same perspective.

4. The current economic and social status of the Negro, and the contributing factors and corrective proposals.

5. The impact of equal employment legislation on the opportunities of the Negro worker.

6. Affirmative action: definition and analysis of its meaning in regard to the provision of equal employment opportunity in business and industry.

7. The development of effective programs for recruiting, interviewing and testing the Negro applicant.

8. Positive action in job assignments to utilize the employee's full ability, evaluating task performance, on-the-job training and retraining, upgrading, and promotion.

9. Identifying and correcting practices not conducive to smooth relations between minority group members and others in business and industry.

10. Coping with problems arising from intracompany transfers of minority group members in the work force.

11. Internal opposition to work force integration.

12. Assessing and measuring corporate executive efficiency in providing equal employment opportunity in the need now to produce results rather than the traditional concern for avoiding problems.

13. What corporate management should know about the nonwhite community's aspirations, problems and prevailing attitudes.

14. Building the company's image in the Negro community.

15. Evaluation of, and specific recommendations on, the business and industrial community's development of support in the nonwhite community for furthering programs for economic opportunity and development.

APRIL 11, 1966.

Mr. JOHN E. FARRELL,  
President, P. Ballantine & Sons,  
Newark, N.J.

DEAR Mr. FARRELL: Thank you for your letter of March 31, 1966, regarding the seminars your company is holding in cooperation with the Urban League of Essex County.

I very sincerely commend your company and the Urban League for undertaking this most constructive effort toward equal employment opportunity. It is precisely the kind of forward-looking program which I have long urged our private enterprise system to adopt, and I hope that you will continue to keep me advised as to your progress.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,  
U.S. Senator.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 11, 1966]  
PROFIT IN REHABILITATION: U.S. GYPSUM REBUILDS IN HARLEM AND MAKES IT PAY—SO FAR

(By Bowen Northrup)

New York.—Mrs. Stephanie Lahoussaye, a sturdy and gentle woman of 73, who lives quietly with her toy white poodle, may not be aware of it, but she and her fellow tenants at 307 East 102d Street are passing judgment daily on a precarious new initiative in housing.

Eight months ago their building was among the most dismal in a forlorn row of tenements. Now, painted light gray, with bright yellow trim, and totally refurbished inside, it is the showcase of the block. The local idlers survey it with something like incredulity.

Slum rehabilitation heretofore has been the unchallenged province of government. But the U.S. Gypsum Co. has plunged into the heart of Harlem with a \$1.25 million pilot project to demonstrate that private interests can profitably undertake slum renovation. The company bought, and is rebuilding, six old buildings.

If it works in Harlem, it should work anywhere, U.S. Gypsum thinks, and rehabilitation appears to be a relative bargain; work at No. 307, the first building to be completed, cost between \$9,000 and \$9,500 per living unit, compared with an average \$22,500 per

April 21, 1966

tary Freeman. The study was to be conducted by a task force of representatives from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget. Among the key targets of this task force was the proposal of programs to "stem farm migration to the cities and encourage a return to rural communities."

Robert G. Lewis, head of the Rural Community Development Service, crystallized this thinking in the preface to the program the task force hoped would be submitted to the present session of Congress: "The tragedy that occurred in the slums of Los Angeles \* \* \* began as depression on the farm. Fundamentally, it was not a 'race riot'—but rather an explosion growing out of the poverty and despair of rural people lost in an urban slum existence that had eroded away whatever social capability and discipline they had at the start."

Although a detailed program suggested as a result of the study has been temporarily shelved because of budget conflicts—some observers feel the squeeze of current Great Society programs and Vietnam left no room for major legislation of its kind—it has stimulated further study and some further investment in rural problems. This increased interest in new ideas for rural solutions was evidenced in President Johnson's request in January for \$5 million for pilot projects to combat rural poverty. The President envisions a common planning effort aimed at community development and the pooling of resources in rural areas.

"Our purpose," his message said, "is to demonstrate how a common effort can provide the needed district vocational school in one county, the hospital in another, the police training in a third, industry or an adequate library in a fourth—and how it can avoid the waste of duplication or, worse still, the total lack of any such facilities or services in a wide area because of a failure to pool common resources. Our purpose is not to supplant present efforts of local, State, or Federal Governments—but to supplement them; not to forsake the small community, but to help it avoid underrepresentation in decisions that affect its life."

An example of the effect that such a coordinated attack could have in a depressed rural community may be seen in the neighboring towns of Tazewell and New Tazewell, Tenn., which have a population of some 2,000. There, in 1962, the Area Redevelopment Administration gambled a million dollars on a public works project to develop water and sewage facilities. Three years later, that initial Federal investment has been matched by \$9.5 million of other public and private investment and has brought the Tazewells to the point where they will qualify as a potential growth center under the Appalachian Commission formula. As a result of the ARA's million-dollar gamble, they have attracted plants manufacturing trailers, plastics, textiles, and furniture, creating 700 new jobs. Public and private building has been stimulated; credit has opened up for local development; 22 members of the 1954 graduating class at the local high school who left the Tazewells for the higher pay of the cities have returned home.

The central idea of the task force program that was dropped was the proposal for opportunity homesteads. Loans on liberal terms were planned to help a family to develop land on which it lived or to purchase and develop a homestead on land in areas where economic development appeared feasible. A probationary period was to be required in which the homesteader would improve the property and develop a subsistence farming operation; the participation of all adult members of the family in vocational, home management, and general education programs would be required. The end result would be the transfer of equity

in the homestead to the family; because of the required training programs, it would be better prepared to develop economic independence.

Since the homestead farm was conceived only for subsistence purposes, off-farm employment would be provided in the first years by Federal investment in rural work projects. Planners point out that there is a backlog of needed work requiring low levels of skills, including soil, water, and wildlife conservation, forestry, and beautification. While such investments would be expensive, they would, unlike present relief expenditures, have a lasting value in developing natural resources, human skills, and a strong rural economic base.

#### A CHANCE TO GROW

Supporters of rural programs know that in President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey they have two men attuned to rural problems. As a lobbyist for the National Farmers Union said recently: "These guys know us, they know our problems. For the first time in a long time I don't feel as if I'm speaking a foreign language in Washington when I talk about rural affairs." The optimism of people like this, however, has suffered a setback with the increasing concern over Vietnam. Not only are the chances dim for new programs and increased poverty program spending; as city job opportunities open up with increased military spending, another massive migration of the rural poor comparable to that of the Second World War and the Korean war is apt to occur. Moreover, migrants have higher hopes and deeper hostilities than those of the 1940's or 1950's. The gap between what they possess and what they desire is infinitely wider.

Watts and Harlem and south Chicago and the other ports of entry into America's cities are not equipped to absorb many more of the rural dispossessed. Unless a solution is found for rural poverty where it exists, the human and physical resources of the countryside will be forfeited, and their forfeiture will serve as a continuing drain on the vitality of urban America.

Already the frustration and disappointment of small-town and rural leaders is being voiced. Recently the Appalachian Regional Commission decided that a highway could not be economically justified in Hancock County, Tenn. When he heard of it, Mayor Charles Turner, of Sneedville, the county seat, remarked, "I'm sorry to jump on you fellows about your programs. They're all real fine programs. It's just that I've put my whole life into this town and this county, and only now they're telling me it doesn't have a chance to grow anyhow."

#### TRENTON, N.J.—ALL AMERICA CITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of New Jersey's great cities, Trenton, has received a signal honor from the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Trenton has been named an All America City. This richly deserved award recognizes the fine efforts made by the citizens of Trenton, working through their local government with the enthusiastic cooperation of private business and groups of concerned citizens. Trentonians have shown what an active and dedicated program of urban renewal and rebuilding can mean.

Only a few years ago Trenton was a blighted city in a state of decline and decay, but today it is one of the most progressive and forward-looking cities in all of New Jersey. To those of us who are concerned with the problems of urban decay, Trenton will stand as a good example of what can be done through a

combination of Federal, State, and local efforts to rehabilitate and to rebuild a city within a relatively short period of time.

Although we often speak pessimistically of the problems our cities face, I think Trenton's great success is a cause for optimism as we look to the future of our other great cities. I salute and congratulate the citizens of Trenton for their outstanding efforts. Trenton is truly an "All America City" and a shining example to every other American city.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial describing the award, which was published in the Trentonian, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### OUR ALL AMERICA CITY: AWARD TO THE CITIZENS

Tonight the citizens of Trenton will be honored as the city receives its All America City Award in ceremonies at the war memorial.

It is important to note that the citizens of the city are being honored, for the award which was made by the National Municipal League and Look magazine was based on the participation of citizens in making Trenton a better place in which to live, work, and do business.

As Dr. George H. Gallup, of Princeton, the noted public opinion expert who served as chairman of the All America Cities Award jury, said in his letter of notification that Trenton had been among those chosen: "I salute the citizens of Trenton whose effective action has won this award and sincerely hope they will view this honor as a further incentive to play a positive role in the affairs of their community."

It goes without saying that the various movements which brought Trenton this honor were not accomplished without leadership on governmental levels. But it also goes without saying that such leadership would have been meaningless had not the citizens of the city responded the way they did.

From the formation of the Greater Trenton Council on through the birth of the Citizens Action Council, the change in government, the creation of a Citizens Advisory Committee on Human Rights, the successful campaign for water fluoridation, the turning of Coalport from a failure into a success, Mayor Holland's move into the Mercer-Jackson area that spurred improvements in that area, and the spawning of an antipoverty program by the Human Renewal Coordinating Committee to the repeated successes of the Delaware Valley United Fund, the accent clearly is on what citizens did.

And that's what makes the award so meaningful. It recognizes the fact that the people of Trenton, concerned over a dying city and aroused by the horrible "Case City" epithet, were not found wanting when the call to action was sounded.

Thanks to its citizens, Trenton has turned from "Case City" into All America City.

#### VIEWS FROM KANSAS ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Unpopular, Divided-Opinion War," published in the Independence News, Independence, Kans., on Saturday, April 16, 1966.

The editorial was written by my friend, John Vermillion, and expresses not only

his view of the Vietnam war but the views of many people in Kansas. I cannot associate myself with some of the conclusions Mr. Vermillion draws. On numerous occasions, personally and by correspondence, we have discussed and debated this issue. We do not always agree. Our friendship does not require that we agree, but I respect his intellectual curiosity, his independence, and his sincere interest in the problems that face Kansas and the Nation.

On large and small issues we cannot hold to irrevocable and unchanging positions. There is a constant need to look at every side of every issue. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

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

#### THE UNPOPULAR, DIVIDED-OPINION WAR

We call upon President Johnson to change his foreign policy in Vietnam.

It is very clear to the American people and should be very clear to the President of the United States, that the Vietnamese people, North and South, do not want the U.S. Government and military forces interfering in their internal affairs.

This rejection by the Vietnamese has been noticed by many Americans for many months, but loyalty has kept some Americans in line with the President's foreign policy. But now loyalty has taken on another design.

If we're going to be real, true, loyal Americans that we all should want to be, then loyalty at this time should be determined by taking a position that we must not be betrayed by the people that we are trying to help in South Vietnam.

We have been undermined and sold out by our so-called friends in that area.

Premier Cao Ky hoodwinked and promised the U.S. Government a lot of things that he couldn't deliver. We questioned his real purpose. We fell for his type of blackmail.

If we're really going to be loyal to our Nation and loyal to our fighting boys, then it is time that we get out of Vietnam and establish a strong line of defense in an area, where, if we are attacked, we will declare all-out war to defend our Nation against the enemy.

In the meantime, our Navy should continue to roam the high seas. Our Air Force should continue to be in the skies in the interest of maintaining a strong national defense for this Nation and this hemisphere.

Now the way the Vietnamese have betrayed us, it would be treason on the part of any leader, military or civilian, to ask and keep a footsoldier in that area where he can be shot in the back, where he has no real friends and comrades, and where no one seems to come to his defense when he needs it most.

It would be easy to say that we have probably lost as many fighting men that were killed by South Vietnamese as killed by the North Vietnamese.

Recognizing that this Nation cannot become an isolationist nation, we therefore call upon the President to use his influence and the available resources necessary to allow the Chinese Nationalists to regain control of China by encouraging the use of available Chinese Nationalist troops that are well equipped, well trained, and eager to regain the leadership of their country.

This will stabilize governments of smaller nations in that area in due time. Vietnam will be one of the nations that will be stabilized.

At the same time, we ask the President of the United States to use his influence to allow Germany to become united. When these

steps are taken, which should help to stop communism, they will bring about a change in our foreign policy that will definitely be in the best interest of the United States and this hemisphere both from an economic and military standpoint.

If Germany is united, that nation has a definite distrust for Russia and will probably stop the growth of communism in Eastern Europe. The French are already determined to become a strong, nationalist nation.

The United States should follow the philosophical idea of Theodore Roosevelt, that being: "Speak softly but carry a big stick." There can be no letdown of duty, because every American can be used to concentrate his individual effort to get rid of totalitarian ideas in this Nation and in this hemisphere, communism being the No. 1 enemy idea that should be defeated and sent back to Russia with its tail between its legs.

The American people should at the same time make it known in a definite and positive manner that any other type of totalitarian idea will be dealt with harshly and whipped.

This Nation can then set about the task of developing strong individuality and at the same time it can use its inner strength to defend freedom where freedom really needs defending.

It's time that we become loyal to our country first.

It takes courage to be truly loyal. Immitation loyalty is a fool's folly. It's time to get out of Vietnam and build America strong and free.

In passing, let us say, too, that, if we don't do something to strengthen America internally both from a financial and a good citizenship standpoint, our enemies will definitely conquer America from within.

Already one can see that internally many hoodlums and troublemakers are causing more and more crime and this is weakening our Nation. We're also being weakened tremendously by an increased taxation and deficit spending program which is stifling individual initiative and creating indecision in the minds of many that would like to build America. And then too—if the best boys we've got for future leaders are being siphoned off, sent to Vietnam and are being killed and wounded, then we're eliminating the natural balance in people we need to maintain a good strong America.

America must be united and the American people have always united and fought shoulder to shoulder when our Nation was attacked, and we will courageously do this again. But it is hard to stay united when there is a definite feeling by many citizens that we are interfering in other peoples' business rather than really defending our own Nation.

This idea isn't one that could be labeled a cowardly withdrawal. It takes great courage to build back when one has found himself wrong or has made a mistake. Many of the greatest victories have come by knowing when to retreat and regroup, and then move on to the goal of righteous victory.

#### NEW JET SHUTTLE SERVICE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as an aviation enthusiast, it is a pleasure for me to salute today another step in aviation's progress toward being the predominant mode of passenger travel in the United States.

On Sunday, April 24, jet aircraft will be introduced on the air shuttle—a unique transportation system which has become familiar to those of us in Washington who have to make frequent business trips to New York and Boston.

The air shuttle will celebrate its fifth anniversary on April 30. Eastern Air-

lines started this service back on April 30, 1961, on the theory that frequent travelers—businessmen and people connected with Government—would welcome hourly service between Boston, New York, and Washington. The service was not only to be frequent, but passengers would be able to board an airplane without a reservation, buy their tickets on board, and be guaranteed a seat at all times through the availability of backup aircraft and crews waiting to handle peak traffic at the busy hours of the day and night—and on weekends and at holiday periods.

On the Sunday of last Thanksgiving weekend, for example, a total of 263 shuttle flights were operated and they carried 19,355 passengers—an alltime record for a single day. Last year, about 85 percent of all those who traveled by air between Washington and New York or Newark used the shuttle. Ten million people have flown it since that first flight in April of 1961, and it carries some 2.8 million passengers a year.

There have been some problems. It costs money to keep standby aircraft and their crews waiting at airports. Because of the congestion in the Washington-New York-Boston air corridor, the shuttle aircraft often have to fly circuitous routes. And since our east coast region, unlike Oklahoma, is not always blessed with the world's greatest weather, there are expensive delays on that score, too. Sixteen times since Eastern started the service, it has flown an airplane with only one passenger—one who was left at the gate when the previous shuttle section filled up.

The shuttle service has been improved continually since its introduction in 1961. Last August, faster, more comfortable prop-jet Lockheed Electra aircraft were introduced on the New York-Boston segment to replace older Constellations. Electras came to the Washington-New York segment last September, and by last October, all first sections operating out of La Guardia were equipped with Electras.

To make the service more attractive, there are now reduced fares—weekend round-trip excursion fares and a week-day family plan air shuttle fare. On April 24, air shuttle fares in offpeak hours on a trip between New York and Washington will be cut from \$18 to \$15 and some change.

On this same date, Sunday, April 24, the Boeing 727 Whisperjet will come into Washington National Airport from New York on the air shuttle. Four of the sixteen shuttle flights each way between New York and Washington will be with jets, and later they will be assigned to the Boston and subsequently to the Newark segments. By the summer of 1967 Eastern expects to have all first sections operating with jets, with Electras as second section and backup aircraft.

The jets are more comfortable and will make the Washington-to-New York trip in 40 minutes, a saving of 20 percent from the Electra time and 40 percent from Constellation travel time.

I want to commend the management of Eastern for this forward step which is

April 21, 1966

community will still be asked in 1967 to provide housing for approximately 1,300 more students than are currently accommodated.

### THE U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, although I have supported our military presence in Vietnam since we first sent our advisers there, for some time there has been no question in my mind but that the physical presence of our servicemen especially in the urban areas of South Vietnam serves as an irritant to some of the Vietnamese.

This should come as no surprise to us. In part, it results from the weight of sheer numbers of men who invariably displace a local population; in part it is the result of the anxieties and frustrations of war. It happened in France and Italy during World War II when we were fighting a common enemy and in England where we have the longest and closest of ties in language, values and traditions. It happens unfortunately in our own cities and our own men when they are located near large military centers.

But when in addition to all these things the affluence of the visitor versus the relative impoverishment of the visited is as compellingly different as it is in Vietnam, and when this difference is reinforced by unrelated language and customs, and when previous associations with Western faces have been tinged with sorrow and bitterness, we face a far more explosive situation.

I have been, and I am sure that, any person who has seen first hand the deportment of our fighting men in Vietnam would be tremendously impressed by their effort not only to win the war, but also to heal its wounds and, in all things, to exemplify the highest principles which they are there to defend.

It is an easy transfer for these Vietnamese, who before our entry could make a living, now to believe that the more affluent Americans are primarily responsible for their declining buying power. The fact that we are there to fight for their freedom or to stop the transgressions from the north, carries little weight with the salaried worker or the head of a household who is in the phase with inflation, and who now is unable to provide for his family. All his feelings can be directed into an hostile act at the mere sight of an American uniform. It is for this reason that I have made two suggestions which may be of interest to my colleagues.

One is to inaugurate programs among military and civilian personnel there to divert the unbalancing effect of their earnings from the Vietnamese economy. Of course, this must be voluntary. Without doubt the fighting men must control the small reward our Nation pays them for their sacrifices.

But if a portion of the earnings of American personnel could be channeled into a reserve for them, to be at his disposal later when new demands will descend upon them, it would be beneficial, both to them and to the goals of

our efforts there. Perhaps such funds could be invested for them in savings bonds, or through regular methods of payroll deductions to banks or savings and loan organizations. The money could be set aside for education or for homes or for families and their future needs.

The economy of Vietnam must be bolstered in this critical period, but this need not be done by the wages of the men who fight there and who themselves are unavoidably caught by the same inflation from the recent inflow of dollars as are the local people.

The other proposal is to provide rest and recuperation for our men through centers outside Vietnam and outside southeast Asia. The military command has seen fit in recent days to keep men from Vietnamese cities which are now in political turmoil. Undoubtedly this has been a wise move and one which recognizes the problem I have been discussing, but if extended it adds additional demands upon those we already place upon our fighting men. It is for this reason that I have suggested that, when possible, rest and rehabilitation centers be established on American soil. I have suggested Hawaii's Fort DeRussy as such an area for it already serves this purpose, and did so during World War II. It would lessen the impact of our men on the sometimes hostile recreation areas in Asia, and would compensate them for the restrictions on their recreational outlets in Vietnam. Fort DeRussy is in the heart of Waikiki, and wives and sweethearts of servicemen on leave could come to visit them at this halfway point. The morale of the men and loved ones would be improved immeasurably. It would be a token of our country's appreciation.

I have made these suggestions to the Department of Defense for I believe they would be beneficial and appropriate both for our fighting men and for our objectives in Vietnam.

### IS THERE A GOLD MINE OUT IN THE OCEAN?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an article in the April 9 issue of Business Week established a connection between three items which are very close to my heart: ocean research, small business, and precious metals.

The magazine report estimates that the ocean floor contains enough reachable copper to keep the world supplied for 1 million years, and that processing nodules of manganese which are known to exist in the mid-Pacific could yield 50 percent of this country's annual nickel requirements, 100 percent of its annual manganese needs, and 35 percent of its annual cobalt needs.

Ninety-five percent of our Nation's Continental Shelf lies within the 100-fathom curve, that is, within 600 feet of the surface.

Development of new techniques to operate at this depth should be one of the Nation's highest orders of priority. Yet, Business Week reports that the Government is spending about \$200 million for

research and development in this field, compared to \$4.8 billion for research in outer space, and \$7 billion for research by the Defense Department.

Because of the expenses involved, only a handful of firms make up the underwater industry, and these, in large parts represent segments of major corporations. However, it is heartening to note that some small businesses, in their traditional role as a go-ahead segment of our society, are scoring successes. The article describes one such company which has added to our store of technology by doing so.

Mr. President, I believe this article illustrates the desirability of concentrating further attention and resources of ocean sciences, so that small and large businesses will be encouraged to develop capabilities to gather wealth from the sea. I ask unanimous consent that the article from Business Week be included in the RECORD for the information of all concerned.

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

IS THERE A GOLD MINE OUT IN THE OCEAN? A HANDFUL OF BIG AND SMALL U.S. COMPANIES BELIEVE THERE'S PLENTY OF MONEY IN UNDERWATER ENGINEERING—THEY'RE BUILDING NEW GEAR, INCLUDING ROBOT DIVERS, TO MAKE THE JOB EASIER, CHEAPER

No matter when—or if—the Navy succeeds in retrieving the missing U.S. H-bomb deep in the ocean off the coast of Spain, the 11-week search is stimulating fresh interest in a handful of firms that make up the underwater industry.

These are the companies, many of them new, that see untold riches of minerals on the ocean floor, that are making money now aiding petroleum producers in their search for offshore oil, and that undertake such unglamorous tasks as unplugging clogged sewers.

In large part, they represent segments of major corporations—Westinghouse Electric, Union Carbide, and Lockheed, for example—but there are also a good many small businessmen among them. All these companies view the oceans, the rivers, and the lakes as their economic oyster.

#### STARTING OUT

While the big companies have the money and engineers to move into what has been a technological vacuum (the diver's hard hat, invented in 1837, is still standard equipment), plenty of room exists for the small entrepreneur, as is shown by the case of Marine Contracting, Inc., based in Southport, Conn.

Its president and founder, George C. Wiswell, Jr., had been an advertising account executive for 10 years. Then, in 1962, he chucked Madison Avenue to get into the underwater business. At that time, his only contact with underwater activities had been a little weekend scuba diving.

Wiswell set up Marine Contracting, the first year selling jobs on days he wasn't supervising his small crew, and taking in some \$60,000 in gross revenues. By 1965, sales had risen to \$980,000, and from here on out, Wiswell claims, it's going to be big business. He expects to do a \$2.5 million volume this year and holds contracts with oil companies doing offshore drilling to prove that he will.

#### TOSSING THE DICE

When he moved into the underwater business, Wiswell was betting that he could use his advertising and marketing background

to sell commercial diving, and also that he could sign up some smart engineers who would apply modern techniques to underwater problems.

He appears to be winning both gambles. Wiswell's biggest coup so far is the first commercial adaption of an advanced underwater environment system—that is, letting men live at deep water pressures for an extended period in order to lengthen the time divers can spend on the bottom. To accomplish this, he used an environmental tank developed by Westinghouse's Underseas Division, designed primarily for the Navy's Sealab experiment. Wiswell did the job for American Electric Power, faced with problems at its Smith Mountain Dam, Va., pumped storage project.

In essence, a baffle system designed to keep trash and debris out of the turbines wasn't doing the job, and the utility had to have the system modified fast. It would have taken conventional divers considerably longer than 6 weeks to do the jobs—much too long for AEP's timetable. The project involved men working at depths of down to 200 feet—where in most cases divers get in less than half an hour's actual work a day, because of the dangers of "bends" and the long preparation and decompression times necessary. However, Wiswell leased a Sealab-type environmental vessel from Westinghouse, knowing that he would get 4 hours' work daily from his divers. He won the contract by promising completion of the project in half the time that conventional methods would take.

#### UNDER PRESSURE

The divers lived in a special tank on the top of the dam for a week. During this period, they were in atmospheric and pressure conditions close to those faced at the 200-foot depth. Because of this, they wasted no time in preparation and decompression, except at the start or end of their stints.

#### I. FRAGILE HUMANS

Divers' problems are the toughest that the underwater industry faces. As T. J. Coleman, president of Ocean Systems, Inc., points out, human divers not only take a tremendously long time to do a job, but their cost is tremendous. Ocean Systems was formed January 1, 1965, and is owned jointly by Union Carbide, General Precision Equipment Corp., and Edwin Link, inventor of Link aviation trainers.

Another engineer points out that a diver in the Gulf of Mexico is paid \$106 daily just to stand by, \$126 if he dons a diving suit, and \$168 if he gets wet. And that's just the beginning. On top of the \$168 charge come per-foot costs, which range from \$1.23 per foot for working between 50 and 100 feet to \$10 per foot for working at depths deeper than 400 feet.

A man doing a job at, say, 300 feet will get \$1,024 for a day's work, which actually means being at the work site below about 20 minutes. Then come costs of the supporting equipment—cranes, barges, and tugboats.

Coleman believes a number of things are starting to shave these costs. Research, he says, is making diving considerably less risky, and stretching the time divers can efficiently work underwater will make the actual cost lower.

#### Machines' role

The real solution, many people in the underwater business believe, will come by eliminating divers altogether. But so far this hasn't been practical.

A few years ago, Shell Oil Co. was very enthused about its ability to replace men working underwater with machines. While the company has had some success in this area, mechanical devices haven't done as well as expected, according to a Shell offshore production expert.

One device Shell built was called a universal manipulator, a man-like robot that can move about underwater feeling its way with sonar and seeing through a TV camera. But its weakness, says the Shell man, is extremely limited visibility. Even in the clear offshore drilling waters near California, a TV camera can't pick up a weld seam 12 inches away, while a human diver can feel it.

In fact, the limits of unmanned vehicles developed so far are evident in the search for the missing H-bomb, being handled by Ocean Systems as prime contractor for the Navy. The vehicle doing the job—known as Curve (for controlled underwater recovery vehicle)—uses a TV camera to locate an object and a manipulator to grab and haul it in.

#### Good news

These difficulties, of course, make any successes noteworthy. Humble Oil & Refining, for example, used a remote-operated drilling vessel to install a wellhead at a 642-foot depth off the California coast at Santa Barbara last December. That's a record so far, and the job was done by Global Marine, Inc., using its Cuss I vehicle, a highly sophisticated electronic and mechanical undersea system.

The depth, too, of the Humble project is significant. Almost 95 percent of the Nation's continental shelf lies at 600 feet or shallower levels.

#### IT JUST THE START

The potential wealth on the ocean floor is staggering. One enthusiast claims that it contains enough reachable copper to keep the world supplied for a million years.

Another—John Mero, an oceanographic consultant long known for his optimism about undersea mining—claims that a single 10,000-ton-per-day dredging operation working manganese nodules known to exist in the mid-Pacific could produce 50 percent of U.S. annual nickel requirements, 100 percent of manganese needs, 5 percent of the copper, 25 percent of the cobalt, and 7 percent of the molybdenum. In fact, the Bureau of Mines is sponsoring two ships in the Pacific conducting explorations and research on mining methods.

All of these minerals could be obtained, says Mero, "at substantially lower costs than those involved in producing similar products from land deposits."

#### In the works

While operations of this kind seem far in the future—10 years or more, even to the optimists—a great deal of ocean mining is taking place right now. Tin ore, for example, is being mined at 90-foot depths off Thailand and being smelted at a plant completed last fall.

Other projects—some just getting under way, others believed close to realization—include titanium ore operations, monocyte sand (used for lamp mantles), iron ore off the Japanese coast, coal from an undersea tunnel off Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, aragonite off the Bahamas, and a De Beers diamond dredging operation off the coast of South Africa.

As Mero and others explain, getting at these deposits is only part of the problem. The other part is developing ways to smelt and refine the minerals and ores, whose composition usually is quite different from those found on land.

Interestingly enough, few mining companies have done much work in the problems of operating on ocean minerals and ores. Some of the most advanced work on processing manganese nodules has been done by a chemical company.

Another gripe of the underwater industry is that the Government is spending relatively little on underwater research compared to its research and development outlays for the space program.

J. H. Clotworthy, who runs the Westinghouse Underseas Division, puts the Government spending at about \$200 million annually, including both classified and unclassified work. He calls this a "piddling" amount—especially in view of the fact that the Government takes in some \$300 million annually on oil leases alone. The lack of any really big Government underseas project means that while big defense contractors have potential interest in this field, most are doing little about it.

#### SAFETY OF INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS PIPELINES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at my request, the Federal Power Commission has prepared a report on the safety of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines. The report contains a chronological list of interstate gas pipeline failures over a 15½-year period. Between January 1, 1950, and June 30, 1965, the report discloses 64 deaths and 222 injuries have occurred.

The possible seriousness of an interstate gas pipeline failure was graphically and tragically shown last year near Natchitoches, La., when 17 people were killed in the fire resulting from a pipeline rupture.

The concern about this matter becomes greater each year as pipelines become older and as the areas around the pipeline right-of-way become more populated. The other side of the safety question involves reliability. As the Northeast power failure has shown, loss of an energy source can have a crippling effect.

The Committee on Commerce has been deeply involved with safety questions this session. A tire safety bill has been reported and passed by the Senate and the committee is now studying automobile safety. An investigation of natural gas pipeline safety has considerable precedent, although the problems and the possible solutions are of a different nature. The committee will schedule hearings on S. 1553, the natural gas pipeline bill in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of the FPC report printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HIGHLIGHTS OF FPC REPORT TO U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON SAFETY OF INTERSTATE NATURAL GAS PIPELINES

The report was prepared by the Federal Power Commission at the request of the Committee on Commerce in connection with the natural gas pipeline safety bill (S. 1553) introduced by Senator Magnuson. The FPC report, which analyzes the gas industry's safety practices and record, concludes that primary responsibility must continue to rest with industry management but that "the Federal Government can make a valuable contribution" by fixing minimum safety standards "for protection against natural gas pipeline hazards." Minimum Federal standards, says the FPC report, "should not preempt the States from additional regulation in this field," the FPC report covers only interstate transmission, excluding both local distribution and intrastate transmission.

The report makes available for the first time in the history of the gas industry a detailed chronological list of gas pipeline failures, over a 15½-year period. The fail-

April 21, 1966

but, in view of Mr. Freeman's campaign against farmers and farming, I am not so sure. We must assume that, if the authority is granted, it will be used.

The bill would put the farmer on the dole from now on out and woe eventually to the producer who angered the bureaucrats. As I see it, H.R. 12784, in its present form, is a bill to help destroy the independence of the American farmer and to make him a ward of the Federal Government henceforth.

Some may argue that I am using the crystal ball and am trying to read Mr. Freeman's mind. In this connection, let me refer them to an exchange which took place between the Secretary and Representative QUIE, of Minnesota, when the former was testifying before the House Agriculture Committee on the food-for-freedom program.

The Secretary stated frankly that:

If we are going to buy in by the Government when we have too much production, we have got to recognize that we will have to sell back when prices are stronger.

Mr. QUIE then commented that:

The Department of Agriculture now is more the voice of the consumer than it is of the farmers.

The transcript quoted Mr. Freeman as saying:

I am disturbed about that, but I plead guilty in the sense that the Department is an important consumer service agency and that it will continue to be so.

Anyone familiar with developments during the past several months must realize that the administration's attempt to put the blame for inflation on the farmers is a phony.

I am not defending food prices. There is a big spread between the price which the farmers receive and the retail prices, but I do know that food prices are cheaper in the United States today than in any major country in the world. For example, the consumer in this country spends about 19 percent of his disposable income for food, disposable income being defined as the income left after taxes and certain fixed costs are paid.

Let us contrast this figure with food costs—using the same yardstick—in some other countries: Britain, 27 percent; Sweden, 27 percent; France, 30 percent; West Germany, 36 percent; Italy, 43 percent; Japan, 43 percent; Yugoslavia, 46 percent; and the Soviet Union about 50 percent.

This is possible only because of the marvelous productivity of American agriculture, a productivity in glaring contrast with the inability to produce abundantly in the Communist countries. Over the years, the efficiency of American agriculture has enabled us to ship millions and millions of tons of food-stuffs to needy areas abroad, food which may have prevented chaos in many nations.

While American agriculture is efficient, in many ways it has not been rewarded for this efficiency. Farm income has consistently lagged behind urban income. In 1965, the farm population had only \$1,510 per capita to spend after taking care of necessary items. On the

other hand, the city dweller had \$2,405, or \$900 more than his rural brother.

Farm debt rose \$3.4 billion in 1965 to a total of \$39.4 billion, a record. Every year there are about 90,000 fewer farmers on the land. Every year the cost of doing business goes up.

Food prices are 111.4 percent of the 1957-59 average and the whole cost of living index is around the same figure. But let us take a look at the base period itself. In this period, farmers got only about 83 percent of parity for their products. In other words, the base period, itself, is not a true measure of the situation.

With the realization that the United States must use its farm surpluses and techniques to deal with the world's food deficit, many of us felt that the farmers would at last come into their own. They could get a fair price in the marketplace. Their contribution to the economy, to foreign policy, and to national security should be recognized. Farming would be put upon a sound and stable basis.

Agriculture is our most important single industry. Farmers spend nearly \$45 billion every year in production costs and for consumer goods. More people are employed in agriculture than in the combined employment of the public utilities, automobile, transportation and steel industries.

The administration's campaign against the American farmer will have far-reaching and disastrous results. The comparatively low prices for corn means, within the next few months, low prices for hogs, poultry and, in time, livestock. So it goes and I might point out that industry and business in the farming areas and outside also will be hard hit eventually.

Recently, my attention has been called to the fact that farm net income this year probably will be up by \$1 billion, which seemingly is put forward as proof that Mr. Freeman does care for the producers. I am unconvinced. All this projected increase comes from an increase in payments to farmers which, overall, will total more than \$3.5 billion. Government payments, year in and year out, are a most unstable foundation for agriculture. They depend on the whim of the executive branch of the Government and on the decision of each Congress. They are a poor substitute for cash in the marketplace.

The departure of Mr. Freeman would not in itself put American agriculture on a sound basis for solid market development in the future, but it would certainly be a hopeful and necessary beginning toward that end.

#### MR. FORD'S TIMELY CHARGE OF MISMANAGEMENT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are concerned over the question of whether we can afford both the frills of new Great Society programs and

the financing of the Vietnam war, without runaway inflation or even higher taxes, were greatly impressed by the thoughtful and sober statement made recently at a news conference by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, during the Easter recess.

The occasion for Mr. FORD's statement was twofold—the birthday anniversary of Thomas Jefferson, who as President, cut taxes and reduced the national debt, and the 15th of April, when most of us had to file our Federal income tax returns for 1965. Mr. FORD cited the roll-call record of this body to show that on domestic nondefense spending measures, an average of 93 percent of the Republicans had voted for savings and 82 percent of the Democrats had voted for spending more, and inevitably higher taxes.

The distinguished minority leader very carefully pointed out that we Republicans in the House of Representatives, though outnumbered two-to-one, have consistently voted President Johnson every penny he has asked for in support of the war in Vietnam and the national security. But in charging the Democratic majority, except for a handful of Jeffersonian Democrats, with being a "blank check Congress" for the Democratic administration, he served notice that we Republicans do not intend to countersign blank checks forever even in the defense area. He cited reports from South Vietnam of mismanagement by Pentagon planners and rightly warned that such shocking errors of judgment cannot be condoned merely for the sake of national unity. These management mistakes—and more—have been confirmed since by Secretary McNamara himself and, more significantly, by independent and reputable observers on the scene, among them the correspondents of CBS and the New York Times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text of Mr. FORD's excellent statement and a few corroborating reports from the press and the networks in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

Yesterday was the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. Today is the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's death. Tomorrow, as most of us are unhappily aware even without this reminder, is Great Society tax day—the deadline for filing your Federal income tax returns for 1965.

President Johnson is in Mexico City today unveiling a statue of Abraham Lincoln, so I suppose it will not be amiss for me to say a few words in praise of Thomas Jefferson.

Jefferson, though he called himself a Republican, is regarded now as the father of the Democratic Party. Lincoln, the first Republican president, was himself a great admirer of Jefferson, saying that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society." For his part, Jefferson declared that "every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists."

So without quibbling about labels, let me merely note that we are all today indebted to Thomas Jefferson for one major contribution to our system of government. He was the Founding Father who started the two-party system. You might say that, as Vice President, he was the first minority leader

April 21, 1966

prospered under the two-party system which here on Capitol Hill. And the country has developed—thanks to Jefferson—outside the provisions of the Constitution. It added another and most important check and balance to our experiment in self-government.

As to Jefferson's principles, during his Presidency he cut Federal spending, reduced taxes, repaid \$33 million of the national debt, and repealed the excise tax on whisky. Whether he was the last Democrat or the first Republican to do this I will leave for historians to argue.

There certainly can be no argument, however, about the differences of principle that divide our two parties in this lopsided 89th Congress. There is no doubt which is the spending party and which is the prudent party. Nevertheless, we keep hearing noises from the direction of the White House that we 140 Republicans in the House of Representatives, outnumbered more than 2 to 1, are wrecking the Johnson-Humphrey administration's earnest efforts to economize and head off higher taxes. The President pleads with us and with the housewives and businessmen and the farmers and labor leaders to sharpen our pencils and help him halt inflation.

Well, I have sharpened my pencil on my income tax forms, so let me show you a little simple arithmetic:

At this moment, there are 293 Democrats and 140 Republicans in the House. That is a 2-to-1 majority with 13 votes to spare. Even the liberal Democratic study group in the House of Representatives boasts enough members to outvote the Republican minority.

In the Senate there are 68 Democrats, including WAYNE MORSE, and 32 Republicans. That's also a two-to-one majority with four votes to spare.

In short, this is a blank check Democratic Congress which can do virtually anything it pleases, or anything President Johnson pleases, whether the Republican loyal opposition likes it or not. Such lopsided legislative majorities can spend your money, raise your taxes—and that's exactly what this blank check Democratic Congress is doing.

And remember, no matter what President Johnson says or how fervently he pleads with the housewives to stop buying steaks, the responsibility for Federal spending and for Federal taxing rests with the Congress. This blank check Democratic Congress will have to face the American voter in November, and the people will know who are the spenders and who are the savers.

They will know because there will be rollcalls on every spending bill that comes to the House of Representatives which offers any hope of saving a single wasted dollar of your money.

We asked President Johnson at the outset of this session to put wartime priorities on his wartime budget requests. So far he has refused. We have gone along with our elected Commander in Chief on everything he has asked to support our fighting men in South Vietnam—but when I read what is happening over there and how we are running short of bombs despite all the billions we have voted for defense, I wonder how long we can underwrite shocking mismanagement in the name of national unity.

We are certainly going to take hard second looks at all the rest of the Johnson-Humphrey spending proposals when the Congress resumes.

Now here is the record on nondefense spending rolled up by the blank check Democratic Congress thus far this session: On six key money measures, an average of 82 percent of the Democrats have voted for higher spending and, inevitably, higher taxes. (See table.)

On the same six rollcalls in the House of Representatives, an average of 93 percent of my Republican minority colleagues have

stood up for economy and the now dwindling hope of holding off inflation and higher Federal taxes for future April 15's.

We were faced with three new spending proposals, all having some merit in normal times but steamrollered through the blank check Democratic Congress by lopsided majorities. Then we tried to trim excess fat from three appropriation bills which came to us before the recess. Some of these proposals were worthy, and they had powerful advocates. But we are a war—and not doing too well with it. So again the roll was called. Again the result was the same. Ninety-three percent of the Republicans were for saving; 82 percent of the blank check Democrats were for more spending.

Who votes for higher taxes? Democrats—4 out of 5 of them. We cannot expect to stop this steamroller without substantial help from any Jeffersonian Democrats still left in the Congress—and it doesn't look like there are very many of them left.

But we are going to make the record clear for the people to judge in November, and I predict that the next Congress will be known as the check-and-balance Congress instead of the blank check Congress. I am confident that here in the legislative branch, at least, this country will have the right kind of leadership next year to meet the mounting array of dilemmas and disasters at home and abroad.

#### Who votes for higher taxes?

SIX ECONOMY ROLLCALLS IN THE HOUSE, 1966

[In percent.]

	Democrats voting for spending more	Republicans voting for cuts and saving
5-percent cut in Interior appropriations, Apr. 6, 1966	88	95
5-percent cut in Post Office-Treasury appropriations, Apr. 6, 1966	93	89
\$12,000,000 supplemental for rent subsidies, Mar. 29, 1966	75	95
\$750,000 new authority for Robert H. Humphrey House, Mar. 22, 1966	76	95
\$4,000,000 new authority for Alaska Centennial, Mar. 2, 1966	79	94
\$9,500,000 new authority for Florida "Interama," Feb. 3, 1966	83	87
Average	82	93

NOTE.—Total strength: 293 Democrats versus 140 Republicans—2 seats vacant.

#### U.S. PAYS \$21 FOR BOMBS IT SOLD AS JUNK AT \$1.70

The United States paid a West German firm \$21 apiece for bombs which the German firm had bought from the Air Force as junk for \$1.70 each 2 years ago, the Pentagon acknowledged yesterday.

Despite the fact that the Germans sold back the bombs—needed in Vietnam—for more than 12 times the purchase price, the Air Force claimed there was a saving in the transaction.

Bombs of the same type—750-pounders, cost \$440 when bought new today, a spokesman said.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara mentioned Thursday that bombs had been repurchased from the Germans, who bought them to use the nitrate in them for fertilizer. He was replying to newsmen's questions in regard to House Republican Leader GERALD R. FORD's charge that administration "mismanagement" had created ammunition shortages in Vietnam.

The firm—Kaus & Steinhilber Co., of Schwinge, Germany—bought 7,562 of the 750-pounders for \$12,376 in 1964 after they had been declared surplus. The Air Force bought back 5,570 of them for \$114,500.

The repurchase need came about when the Defense Department decided to send B-52 jets against the Communists in Vietnam. The 750-pounders had been disposed of in the belief that the giant bombers, which normally are armed with hydrogen bombs, would have no use for the conventional bombs.

On that basis, the Air Force was authorized in 1963, to dispose of excess 750-pounders stored in Europe. The reasoning was that the European storage space could be better used.

The Vietnam missions assigned to the B-52's last summer changed all that because the bombers were being loaded with 750-pounders at 30 tons a clip.

#### REPORT FROM SAIGON BY PETER KALISCHER, CBS NEWS, APRIL 19

U.S. Air Force sorties in South Vietnam have been cut drastically from over 400 to less than 100 a day in the past week because of a dire lack of ammunition and explosives, CBS News learned unimpeachably today.

There is no bomb shortage; there is only a shortage of what makes the bombs go off—fuses, pins and some timing devices. And there is even a shortage of 20-millimeter cannon shells.

This correspondent learned that since mid-April Air Force bombers have been taking off half loaded. Only emergency missions and those in direct support of ground force operations are being flown.

Apparently, the shortage, foreseen but not avoided, is now about to be remedied with tons of missing parts on the way. But they are not here now.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1966]

**AIR FORCE RAIDS—INFORMED SOURCES IN SAIGON ASSERT NUMBER OF SORTIES IS DRASTICALLY REDUCED—DISPUTED BY PENTAGON—INTENSITY OF STRIKES AGAINST THE FOE IN SOUTH VIETNAM ALSO REPORTED CUT BACK**  
(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, April 19.—The U.S. Air Force has drastically reduced the number and intensity of its bombing raids against Communist forces in South Vietnam over the last 13 days because of a shortage of parts for bombs and other explosive ordnance, informed sources said today.

Since April 6, when the reduction went into effect, the number of Air Force attack sorties in South Vietnam has shrunk to about 43 percent of its former level. The amount of bombs and other munitions being expended has similarly dropped.

A sortie consists of an attack on a target by a single aircraft.

Reserve supplies have recently dwindled so alarmingly that some U.S. airbases in southeast Asia are now operating on a few days' supplies of certain munitions, the sources said.

(In Washington, the Pentagon termed the report of shortages "misleading.")

#### USE OF ROCKETS FALLS

Before April 6 the Air Force was averaging about 185 sorties daily. The planes were dropping about 1,000 bombs each day on Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam.

Since then the sorties have averaged approximately 83 daily and the number of bombs dropped has averaged about 400 a day. The number of 2.75-inch air-to-ground rockets being fired has fallen from 2,800 for the week ended April 1 to 98 for the week ended April 15.

The sources said that further economies were being achieved by sending planes out with fewer bombs and other items of ordnance than normal. This technique, called "light loads," decreases the intensity of the attack.



April 21, 1966

## WARNINGS TO PENTAGON

Air Force officials in Vietnam, the sources said, have repeatedly warned the Pentagon over the last 4 months that munitions were not arriving fast enough to meet requirements. So far, supplies have not been adequately increased, they said.

The sources, who are qualified but cannot be named, said that the shortage to explosive ordnance was somewhat widespread. It includes rockets and 20-millimeter cannon shells used by fighter-bombers in strafing as well as bomb fuses, without which the bombs will not explode.

The sources declined to explain in detail the reasons for the shortage, which they attributed to a failure of enough supplies, to arrive here from the United States. They said the shortage was definitely not due to faulty distribution of ordnance within South Vietnam.

Nor have political disturbances within South Vietnam been responsible for the shortage, these sources said. Earlier this month the airbase at Da Nang, 385 miles north of Saigon, was unable to obtain munitions at the port there because Buddhists and rebellious military units had set up road-blocks, but this problem was cleared up within a few days, it was said.

The amount of munitions required by the Air Force in Vietnam has soared over the last year as the United States has built up its military power here. Air Force sorties have increased from a few hundred a month earlier last year to an average of more than 1,300 a week this March.

## ORDERS FROM WASHINGTON

Air Force officials here today would not discuss the shortage. They said they had received orders from Washington not to talk about the matter.

An official military spokesman would only say that the Air Force had enough munitions in South Vietnam "to meet all operational requirements so far, and we anticipate that the Air Force will be able to meet these requirements in the future."

Air Force officials here, it was said, decided to reduce the number and intensity of combat sorties when it became obvious they were beginning to use up their critical reserve supply of munitions.

The Air Force maintains a 15-day to 30-day supply of munitions within South Vietnam in the event of a major expansion of the war here, such as a large-scale intervention by Communist China. It is considered unwise to allow this reserve to become too low. If a major conflict did break out, the Air Force might then run out of munitions.

## SAVINGS IN LIVES SEEN

Sources here said that a number of high-level conferences had been held in the last week in an attempt to find ways of remedying the shortage. The Air Force, these sources said, may soon begin emergency flights of ordnance from the United States.

So far, the sources said, there are still enough usable bombs and other munitions within South Vietnam to take care of priority military targets and to support American and Vietnamese ground troops in direct contact with the guerrillas.

The reduction has largely affected so-called preplanned bombing raids against suspected Communist troop concentrations, supply depots, and other bases.

The heavy use of airpower against such targets has been part of United States strategy in Vietnam. The theory is that constant bombing will harass the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, lower their morale, and help prevent them from massing for large-scale assaults, thus saving American lives.

## EFFECTIVENESS IS QUESTIONED

Other military observers here question the effectiveness of this strategy and contend that it has been responsible for killing and

wounding large numbers of peasants caught in the raids.

Under policies instituted by the Defense Department in recent years, maintaining large stockpiles of munitions overseas is considered uneconomical. Instead munitions are transported to an area as they are required.

This system ties the fighting units closely to their supply line and necessitates careful planning long in advance, a smooth-running transportation network and sufficient factory production to meet requirements.

Sources here said that the vast bulk of munitions was shipped to Vietnam by sea and that it took 4 to 5 weeks, or more, from the time the munitions left the factories until they were unloaded at the docks here.

The U.S. Air Force carries about 40 percent of the burden of the air war in South Vietnam.

The rest is maintained by the South Vietnamese Air Force, the Marines, and Navy planes from 7th Fleet carriers. So far as is known, there has been no reduction in sorties being flown by these forces.

GERMAN DENIES SHARP DEALING  
(Special to the New York Times)

BONN, April 19.—The owner of the West German company that sold 5,570 bombs back to the United States at nearly 13 times the original purchase price emphatically denied today that he had engaged in sharp business practices.

"I have made absolutely no profit on the transaction," Karl Kaus, owner of Kaus und Steinhausen, asserted in a telephone interview.

The U.S. Defense Department, in urgent need of munitions for the Vietnam war, recently repurchased for \$21 apiece, the 750-pound bombs it had sold to Kaus und Steinhausen for \$1.70 each.

Mr. Kaus said that the repurchase price had been determined by "American auditors in Washington and also here in our plant."

The Defense Department in Washington has said that it considers the repurchase a good deal because new bombs cost about \$440 each. The bombs originally cost \$330 each.

## STILL BELONGED TO UNITED STATES

The bombs were still officially American property, the German businessman explained. By contract, the U.S. Government keeps title to the bombs until they are fully dismantled.

Mr. Kaus asserted that the difference between what he paid for the bombs 2 years ago and what he sold them for just covered his expenses in storing, securing, and guarding the bombs, taxes to the West German Government, and losses incurred by their removal.

He said that the United States had wanted to buy back 2,000 more bombs but that they had been found to be in poor condition.

The company dismantles surplus bombs and sells the scrap to metal fabricating firms and the chemical components to fertilizer manufacturers.

STATEMENT BY HOUSE MINORITY LEADER  
GERALD R. FORD

A week ago, in reiterating that the Republican minority in the House had given the President every penny he has asked for defense purposes, I raised a question of serious shortages and inadequate advance planning by the civilian managers in the Pentagon which, according to widely publicized reports by reliable and patriotic Americans close to the scene, have been and still are hampering the stepped-up level of combat operations in Vietnam.

These reports, coincident with serious internal disturbances in that troubled country, came as something of a surprise to me, to a great many Members of the Congress, of both parties, as well as to the millions of

Americans we are here to represent. We had been told in October 1963, by Secretary of Defense McNamara, that most Americans would be out of South Vietnam by the end of 1965. We had been assured, again by Mr. McNamara early last year that neither more combat troops nor more money would be needed in South Vietnam. Late last year, the Defense Secretary returned from a personal inspection of the situation there to say, "We have stopped losing the war." And we have been told ever since that the situation was improving day by day.

So it produced something of a sonic shock wave when suddenly the front pages of the newspapers and the radio and television newscasts were full of reports of internal unrest, attacks on Americans, and curtailment of combat operations against the Communist enemy. These were variously attributed to supply tieups, shortages of essential equipment, and civil disturbances in South Vietnam. Evidence mounted, and continues to mount, that the Pentagon planners were not adequately prepared to cope with the kind of limited, nonnuclear type of military operation for which they have supposedly been reorganizing since the end of the Eisenhower administration, with much fanfare about modern management methods.

When I raised the question of mismanagement, Mr. McNamara quickly—perhaps too quickly—sought to smother it by sheer weight of computer-like statistics. He called a quickie press conference that afternoon and personally declassified large areas of secret information about U.S. bomb loads and backlogs. This information was presumably classified on the grounds of national security and potential value to the enemy. It was not the first time he has removed the "secret" label when criticism of the Pentagon came too close for comfort.

In the course of Mr. McNamara's news conference to discredit his critics—who have never supposed or suggested that any of his mistakes were deliberate or dishonorable—the Secretary found himself partially confirming our concern. He admitted that the Air Force had to buy back 750-pound bombs which had originally cost U.S. taxpayers \$330 apiece, were sold as surplus to a West German fertilizer firm 2 years ago for \$1.70 apiece, and have now been recovered for \$21 apiece. If this is good management, I am mistaken about the meaning of the word. If there was no bomb shortage, was this transaction really necessary?

Mr. McNamara also denied there is any shipping shortage affecting Vietnam. Yet only last Monday there were reliable reports—one headlined "United States Again Short of Viet Ships" from the April 18 Journal of Commerce—that the Government is trying to get 20 or more additional vessels from private shipping companies. It is a known fact that ships have been stacked up for weeks as far away as Manila waiting to unload their Vietnam cargoes. Mr. McNamara cites figures on post exchange supplies delivered to Saigon in answer to allegations that our airmen haven't enough bombs.

He says there is no ship shortage, only shortages of dock facilities. I am not interested in playing word games, nor am I interested in playing politics with this serious situation. I am only interested—and I think every Member of the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, is also interested—in seeing that the billions for defense we have unhesitatingly voted is well and wisely spent and that every American sent 10,000 miles from home is given all the support and supplies he needs to protect himself, defend all of us, and bring the war to a swift and satisfactory end.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that every one of my colleagues in the House and Senate, regardless of party, agrees completely on this point. I am proud to see such distinguished Americans and distinguished Democrats as Senator STENNIS say,

as he did on a national television network last Sunday, that his Preparedness Subcommittee has found evidence of "mismanagement" in Pentagon planning for the war. I am encouraged to hear that Mr. McNamara conceded before the Fulbright committee that we have some "temporary dislocations of supplies" in South Vietnam because that means that he is going to do something about it. I am informed that he sent his chief of Air Force logistics to Saigon to investigate what he calls the nonexistent bomb shortages and to eliminate them. That's what we want.

But I am deeply concerned that Mr. McNamara, in his Senate testimony yesterday, brushed off the concern of millions of patriotic American as "all this baloney." I share this concern, and I shall continue to express it. I think such able Members of Congress as Senator STENNIS, Chairman GARMAN, of the House Merchant Marine Committee, and Congressman OTIS PIKE of the House Armed Services Committee, share it. I know that many responsible newsmen here, covering the Pentagon and sharing risks with our fighting men in Vietnam will continue to express their concern because that is our obligation to the American people.

Now here are just a few of the reports that have come in to corroborate the question I raised a week ago:

1. New York Times Correspondent Neil Sheehan, in a front page story from Saigon yesterday, reported that since April 6 "the number of Air Force attack sorties in South Vietnam has shrunk to about 43 percent of its former level"—from 185 daily sorties dropping about 1,000 bombs on Communist targets to an average of 83 sorties and 400 bombs. Rocket firings, according to this reliable report, have fallen even more spectacularly from 2,800 a week to 98. Mr. Sheehan says further that our planes are being sent out against the enemy with light loads—which is another way of saying more American manpower is being exposed to combat risks with less firepower. The New York Times dispatch states that "Air Force officers in Vietnam have repeatedly warned the Pentagon over the last 4 months that munitions were not arriving fast enough to meet requirements" and so far they are still inadequate. This has nothing to do with recent civil disturbances at South Vietnamese ports nor with the internal distribution system our fine military field commanders under General Westmoreland, according to Mr. Sheehan's sources. This New York Times report was called to Mr. McNamara's attention in the Senate hearings yesterday and he called it "baloney."

2. Earlier, CBS News Correspondent Peter Kalischer, quoting what he called an "unimpeachable" source, reported from Saigon that "a dire lack of ammunition and explosives" has forced a cutback in U.S. Air Force sorties from over 400 to less than 100 per day. Kalischer said the critical shortage was not in bombs but in fuses and other key parts that make bombs usable. He also reported a shortage of 20-millimeter cannon shells and planes taking off half loaded. "Only emergency missions and those in direct support of ground forces operations are being flown," CBS News said. This and other careful reports from trained war correspondents on the scene also, apparently, come under Mr. McNamara's category of "all this baloney."

3. The long-range management of our overall defense effort can be faulted for its failure to adequately anticipate the needs of the American merchant marine, a subject which we discussed at some length yesterday at the House Republican policy committee press conference. As recently as the start of this year, Mr. McNamara testified that our merchant fleet was adequate for our defense needs and reaffirmed his earlier preference

for airlift. Yet this week the administration is reportedly trying to scrape up 20 or more additional U.S.-flag carriers, and the current budget includes funds for replacement of only 9 to 13 of the World War II merchant ships that form the bulk of our dwindling merchant marine—now fallen to about 1,000 vessels, mostly old, while the Soviet Union has 1,500, mostly new, and 673 more building or on order. In this connection, I note that Mr. McNamara yesterday brushed off questions by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, about the resale of surplus items by NATO nations. He said it was all "World War II equipment junk." It's a sad fact this is true of much of the merchant marine that he considers perfectly adequate. But our alarm over shipping is more "baloney."

4. The authoritative magazine, *Aviation Week*, in a series of articles by a Marine Corps Reserve pilot who spent 2 months in Vietnam reports in technical detail on a wide range of ordnance and ammunition shortages, deficiencies and deterioration. The publication, *Aviation Daily*, in its April 19 issue summed up the misstatements Mr. McNamara has made in recent weeks and concluded that "he has managed to almost meet himself coming back on some of the stories he has presented to the public."

Mr. McNamara has a great gift for figures. He is extremely agile in the use of words. As I said previously, I am not the least concerned with playing word games. I have not myself used the word "baloney" to characterize disagreements among equally patriotic Americans. We in the minority in this Congress cannot selectively declassify information which has been stamped "Secret" in order to substantiate the serious questions raised about the safety and support of our fighting men in Vietnam and the future security of our country.

We must, therefore, depend in large measure on the kind of responsible, independent reporters I have cited for firsthand information on the situation in Vietnam. I for one do not regard them as "baloney." Whether you call these examples mistakes of judgment, mismanagement, poor planning, faulty foresight, bad bungling or just plain goofs, I don't care. Whether they are "alarming" or "distressing" or "shocking" or whatever word you prefer—they are intolerable as long as they endanger any American soldier, airman, sailor, or marine. They are intolerable as long as we, by asking questions of the Pentagon and persisting after answers, can compel or speed up remedial action. This is the joint duty of the responsible press and the responsible representatives of the people. I intend and hope they intend to continue this duty. It is not "baloney."

#### CUBAN MILITARY TRAINING, SI— MILK FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN, NO

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

MR. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1966, I wrote the President urging him to reverse the decision of our Government to send money through a United Nations agency to train Cuban Communists in military-related subjects. The letter was prompted by authoritative reports that \$1,240,000 is to be channeled to Cuba through the U.N. More than half of this money is to be spent teaching subjects like military communications, radar, electronics, and computer training at the University of Havana.

The school is open only to Communists and Cuban militiamen, and it is operated by Russian and Cuban Reds. Some of the money is also to go to help build a million dollar agricultural research station.

As I wrote the President, it seems to me some existing American programs which he would like to cut back, like the school lunch and milk programs, are far more worthwhile and needed than either of these Cuban projects. Certainly, there's no sense in financing the military educations of those sworn to destroy us.

With permission, I will insert the text of my letter to the President at this point in my remarks:

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,  
*The White House.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was utterly shocked by revelations on the House Floor on February 1, indicating that our Government plans to send \$1,240,000 through a United Nations agency to the Government of Cuba, which plans to spend more than half of it providing military-related training to Communists, using Russian and Cuban military teachers. As I understand it, the University of Havana technological branch, which is open only to Communists and Cuban militiamen, will provide training in military communications, radar, electronics, and computers, with the U.S. Government footing 40 percent of the project cost. As if this were not enough, the rest of our Government's contribution is to assist in building a \$1.1 million agricultural research station near Havana.

According to statements made on the House Floor, the sizable contribution of the U.S. Government is entirely voluntary on our part, but Ambassador James Roosevelt, the delegate to this particular U.N. agency, has advised our Government will not demand rejection of the projects nor will the United States withhold its share of the costs. Ambassador Roosevelt is quoted as saying he merely intends to "place on the public record the Government's objection in principle."

Mr. President, tyranny, bloodshed, and chaos have been part of the lot of the Cuban people and many of their Latin American neighbors ever since the Communists seized Cuba. As a matter of fact, about 1 month ago some 82 Communist parties from three continents met in Cuba to plot the more effective subversion of the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and Africa. On these bases alone, the United States contribution to these improper projects should be withheld.

The fiscal 1967 budget which you recently presented to the Congress calls for cutting back the school milk program by \$82 million, the school lunch program by \$19 million, the agricultural research program by \$70 million and the agricultural conservation program by \$120 million. I would respectfully suggest that every single one of these programs is far more worthwhile and needed than is either the building of a million dollar agriculture facility near Havana or the financing of the military educations of those bent on our destruction.

In view of all these reasons, and because of the Government's heavy spending commitments at home and elsewhere in the world, I urge the immediate reversal of the Government's decision to contribute to these projects. Knowing you will want to investigate this further, I am enclosing a tearsheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which includes the appropriate remarks on which this letter to you is based.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,  
Member of Congress.