

May 2, 1966

ence over the long run, the Chinese are doing very little to encourage the courtship.

ON RECOGNIZING CHINA

When it comes to the problem of recognizing China it is undoubtedly true that there is less pressure in Japan today than there was a year ago. On the matter of recognition, in fact, the Japanese are over very much the same barrel as the United States. Their relations with Taiwan are close and cordial, their trade with the Nationalist Chinese almost as great as with the mainland. Above all, perhaps, the Japanese are highly conscious of the fact that Taiwan lies across their vital lines of sea communication to southeast Asia and the Middle East and are determined that it shall remain in friendly hands.

The debate over China policy in Washington, therefore, has aroused mixed reactions here. The Japanese are relieved at assurances from Secretary Rusk that the United States does not expect to fight a war with China—an assurance which they would like to hear repeated as often and as loudly as possible. On the other hand, as pioneers in the business of trying to coax Peking out of its own isolation, they are somewhat baffled by glib assurances of American experts that this can be done without simultaneously scuttling the Nationalist regime on Taiwan.

On the question of Vietnam as well, the debate in Washington has brought about an encouraging turn of Japanese thinking. Though Japan's antiwar bias remains strong, there is less emotional opposition to the military intervention of the United States and far better understanding of the issues at stake than before. On the question of Vietnam, the Japanese would seem to stand somewhere in the vicinity, and somewhat on the right side of Senator FULBRIGHT.

MILITARY DECISIONS

The decision to bomb North Vietnam took them by surprise, they say, because they did not understand at the time the seriousness of the military situation in the country. The fear that the war would escalate into a general conflict with China—which remains the dominant Japanese obsession—now seems to have been somewhat allayed.

The shifting of public attitude is illustrated by the changing tune of the Japanese press.

Last year the two leading newspapers, Mainichi and Asahi both sent their foreign editors on a trip to Hanoi, the capital of Communist North Vietnam. The reports of Minoru Omori of Mainichi caused a sensation in Japan, describing in lurid detail the effects of the American bombing attacks, including one particularly heart-rending story of the destruction of a leprosy hospital near the capital.

Shoru Hata, of Asahi, whose reports were less colorful, was at some disadvantage until it was discovered that Omori's "eyewitness" reports had been culled largely from North Vietnamese propaganda films and Omori lost his job.

A growing understanding about Vietnam does not imply, of course, a complete identity of view between Tokyo and Washington when it comes to the larger problems of southeast Asia. The major difference, perhaps, is a refusal to believe that China at this point represents much of a military threat to the countries surrounding it. The belligerency of the leadership in Peking is read here as a sign of weakness rather than strength. Of all the mixed emotions which the Japanese display toward China, fear is perhaps the least conspicuous.

TROOP POLICY

Their ambition to participate more actively in Asian affairs, furthermore, by no means implies a willingness to assume any part of the military burden in Vietnam or elsewhere.

The Japanese are a bit exasperated by suggestions along this line, pointing out that among other things, that their American-dictated constitution specifically forbids the stationing of any Japanese troops on foreign territory.

No doubt, there are plenty of Americans today who would like to see this provision of the constitution amended. But ever since 1951, when Secretary of State Dulles urged the immediate rearming of Japan and was politely told to go jump into the Yellow Sea, the Japanese with the hearty approval of their neighbors have firmly insisted on a nonmilitary posture. Yet this, too, has recently become a matter of public discussion. The Sato government itself has taken the lead in opening a debate on basic security questions in the Diet with the avowed purpose of squelching unrealistic demands of the opposition for the scrapping of the United States-Japan Security Treaty.

The treaty, first signed in 1951 and revised in 1960, has been under violent attack from the opposition from the beginning. Japan's Socialists naturally criticize it as tying Japan too closely to American apron strings and have played on the theme that Japan might become involved in war as the result of the existence of American bases on Japanese soil.

Conservatives as well have criticized the treaty as limiting Japan's freedom of choice in foreign affairs. Until very recently most observers have felt that the Government faced rough sledding when the treaty comes up to review and possible renunciation in 1970.

VARIETIES OF NEUTRALITY

The Japanese Foreign Office, however, does not seem to share these fears. At least it has come out swinging on the issue in a "unified" view after lengthy consultations with all government leaders, the alternatives to the present treaty, according to this argument, would be either unarmed neutrality which would leave Japan "utterly defenseless" or a fully armed neutrality, including the production of nuclear weapons, entailing a "tremendous financial burden" which would be almost impossible for Japan.

The report concludes:

"Judging from these facts, the maintenance of the current security treaty, as compared with nonmilitary neutralism or military neutralism, is the most realistic, reliable and the least dangerous means in the present world situation." The Socialists, no doubt will continue to denounce this line of reasoning. But since there is virtually no chance that the Socialists will come to power between now and 1970—or for a good many years thereafter—the outlook for the survival of the treaty would seem considerably improved.

Japan's new role in Asia, therefore, will be limited and conditioned by the realities of Japan's situation. Since national security and economic interests are dominant considerations, Japan must remain firmly tied to the Western World for the foreseeable future. Within this limitation, however, Japan can be expected to make the most of its advantage as an Asian nation with enormous economic potential.

The self-conscious effort to minimize political conflicts may make for certain difficulties with the new hawks among the Asian nations, notably Korea and Taiwan. But in the Japanese view at least, this is a risk worth taking if it results in the establishment of firm relations with countries of the neutralist camp. In Indonesia alone, the Japanese see a superb opportunity for the kind of neighborly assistance which they, almost alone, are capable of providing.

In short, the Japanese today are proposing to begin to carry the ball in a good many places where it badly needs carrying and where the United States, with its essential

military commitment in Vietnam, is virtually hamstrung. The reaction so far has been highly encouraging. Shorn of any military or political implications, the new version of Japan's ill-fated prewar coprosperity sphere has a bright future in which many of the free nations of Asia will be eager to share.

DESTRUCTION OF SUPPLIES IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read the following report in Friday's Wall Street Journal which would, if true, indicate a gross inconsistency on the part of somebody in our conduct of certain phases of the mess in Vietnam:

Large catches of Vietcong supplies were turned up by U.S. troops seeking jungle terminals of the Ho Chi Minh trail near the Cambodian border. The Americans began destroying the hundreds of tons of rice, salt, cooking oil, and sheet tin—one of the richest such lodes ever unearthed in Vietnam.

How in heaven's name can we justify destroying food on the one hand, continue to acknowledge a shortage of it on the other, and do all we can to get more out there?

THE LATE GUY A. TRAMMEL

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Guy A. Trammel, who died on my birthday last week, is being buried today. For years he was an employee of the Congressional Hotel newsstand and was well and affectionately known by many of my colleagues in the House who will be saddened by the tidings of his passing. He is survived by his son, Richard A. Trammel, to whom I convey expression of the sincere sympathy of this body.

Guy Trammel was a fine American who retained the spirit of youth well past his 80th birthday. He lived cheerfully and helpfully a long life on the simple rule of understanding of and service to his fellow man.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first measure on the Consent Calendar.

NATIONAL FLAG WEEK

The Clerk called the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 763) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 763

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week, and

May 2, 1966

calling upon all citizens to display the flag of the United States on those days.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the House has passed today my resolution to make a National Flag Week possible and I hope that the Senate and the President will act quickly so that we may have our first National Flag Week next month. My bill calls for National Flag Week to be the week in which June 14—National Flag Day—occurs. The historic importance of this date in American history is deserving of a longer period of celebration by the Government and the public. The passage of this bill at this time also amounts to a rousing vote of confidence for our U.S. forces in Vietnam. This will show our boys we are really behind them. I can think of no more fitting tribute to our fighting troops and to the many millions of other Americans who revere our flag and everything for which it stands, than enactment of this legislation into law.

STEELMARK MONTH

The Clerk called the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1001) to provide for the designation of the month of May in each year as "Steelmark Month."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I trust that during the month that is to be designated as Steelmark Month consideration will be given to the increasing amounts of foreign steel that are being imported into this country to deprive American workers of jobs, and that during the designated month the House will at some time or other give consideration to doing something about the Trade Agreements Act when it next appears on the floor of the House with respect to providing at least some protection for the domestic steel industry.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. I am sure that full attention will be paid to this problem during the month in question. I believe there are some amendments at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1001

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of May in each year is hereby designated as "Steel Mark Month" in recognition of the tremendous contribution made by the steel industry in the United States to the national security and defense of our country. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all people of the United

States for the observance of such a week with appropriate proceedings and ceremonies.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, delete "in each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1946".

On page 1, line 4, delete "Steel Mark" and insert in lieu thereof "Steelmark".

On page 1, line 3, delete "a week" and insert "month".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have authored this resolution which asks the President of the United States to designate the month of May 1966 as Steelmark Month in recognition of the tremendous contribution made by the steel industry to the national security and defense of our country.

In my congressional district alone, two major steel companies and related steel-using companies provide jobs for 30,000 people along both sides of the Ohio River. Nationally, the steel industry provides jobs for 450,000 people alone and, including steel-consuming industries, accounts for one-third of all manufacturing jobs in the Nation.

There are about 275 companies in the United States engaged in the manufacture and fabrication of steel, turning out 10,000 different products ranging from bobby pins to bridges and locomotives.

The Steelmark observance, launched nearly 5 years ago in my congressional district, has grown from a weeklong celebration in Weirton to a monthlong salute to steel involving Wheeling, Weirton, Follansbee, and Wellsburg on the West Virginia side of the Ohio River and Steubenville, Mingo Junction, and Toronto on the Ohio side.

The observance of Steelmark Month has grown into national proportions. Most areas of the country that are identified with making of steel now observe Steelmark Month. It is for this reason, I feel the time has come for the people of the United States to recognize the tremendous contributions made by the people of steel to our way of life, to our national defense and security, and to our Nation's welfare.

Steelmark is a symbol of high-quality, American-made steel and consists of three four-pointed stars in a circle. One star is colored yellow, one orange, and one blue. The yellow star signifies that steel lightens your work. The orange star signifies that steel brightens your leisure. The blue star signifies that steel widens your world.

I believe it is incumbent upon all of us in view of the growing influx of cheap, foreign-made steel, to recognize and honor through this resolution the men and women who make steel and who work in steel-using industries in America. I urge its adoption.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May 1966 as 'Steelmark Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESTRUCTION OF UNFIT CURRENCY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5305) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in connection with this bill I notice that the report makes the statement that the legislation as amended has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. Speaking for the objectors, we would like to have the actual letters or reports printed right in the text of the report, and I would hope, since I plan to ask unanimous consent to have this legislation passed over, it having been scheduled to come up under suspension, that when it does, the legislative history will be strengthened during consideration under suspension, and that the actual letter of the Secretary of the Treasury and the communication from the Federal Reserve Board will be included in the Record.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I speak to the gentleman?

Mr. PELLY. I still have time under my reservation of objection. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought the gentleman had made a unanimous-consent request, and I was reserving the right to object.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I did not make that unanimous-consent request yet.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the gentleman's attention to page 6 of the hearings. There is a letter from Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in which he endorses this legislation. There is also a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury supporting this legislation.

I would like to put this in the Record at this point, along with the letter from Mr. Martin. I ask unanimous consent to do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 18, 1966.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of February 15, 1966, in which you asked for a report on H.R. 5305, to authorize revised procedures for destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes.

The Board urges prompt approval of the bill. It is needed not simply because it will save money but also because the day is fast approaching when the Federal Reserve banks

May 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

for sale or any commercial use in the United States"—free.

The purpose of this amendment is to reduce the unnecessary hardship on those returning American residents such as businessmen, teachers, and missionaries, who of necessity have had to purchase certain personal effects and articles for their own or their families' use abroad. Currently such effects are considered by the Customs Bureau as falling within the \$100 personal exemption of duty-free articles allowed returning residents. In many instances this exemption is far too small to cover the used wardrobe or personal effects of a returning family.

As the customs provisions for returning residents, who have been abroad over 1 year, are currently interpreted and applied, books, furniture, and similar household effects which were actually bought and used abroad, could, after proper certification of such use, be brought back to the United States, free of duty. The Commissioner of Customs, however, has stated specifically that clothing and personal effects are not included in this exemption.

Many American citizens, who have been abroad for over 1 year, with no intention of settling permanently outside the United States, have had to buy clothing and personal articles overseas for their own use. Granted that a substantial allowance is made by customs in the value of such articles by reason of its use or wear abroad, it is evident that to pay duty on used clothing acquired abroad is merely an added expense to, say a returning missionary who might be coming home on furlough or for reassignment. The purpose of my bill is to eliminate this burden on returning American residents.

I believe that this amendment is urgently needed to clarify the personal exemption provisions of our customs duties, as well as to reduce the customs burden on bona fide American citizens returning from abroad.

POLISH MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the traditional independence day of Poland, specifically commemorating the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. This year, the 175th observance of the adoption of the first democratic constitution in Europe, has special significance for the Polish people since they are also commemorating their millennium of Christianity.

Unfortunately, under the tyrannical domination of their Communist rulers, the brave people of Poland cannot speak out on this day as proudly and vigorously as they wish. The Gomulka dictatorship, which obviously is not representative of the freedom-loving Polish people, forbids proper observance of the religious and historical events of which the Polish people are so rightly proud. Moreover, Americans of Polish extraction and

people of Polish origin scattered throughout the world, as well as other freedom-loving people, join in this commemoration of the historic Constitution Day of Poland.

We in the Congress must continue to show how strongly we support the desire of the Polish people for the restoration of freedom and a democratic government which truly represents them.

Typical of the editorial comment in the Polish-American press of the country is an editorial in the Polish American Journal of April 30 which I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

[From the Polish American Journal, Apr. 30, 1966]

THIRD OF MAY CONSTITUTION

On May 3, people of Polish background throughout the world will celebrate the anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland. It will be a most memorable day to all, especially this year, when Poles celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the country's conversion to Christianity.

We are sure that the people in Poland will secretly pay homage to the authors of that great Constitution adopted on May 3, 1791, reminding themselves that "Poland is not dead yet, while we are alive."

This year on May 3, the spirit of 95 percent of the Polish nation will be in Czestochowa, Poland, where the greatest religious ceremony in the history of the country will take place before the miraculous picture of the Black Madonna—to commemorate the millennium.

It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland guaranteed freedom to all her citizens by adopting a constitution, and became the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic document proclaiming the principle of human liberty.

On September 1, 1939, Poland was the first nation to take up arms to resist Nazi aggression—the first who had the courage to say, "No" to Hitler. Yes, Poland was first to fight, and for this honor paid dearly with the blood of her soldiers, not only in Poland during the September campaign but on all Allied fronts—in Norway, France, in the Battle of Britain, Africa, Italy, Belgium, Normandy, Holland, Germany—on the seas, and in the skies over Europe.

Poland was the first ally. While Poland was the "mother of the United Nations," she was excluded from the Conference of the United Nations, convened on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco. Yet the thought that was to guide the work of the San Francisco Conference was expressed by a Polish king in 1750—Stanislaw Leszczynski, one of the early protagonists of international cooperation, who wrote a memorandum on strengthening the general peace. The thought underlying his plan was that the community of nations should go to the assistance of any country attacked. Likewise, in 1833, Poland's greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz, proclaimed in his works the ideal of the common brotherhood of man—a genuine international organization.

The Polish people have pioneered and cradled the cause of liberty and justice, not only for their country, but in many parts of Europe and the United States of America.

The Poles fought against a German invader trying to steal other peoples' lands as far back as the year 963. In 1241 they saved Europe from the invading Tartar hordes. In 1685 it was King Sobieski and the gallant Poles who protected and saved Christianity from the ravages of the Mohammedan sword and stopped the infidel hordes from overrunning Europe and destroying the Christian people. The liberty-loving Poles came to the aid of our American Colonies in the Revolutionary War.

The United States of America sometimes called the melting pot of the world, has been enriched with the contributions made by our immigrants that came from the cradle of European democracy. Whenever the Polish people have taken domicile in the United States, their citizenry has proved second to none. They have taken an active part in education, religion, law, civic, social, and governmental affairs. Their loyalty and patriotism have been unexcelled. They have carried Old Glory in both war and peace and they stand ever ready to protect our priceless heritage regardless of the sacrifice connected therewith.

In observing this anniversary of a great event in the history of Poland, let us recognize that the fate of this old, brave, great nation still disturbs the world and America. At Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, we played a role not entirely compatible with our ideals. Let us all hope and pray that Poland, the first nation in Europe to adopt a democratic form of government, will be permitted to work out her own destiny under a government of her own, chosen by her own people in a free election.

Another excellent commentary which points out how the Gomulka dictatorship is thwarting Poland's observance of their millenium of Christianity appeared in the April 23 edition of the Polish American. I insert this column by Harry E. Dembkowski in the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks:

[From the Polish American, Apr. 23, 1966]

THE MILLENNIUM SPOILER (By Harry E. Dembkowski)

Even to the most optimistic of optimists, the events as they slowly unfold seem to be saying with unmistakable clarity: The Year of the Polish Millennium is fast taking on the appearance of a fiasco. Poland—in the past, not uncommonly treated by the larger nations with a mixture of amusement and contempt—is in danger of becoming an international laughing stock as its most heralded celebration in decades, the millennium, turns into farce.

The latest in a chain of events that prompts this unpleasant but necessary observation was the recent refusal by the Gomulka regime to grant a tourist visa to Pope Paul VI. A host of other church dignitaries, including Chicago's Archbishop Cody, are likewise being prevented from visiting the country. As a result, the millennium celebrations will be deprived of much worldwide publicity it would otherwise have received; as a result, in other words, the millennium is being reduced from a first-class spectacle of international importance, into a second-rate event of little importance outside of Poland and Polonia.

The cause of this systematic downgrading is clear. The Gomulka regime, a Communist dictatorship which does not truly represent, nor has ever represented, the Polish Nation as its legitimate government, is envious of the church's prominent position in Poland today. It is particularly concerned about Cardinal Wyszynski's position as the nation's paramount moral and spiritual leader.

And so the regime is quite willing to play the role of spoiler. Knowing that communism cannot successfully compete with catholicism in winning the loyalty of the Polish people, and although careful to avoid any too obvious persecution of the church, the regime is doing all it can to nullify, as much as possible, the millennium of Polish Christianity.

Because of the undeniable damage that is being done to the nation's international prestige, this entire matter should prompt a total reassessment by America—and especially by Polonia—of its relationship to Poland's Communist government.

May 2, 1966

There are those who claim that the Gomulka regime must be treated cordially because it is Poland's sole government. This regime must be respected and even aided by the United States, it is argued, because then and only then will the Polish Communists "mellow" and "evolve" into a lighter, more pleasing shade of red.

But somehow this "liberal thesis" (so-called because it is principally expounded by the American political left) has not borne much fruit in recent years. Since the much-lauded "October thaw" of 1956, there has been a gradual re-freezing of the red ice pack. Not only has the "liberalization" trend been halted, it has reversed itself and is now proceeding in the opposite direction.

Why is this? Perhaps because the "liberal thesis" is in error. As the recent hints of Stalinist rehabilitation in Russia seem to indicate, a totalitarian dictatorship is too durable a system to simply wither away under its own weight. Many hopeful observers—including many Poles—misjudged Gomulka's intentions in 1956 and—with the obvious exception of the experience-wise Poles—many still persist in misjudging both him and his regime.

To realize what the "liberal thesis" has consistently overlooked, one should keep in mind a most perceptive observation made by Milovan Djilas in his famous critique of Communist society, "The New Class." He wrote:

"Ideas, philosophical principles, the nation and the people, their history, in part even ownership—all this can be changed and sacrificed. But not power. Because this would signify communism's renunciation of itself, of its own essence. Individuals can do this. But the class, the party, the oligarchy cannot. This is the purpose and the meaning of its existence."

Gomulka is a fanatical Communist by conviction and an authoritarian by nature. He was swept back into power on a wave of popular enthusiasm during the "October revolution," of which he was not the leader but basically a bystander. Far from being stimulated by the spontaneity of the acclaim he first received, he is profoundly distrustful of the people and, in the years since then, has steadfastly chipped away at the flattering monument—that unreal image—which the Polish people and, even more, the Western observers, had erected to him. The "retrogression from October" has mainly been of his doing—and not simply the result of Soviet pressure.

Gomulka and his system represent a terrible aberration of Poland's thousand-year-old cultural heritage. He cannot, therefore, be considered Poland's official, legal, spokesman. And his mischievous acts in attempting to scuttle the millennium merely compound the great chasm which separates him and his cohorts from the overwhelming majority of Poles both at home and abroad—who had hoped to see, in the millennium, a great event of historic dimensions.

UNITED NATIONS INSTEAD OF THE UNITED STATES MIGHT ASSIST SOUTH VIETNAM WORK OUT HER OWN DESTINY

(Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily with regard to foreign policy I go on the theory that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." However, that does not mean lack of interest. Rather it is owing to the belief that the Presi-

dent has the widest and best sources of information and there seemed to be no reason why he has not deserved congressional support. At home I have publicly stated with regard to Vietnam that President Johnson had my support, and I said, too, that I was proud Republicans in Congress were not making a partisan issue out of our policy in Southeast Asia.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am departing from normal silence and have written the President suggesting that the United States might urge on various contending political groups in South Vietnam that the United Nations supervise the upcoming elections. Thereafter, under my suggestion, if it was declared that these elections were free, then the United States would withdraw its troops if North Vietnam, on her part, agreed to discontinue her aggression. From then on it would be up to the United Nations to provide against civil disorder or to protect against extremist aggression. Any future military action would be under the United Nations of which, as with Korea, we would carry the heaviest load. But I would hope there would be no such action.

Herewith, Mr. Speaker, is the text of my letter to President Johnson which is dated May 2, 1966:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter has to do with Vietnam, but, unlike many letters which you receive from Members of Congress, it does not say in one breath that I support your policies and in the next proceed to show lack of confidence in your judgment by urging escalation or deescalation of the war. Without such qualifications, I have felt your policies merited the full support of Congress.

Knowing of your continuing desire to achieve peace, and with Ambassador Cabot Lodge returning for consultations, I am offering a suggestion which you might think worth discussing with him.

This suggestion is very simple; namely, that the United States use its influence with the present government and the various contending political groups in South Vietnam to try to obtain an agreement whereby the United Nations would supervise the upcoming elections. If the United Nations thereafter declares these elections were free and in accordance with democratic procedures, then the United States would withdraw its troops if North Vietnam agrees to cease her aggression. It would be up to the United Nations to supervise any truce or agreement and to assist in achieving stability. Through the United Nations we and other nations would provide economic aid to help South Vietnam work out her own destiny.

It hardly seems possible that the Buddhists, Catholics, and the other political groups in Vietnam would not accept such a plan. As to North Vietnam's willingness or good faith, there may be some question, but certainly another attempt to achieve peace would be worth a try.

Meanwhile, I continue to support your southeast Asian policy.

Respectfully,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

(Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURE ACT

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill entitled the "Civil Rights Procedure Act."

This act will modernize and strengthen the Federal law to make it more effective to prevent the infringement of federally granted substantive civil rights by unlawful State action in the form of criminal prosecutions.

More specifically, the act will liberalize the provisions of Federal law regarding removal of State prosecutions to Federal district courts in civil rights cases and extend the jurisdiction of Federal courts to enjoin unconstitutional State criminal proceedings.

The need for this legislation is clear. Americans seeking to avail themselves of their constitutionally protected rights have been subjected to criminal proceedings designed to drain them of their financial resources and destroy their spirits.

This act will extend protection to citizens in the exercise of the rights secured by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as in the exercise of the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom peaceably to assemble and the guarantee of the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

The bill was drafted by the Special Committee on Rivil Rights under law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Under the able leadership of its chairman, Hon. FRANCIS E. RIVERS, the committee has performed an outstanding public service in preparing this legislation after exhaustive study of the underlying problem.

We may hope that State courts will in time assume the full burden of protecting the civil rights of our citizens. The Federal Government must not be remiss, however, in assuring a full measure of protection for all Americans who seek to participate in our Government of laws.

equivalent of standard 6. (In Britain only 34 percent, continue their schooling beyond the age of 15.) Those having grades lower than one and two in standard 6 must accommodate themselves to semiskilled work. Trade schools could play a more useful part. The demand by Africans for this type of training tended to be disappointingly low, but there is now evidence of renewed interest. Plans are in hand to provide more facilities for technical and vocational training.

This country long ago decided on a broad-based education, giving more opportunity for the bulk of the population to obtain primary education. Most other countries in Africa chose rather to educate a few, as highly as possible. For this reason, countries like Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania have a larger number of G.C.E. "A" level passes than Rhodesia, but Rhodesia has a far higher percentage in school, and thus will now rapidly overtake those countries in the secondary sphere.

Correspondence courses have been planned to step up still further the campaign for secondary education. Under this scheme 20 or more students may gather under a responsible organizer, with a reduction in the normal fees. There are, of course, night schools in various centers, and adult education is also being actively pressed. In 1965 there were approximately 12,000 African students taking secondary courses with the correspondence colleges. This gives, with those in the schools, about 24,000 who are in the secondary sector.

All African students at our multiracial university are eligible for Government support. In addition, certain qualified African students are eligible for Government support in universities elsewhere. If these grants, loans, or bursaries were to be issued on a nonracial basis, purely on academic standards, none of these African students at the University would have qualified for them. (This position has recently changed, since one African student has qualified by his own merit.)

CONFUSION REIGNS SUPREME

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the confusion over Vietnam should concern every American. "We think the Vietnamese are going through a trying period"—so spoke President Johnson on April 22, in response to a reporter's question asking his evaluation of the effect of the political turmoil in South Vietnam. This bland evasion, however, was an advance over the President's reply to a similar query at his March news conference when he said:

There is not any information that I could give you that would add to what you have read in the papers.

It has become commonplace to say that the American people are confused about Vietnam. This is undoubtedly true, but what is the reason for this confusion? The fault lies in great part with an administration that fails to inform the people fully and frankly about its objectives and about the progress of the war.

Mr. Speaker, this point was recently made by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut in a speech at the University of Hartford on April 23, 1966. On that occasion Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, who cannot be accused of having a

partisan ax to grind, made the following remarks:

The confusion of official tongues over Vietnam is causing skepticism, doubt, and concern in the minds of the American people. As a matter of fact, there aren't enough fingers on both hands to count the number of ways our role in Vietnam has been explained and justified by Government officials.

At first we were to advise the South Vietnamese Government. The explanation was that our role was purely advisory and the South Vietnamese would do the fighting because the South Vietnamese Government had the basic obligation to defend itself.

But gradually the American role changed, and our troops took on an increasingly greater combat role. The explanation of our commitment also changed—and it was stated that the vital interests of the United States were involved in South Vietnam. The question began to be asked: If the U.S. interests in Vietnam are vital to our national security, would we continue to fight if the South Vietnamese decided to quit?

The answer has never been clear. Rather, another theory was introduced—a theory that our presence in South Vietnam was justified—even required—by our membership in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. President Eisenhower, who signed the treaty, did not interpret it as a commitment to send combat forces to Vietnam; President Kennedy assured the American people that combat forces would not be sent to Vietnam. It would almost appear that a new discovery was made a few months ago.

The political turmoil of the past several weeks brought more and different explanations. At first, officials explained that the political unrest was not affecting the main course of the war—which was military. Then, after a few days of admitted concern, the unrest was termed a "healthy" development. Officials conceded that military operations were suffering, but said that everything would be all right, for the turmoil was a sign of new political awareness. Suddenly, in a 180-degree turn, the political arena had become more important than the military.

And it is interesting to note that once again, government officials are saying that the war must be won or lost by the South Vietnamese themselves.

Is it any wonder that in a public opinion poll sponsored by NBC News, 59.6 percent answered "No" when asked, "Has the White House been giving us all the truth about Vietnam?"

The administration has consistently sought to conceal the hard and unpleasant facts of the conflict from the American public. This effort has gone into high gear in recent weeks as the disturbances in Danang, Hue, and Saigon threatened to topple the Ky government.

George Ball, Under Secretary of State, asserted on April 10, 1966, on the CBS program "Face the Nation" that "the political turbulence in South Vietnam" caused "no particular reduction in" the military operations.

How false this statement was is clear from the ominous statistics released 2 days later by the Defense Department that American troops sustained more than twice as many casualties during the preceding week as did the South Vietnamese.

One able journalist, Jack Foisie, of the Los Angeles Times, reported on April 14:

I spent most of the political crisis in the northern Provinces, where much of the fighting occurred. A number of American Marine

commanders complained that the Vietnamese units with which they sometimes joined in battle against the foe were no longer interested in leaving their garrisons until the political situation cleared.

Secretary McNamara on April 20, 1966, gave the Senate Foreign Relations Committee an appraisal of the military situation during the civil disturbances that flatly contradicted that of Mr. Ball. The Secretary of Defense testified:

The military operations have been at a lower level because of the political disorders in the last approximately 2 weeks, and you can see that by the number of—the indices; the number of Vietcong killed is off 40 percent, the number of Vietcong killed per week last week was 600, it averaged a 1,005 for the first 3 months of the year.

The number of weapons lost by Vietnamese forces, the number of weapons captured is also off by substantial amounts.

This reduction in military activity is customary under conditions of political disorder. It has happened every other time we have had political disorders.

No wonder, then, that the American people are confused about Vietnam. When administration leaders give contradictory testimony, how can the public have a clear understanding of events in Vietnam?

Confusion increases when one attempts to analyze successive pronouncements of administration leaders about the objective of our Nation in Vietnam.

Once, according to Secretary Rusk, it was victory. Then in Baltimore at the Johns Hopkins University it was redefined by the President as unconditional negotiations with only the most ambiguous reference to the minimum terms which the United States would insist on in negotiations.

No one objects to negotiations. The war eventually will be ended by negotiations. But unconditional negotiations are not an adequate policy objective. They can be a means of attaining an objective, but nothing more. When the administration commits a quarter of a million troops to fight in South Vietnam, there must be some objective of such value to the Nation that it cannot be negotiated away. What that is has become fuzziest as the administration has sought to appease the hawks of its party in one breath and the doves in the next.

Mr. Speaker, would the administration settle for a coalition government in South Vietnam including Communist representation? The President's Press Secretary looked with favor upon such a proposal even as the Vice President denounced it as "putting the fox in the chicken coop."

Now new doubts about the policy objectives of the administration have arisen as a result of the scheduling of elections in South Vietnam for mid-August. There is speculation—in some quarters, even a prayerful hope—that the elections will lead to the establishment of a government that will surrender to the Vietcong and request the withdrawal of U.S. forces.

What the administration would do in these circumstances is not clear. But this is not the real question at the moment. The important problem now is to provide for a fair and free election in

petence; license ought not to supplant realistic freedom; poverty, and sloth should not dictate to capital and enterprise; nor ignorance to skill and experience.

There are few countries in Africa today that can claim to equal Rhodesia's record of democracy and racial harmony. There are even fewer who would attempt to substantiate a claim to match Rhodesia's history of tranquillity and steady economic progress since self-government was granted in 1923. In the space of only 42 years Rhodesia's economic progress, political advancement and judicial integrity can be measured by a yardstick which not only surpasses every country in Africa north of the Zambezi but that of many countries elsewhere in the world.

MYTH OF ILLEGALITY

The so-called illegality which other countries would hold against Rhodesia is shown to be a myth. The assumption of independence merely confirmed the factual position.

According to a South African Q.C., Mr. D. Molteno, "any constitution rested essentially on general acquiescence. A constitution was not law because somebody had made it, but because it had been accepted." There is no doubt whatever that the Rhodesian populace as a whole has accepted the 1965 constitution. Peace and good order have continued to reign throughout—an example unexcelled in Africa. Both international law and the United Nations Charter provide for the recognition of a de facto government once it has been accepted by the people. By virtue of the peace and calm that has prevailed in the country it is Rhodesia's demonstrated and undoubted right to be recognized forthwith.

The historian, Lord Acton, commenting on the American Declaration of Independence, wrote: "It was from America that the plain ideas that men ought to mind their own business, and that the nation is responsible to Heaven for the act of the state * * * burst forth like a conqueror upon the world they were destined to transform, under the title of the 'Rights of Man' * * * and the principle gained ground, that a nation can never abandon its fate to an authority it cannot control."

And it was Thomas Jefferson himself who said: "A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good citizen but not the highest. The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger are of high obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be to lose law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means."

Rhodesia has no intention of abandoning its fate, nor of sacrificing the end to the means; and, in time, the world will appreciate the principles for which she stands.

EXTRACT FROM INFORMATION PAPER NO. 1, ENTITLED "LAND APPORTIONMENT IN RHODESIA," PUBLISHED BY THE RHODESIAN INFORMATION SERVICE, SALISBURY, RHODESIA

AFRICAN POPULATION

In 1962 the African population had risen to 3,600,000 and was distributed as follows:
 African rural areas..... 2,127,000
 European areas (rural and urban)..... 1,490,000

(The latter is 41 percent of the African population.)

The tremendous increase in the African population could not have been foreseen during the early history of the land question. Today's figure is 3,970,000; and at the present rate it will double in 20 years. The idea that every African has an absolute right to free land is quite untenable.

There are nearly eight times as many Africans as they were at the turn of the century; and their cattle holdings have increased from a mere 55,000, to well over 2 million—a 36-fold increase.

The contention that every African is entitled to land and stock rights is manifestly indefensible. Even if every European were to leave the country, the 1,500,000 Africans living in the existing European areas would be no less constricted than the remainder are in the tribal trust lands at present.

In 20 years' time (assuming the present increases in population continued), the position would be completely chaotic, with millions of people on a desperately low subsistence level and the probability of anarchy due to collapse of the economy for which the Europeans are responsible. The pattern in parts of Africa today is clear enough.

COMPARATIVE QUALITY OF LAND

Many Africans continue to complain that their areas in Rhodesia comprise the poorest, most arid, remote and dissected or broken regions. It should, however, be understood that the apparent poverty and desolation of the tribal trust lands compared with the European areas, is due to the way the land has been used. It cannot be seriously contended that the boundary fences showing startling contrasts between waving savannah and stark desolation really mark different qualities of land.

One well-known illustration may be seen at Domboshawa School bounded on one side by Chinamora tribal trust land. The site was chosen for the school in a corner of Chinamora Reserve 40 years ago because it had been worked out and virtually abandoned by the inhabitants. Today the conditions on each side of the boundary fence (where there are no differences in the basic quality of land) show startling contrasts. In addition, yields of up to 36 bags of maize per acre have been consistently won from the supposedly worthless sandveld on the school, whilst adjoining areas present scenes of poverty and desolation.

There is no truth whatsoever in the allegation that Black areas comprise the worst soils. (Appearances are often deceptive when applied to specific cases.)

NO DIFFERENCE IN SOILS

According to figures supplied by the Ministry of Agriculture, soils in African areas are as good as those in European areas. For simplification, land categories are reduced to three, in the following table:

	[In percent]	
	Proportion in African areas	Proportion in European areas
(1) Medium to heavy textured soils of high inherent fertility.....	8.5	8.3
(2) Light to medium textured soils of moderate inherent fertility.....	10.4	5.8
(3) Mainly sandy soils of low inherent fertility.....	34.8	32.2
Total.....	53.7	46.3

These figures are based on the 1956 Land Apportionment Map, the so-called red (clay) soil areas of Rhodesia comprise only about 4 percent of the country's area. Sandy soils are easier to work, respond quicker to improved farming techniques, have better water-holding capacity, and comprise two-thirds of the country's entire area. Africans traditionally tended to avoid the heavier soils, because they were difficult to work.

As for the complaint that African areas comprise the drier regions, this is likewise false. Thirty-seven percent of Rhodesia has a rainfall above 28 inches, and half the African areas fall within this zone.

EXTRACT FROM FACT PAPER NO. 10, ENTITLED "RHODESIA: PROGRESS IN AFRICAN EDUCATION," PUBLISHED BY THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION, SALISBURY, RHODESIA

Whilst authoritative figures are not always available from other countries, the following information provided by UNESCO is revealing. Nearly 45 percent of the world's population is completely illiterate. In 57 percent of the countries less than half the school-age population is in school. Literacy in North and Western Europe is the highest—over 98 percent. Africa and India have between 10 percent and 15 percent; in Rhodesia the literacy rate for Africans is approximately 30 percent.

In regard to the proportion of pupils in school, accurate figures are difficult to obtain for other countries in Africa, but indications are that Rhodesia has the highest proportion in school. Some of our severest critics amongst African countries have the lowest proportion. Rhodesia's achievements in African education have been virtually without assistance from external sources. Finance and staff are the two main barriers to more rapid educational expansion in Rhodesia.

Of the 4,080,000 Rhodesian Africans today, half are under the age of 17. This means that there is one adult per child—in England there are three, and they are more productive than the average worker here.

Critics sometimes point out that about 10 times as much is spent for each European child. There are adequate reasons for this. In the first place, of the 643,000 pupils in African schools, over 95 percent are in primary schools, which cost a fraction of secondary schools to build and run. In the second place, European pupils receive no better schooling than they would expect anywhere else, and their parents are the main taxpayers who also pay for the bulk of African education. In the third place, Africans have shown interest in education only during the past two or three decades, and in the light of this the expansion has been truly phenomenal. In the fourth place, in order to equalize African with European education, it would cost twice Rhodesia's entire budget. It should also be borne in mind that nine-tenths of Africans' schooling is in the rural areas, where they build their own schools with the assistance of the missions.

Lowering the standards (which they have taken generations to achieve) in order to spend more on African education would doubtless cause many Europeans to emigrate, with a resultant fall in revenue; and would also discourage expatriate teachers from coming to Rhodesia. Raising the standards of African education is the aim, and it calls for more expatriate staff—already extremely difficult to recruit. Of the 666 qualified secondary teachers in African education today, about 130 are Africans.

The main clamor today appears to be for secondary education. This is a good deal more expensive, and staff are at a premium; but the places available are roughly equal to the number of students qualifying to enter. Of the 27,513 pupils sitting for standard 6 in 1965, 7,009 obtained grades 1 and 2 passes, representing 25 percent. Of these latter, 6,059 went to secondary schools. In 1964, 768 went on to lower teacher training and industrial courses, and were drawn from grades 1, 2, and 3 passes. Of the remaining small number, about 10 percent, were girls who were not allowed by their parents to continue. In 1956 there were 1,758 secondary pupils in the schools. By 1965 the figure increased to 11,500 (plus a like number studying by correspondence). This surely demolishes the argument that secondary education is being held back.

It is not normal anywhere in the world for the whole school population to expect secondary education. Twenty-three million adults in the United States of America have less than 8 years of schooling—roughly the

South Vietnam. The comments of Ambassador Lodge about the dangers of terrorism and violence in connection with the election are not reassuring.

What I should like to hear from the President now is whether a genuinely free election is possible in South Vietnam and what steps are being taken to provide the kind of election which could be regarded as an expression of the will of the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, no question is asked more often in public opinion polls than "Do you support the President's policy in Vietnam?" I think the question is unanswerable. No rational person can support a policy unless he knows what that policy is. The only answer is another question, "What is the President's policy?"

The confusion of the American people about Vietnam is caused by the confusion of the administration.

President Johnson must take the American people into his confidence and explain precisely why we are in Vietnam. He must explain what our national security interests are in Vietnam—both long range and short range. He must advise us of the risks involved in protecting this interest and he must spell out what the risks to our national security will be if we are not successful in Vietnam. He must explain why it is that so much sacrifice is asked of so few while the vast majority of our people are able to carry on "business as usual."

Mr. Speaker, the need for leveling with the people has long been apparent and it is the President's duty and responsibility to do so with candor and honesty. The American people must be treated as responsible adults who are capable of bearing their responsibilities. Grandiose schemes for transferring the Great Society to all of Asia are not straight answers to the questions on the public mind. The people want to know why we are there, how we intend to end the conflict with honor, and when we may expect the completion of the task. The answers are long overdue.

THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY CLOSURE—"PROVE INACCURACIES OF OUR CASE"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus Vance, wrote to Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and to Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation saying, in effect, that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is closing the door on the possibility of any further appeal to reverse the decision to close the Springfield Armory. I will enclose a copy of this letter, addressed to me, as a part of my statement. It is a strongly worded letter, carefully prepared from the vast resources of staff and data available to the Secretary. However, the letter still evades most of the crucial and key issues. It tries to

invalidate all of the data and the effort expended by the Springfield Armory Technical Committee by saying:

None of the cost charts displayed by the technical committee at the March 22 hearing were accurate.

The charge that none of the cost charts were accurate is, in my judgment, completely unfounded. The figures that were used by the Springfield Armory Technical Committee, in composing the charts, were obtained from Springfield Armory and Rock Island Arsenal sources. This information was taken from contracts, invitations for bid, and negotiations with respect to work to be done in-house or by private industry. The blanket charge that the charts were inaccurate is an attack upon the creditability of all of us who have labored so long and so hard to reverse the decision to close the Springfield Armory.

I am particularly dismayed that, by inference, the integrity of Mr. Henry T. Downey, our consultant and adviser, has been questioned. Henry Downey is an accountant lawyer of some 18 years experience, a distinguished member of the Hampden County and Massachusetts Bar Associations, a certified public accountant. Mr. Downey heads the largest independent accounting firm in the Springfield community. He is held in the highest esteem and regard by people in the legal and accounting professions and by the citizens of the community. Henry Downey is a close personal friend of mine. I have known him for a number of years, and I respect and admire his ability and integrity. He would be the last to lend his support to inaccurate data.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has the responsibility of proving the sweeping indictment that all of the charts used at the hearing before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee were inaccurate. I am requesting that it do so.

Let me briefly tick off some of the important facts and issues not mentioned or inadequately dealt with in the letter:

First. The original closure order was based on the proposition that closing the Springfield Armory and moving the remnants of the operations—research and development mainly—to Rock Island Arsenal would, after an initial expenditure of \$8 million, save about \$5.6 million each year. This claim for an annual cost reduction overlooked a number of cost factors which were subsequently pointed out by the Springfield Armory Technical Committee organized for the purpose of studying the various facets of the closure proposal. It was estimated by this group that costs and losses resulting from the closure would, rather than show a saving, actually show a net loss each year of over \$1 million for 20 years. A subsequent study by the management consulting firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, under contract with the Department, also refuted the Army claims for cost reduction. This study had this to say on costs:

We find that the proposed move (from the armory to Rock Island) of nonmanufacturing functions is distinctly marginal from a savings cost standpoint.

Between the Springfield Armory Technical Committee and the Booz, Allen &

Hamilton study, Army claims for cost reduction were washed out—eliminated as an argument for closing the armory and moving nonmanufacturing functions to Rock Island Arsenal. The very same thing happened to the Army study claims regarding the cost of manufacturing at the armory. The armory had been branded as a high-cost facility in manufacturing some weapons and equipment. Perhaps in a few instances private industry was able to beat the armory on unit costs where the contractors had bought in on a contract with an unusually low bid on the initial order or had built the newest and most efficient of modern production facilities—with the taxpayers' money, I might add. These claims of high manufacturing cost for the armory were successfully refuted by the Armory Technical Committee and, on the issue of manufacturing costs, the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study had this to say:

We find that actual costs of manufacturing for the armory and for industrial contractors which have produced small arms are about the same for all practical purposes. Wage rates are not significantly different nor are most other direct costs.

With claims for cost savings out and the cost of the Vietnam war increasing rapidly, with the administration and the Congress trying to hold down Government spending to ease inflationary pressures and avoid a tax increase, it is difficult to understand why the Secretary persists in going ahead with the expenditure of the additional funds which it will be necessary to spend to effect this closure and the transfer of functions as proposed. Under the circumstances, it would seem that the Secretary should be amendable to appeals for postponing the proposed closing at least, but he is not.

Second. The Deputy Secretary's letter says:

There have been suggestions that the armory must be kept open for the support of our forces in southeast Asia. In this connection, I repeat the assurance given at the hearing that the closing will be phased in a manner that does not in any way jeopardize supplies required for the Vietnam effort.

This kind of assurance referred to in the above paragraph is a little hard to swallow. The Secretary knows that many of the people in manufacturing at the armory are working 60 hours a week to fill urgently needed orders in support of the Vietnam war. He also knows that industry has frequently showed no interest in some of these unusual odd lot orders because profits are limited, or else have failed miserably to come though on schedule. A recent check showed that there were about 250 battlefield priority orders being worked on at the armory. Most of these orders are for items needed in fairly limited quantities and in which industry has very little interest because the profits are limited, some are for items which industry has failed to produce on schedule, and some are for weapon modifications to cope with the changing requirements for fighting jungle guerrilla warfare. All orders are for the types of things for which it is customary to

May 2, 1966

turn to a "can do" organization to produce.

Reaction time on urgently needed items is much faster in the armory than it is in industry. For example, in providing stocks for the M-1 carbine rehabilitation and conversion program, the order was split between industry and the armory. To date, the armory has produced in excess of 50,000. Industry has yet to produce the first unit. Another example is the drum for an Air Force aircraft weapon—the M-39A2. This drum is the guts of the machinegun itself and is, I understand, a very difficult item to manufacture.

The Air Force attempted to procure it from industry without success so turned to the armory. This difficult and urgently needed piece of equipment is being delivered for use in Vietnam today. Many more examples can be provided, but perhaps the most significant work at the armory in support of our jungle warfare fighters has been and still is in the arming of helicopters. The armory has been a principal leader in the field of helicopter armaments and as such is still developing and providing much of the equipment going into this vital program.

Most of the work currently being performed at the armory in support of Vietnam is there because it is the only place it can be done within the time schedule, or else industry prices have been out of line. The current flow of orders and prospective orders in the pending budget would provide a 5-year work backlog for the present armory labor force and more work is developing every day. These orders will go through a make or buy screening and, under the circumstances of a freeze on the armory labor force, a lot of the work will go to industry regardless of price. However, you can be certain that the difficult and unique, and the small odd lot items will continue to wind up in the armory from sheer convenience if nothing else as long as it is allowed to remain in operation.

In view of all that I have outlined, I again reiterate the Department of Defense and the Booz, Allen & Hamilton management consulting firm have an absolute obligation to prove the inaccuracy of our case.

As an example of the inaccuracy, Deputy Secretary Vance, in his letter to Senator STENNIS and the Massachusetts congressional delegation, cited that the armory had produced 3,643 M-79 barrels at a unit cost of \$29.47, whereas industry's bid price for the same barrel was \$47.95.

I include Secretary Vance's letter to me citing this example and Accountant Henry T. Downey's rebuttal to these charges of "inaccuracy" which appeared in the April 29 issue of Springfield, Mass., Daily News at this point in the RECORD:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1966.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: Secretary McNamara and I felt that we should communicate in writing the strong convictions which we expressed to you and other members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation at

our meeting of April 21 concerning the Springfield Armory.

You are familiar, I know, with the series of studies which preceded the November 19, 1964 announcement that the armory would be closed and with the Booz, Allen & Hamilton Report which, in conjunction with our own reconsideration of the matter, led to the reaffirmation of the closure decision on November 16, 1965.

We have carefully studied all the testimony and written material presented at the March 22, 1966 hearing by the Springfield Armory Technical Committee witnesses. Our study has revealed no basis for changing the previous decision to close Springfield Armory and relocate residual functions at Rock Island Arsenal.

The cost data presented by the technical committee witnesses was analyzed by the Army, and the results of that analysis were forwarded to the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on April 14, 1966. Although the data was offered in an attempt to prove the proposition that manufacturing operations at the armory are more economical than in private industry, the several charts and comparisons furnished by the technical committee did not in fact support that proposition.

For example, the technical committee used a chart which purported to show that the armory had produced 3,643 M-79 barrels at a unit cost of \$29.47, whereas industry's bid price for the same barrel was \$47.95, with a consequent "savings" to the Government of \$87,323 through using the armory in this case. The witness who presented the chart said it portrayed transactions occurring after November 16, 1965. Actually, the barrel order was placed with the armory in May 1964 after a trivial bidding technicality disqualified a private contractor who had underbid the armory. The same contractor in October 1965 bid and won an order for 1,921 M-79 barrels at a unit price of \$18.40, more than \$11 under the armory price. There was no saving whatsoever as a result of placing the earlier order with the armory; rather, the opposite was the case.

None of the cost charts displayed by the technical committee at the March 22 hearing were accurate. If they had been accurately and objectively prepared, they would have shown what is in fact the case, that continued operation of the armory is neither economical nor efficient.

Our studies have repeatedly led to the conclusion that the armory's manufacturing capacity is excess to our needs, and that the relocation of the nonmanufacturing functions now at the armory will bring about significant savings.

The private small arms industry has proved its capacity, and its eagerness, to develop and manufacture small arms weapons and weapons systems for the Department of Defense—and to do so at less cost to the Government than if the work were performed at Springfield Armory. We are convinced that systems management advantages, as well as cost advantages, will accrue as a result of closing Springfield and relocating its residual functions.

There have been suggestions that the armory must be kept open for the support of our forces in southeast Asia. In this connection, I repeat the assurance given at the hearing that the closing will be phased in a manner that does not in any way jeopardize supplies required for the Vietnam effort.

I also repeat the assurance that every career employee at the armory is guaranteed at least one other suitable job offer. Furthermore, the community of Springfield itself—if it wishes—is guaranteed the services of the Defense Office of Economic Adjustment.

That office has a magnificent record in working, on request, with other communi-

ties, some of them hit far harder by base closures than Springfield, where only 1 percent of the local work force is employed at the armory.

For example, the closure of Schilling Air Force Base indicated a projected loss of over 25 percent of the income of Salina, Kans. This did not happen. Now, only 1 year later, through joint efforts with community leaders, an area vocational school, a technical institute, a vocational rehabilitation school, a modern municipal airport and a number of civilian employers (including two business aircraft manufacturers) are located on the base.

We should be pleased to work with the people of Springfield, just as we have with the people of Kansas and of 35 other States in dealing with base closure problems.

In conclusion, reiterating my testimony at the hearing, I would like to say that the decision to close the armory was not lightly taken. It was based on careful, informed judgments following exhaustive analysis of the facts. Those judgments have been validated and revalidated since the closure decision was first announced. There has been no disagreement among the scores of responsible officials in the Department of Defense, in uniform and out, who have studied the issues of Springfield Armory's retention. Every one has agreed that operation of the armory past its scheduled closure date is not needed for support of the Vietnam effort, and that the closure decision is correct, is in accord with sound and efficient management of the Defense establishment, and is consistent with and serves the public interest.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.

DOD SMOKESCREEN HIT BY DOWNEY

Accountant-lawyer, Henry T. Downey, consultant to the Springfield Army Technical Committee, today defended the committee's cost charts regarding armory contracts and charged Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance with laying down a "smokescreen."

Mr. Downey, in a prepared statement, rebutted charges made by Secretary Vance in a letter to Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and to the Massachusetts congressional delegation concerning the armory closure order.

"The contractor prices presented by the Springfield Armory Technical Committee were obtained from the procurement requests issued by Headquarters U.S. Army Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., and represented the average of the most current procurement costs for each item," Mr. Downey said.

Secretary Vance, in the letter dated the 25th, used the M-79 (grenade launcher) barrel contract as an example of the technical committee's figures being inaccurate.

"On the M-79 grenade launcher," Mr. Downey said, "wherein we stated a \$87,000 savings resulted from Springfield Armory doing the work, Mr. Vance stated that a lower price quoted by an industry was disqualified on a technicality. This is typical of the smokescreen technique with which we have been dealing in this case."

Mr. Downey continued: "The word 'technicality' was loosely used because the facts regarding the firm are that they were unable to deliver on their then current contract involving the same weapon. This is completely spelled out in documentation on file at Springfield Armory in which Colonel Durbenberger referred the matter to the director of supply and maintenance at Headquarters Army Weapons Command at Rock Island."

Mr. Downey said the hard cold facts of the matter were that the contractor was failing to deliver on the existing contract for the grenade launcher.

"Secretary Vance describes failure to deliver grenade launchers on time as a techni-

Such opportunities clearly exist for engineers and other science graduates. Scientific American magazine recently sponsored a study which indicated that the proportion of executives in the 600 largest U.S. corporations who have an engineering-science education grew from only 7 percent in 1900 to 33 percent in 1965. This trend points not only to opportunities, but also to the need of our complex industrial society for scientist-engineers, who have broad educational backgrounds and potentialities of leadership.

Recent studies by both governmental and nongovernmental agencies are unanimous in concluding that the available supply of engineers and other scientists over the next decade or more will nowhere match even the most conservative projections of the demand for scientific manpower.

Some of you may recall a cartoon in the New Yorker magazine showing two men in business suits walking off a college campus. Each was holding a long pole on which an engineer, still in cap and gown and clutching his sheepskin, is trussed up like a moose. Observes one bystander to another: "Du Pont's got theirs." (I wish he had said, "Atlas.")

Seriously, competition is stiff—and demand exceeds supply. Not long ago, a spokesman for the National Science Foundation told a congressional committee that if the United States wishes to maintain its position of world leadership it must find ways of meeting growing requirements for scientific manpower. He cited projections over this decade which show that we will fall short of our scientific manpower requirements by about 60–75,000 a year.

Even more alarming, this projection is based only on presently foreseeable needs. But new areas of opportunity for scientific manpower open up all the time—in industry research and development, in defense, space and oceanography; in environmental health and mass transportation, in the development of substitutes for natural resources that may become exhausted, and in helping to meet the economic needs of the underdeveloped countries. Some of these fields were regarded as science fiction when many of us graduated—today they are a vital part of our life.

The Federal Government has launched various aid-to-education programs, which will help in expanding the output of trained manpower. But we, in the colleges and universities, must carry the major load.

Lafayette is trying to meet this challenge. We have taken a number of steps to make certain that Lafayette's science and engineering graduates receive the best possible preparation for their careers, whether in industry, government, or teaching.

We cannot be complacent. Much needs to be done in the years ahead. But we can point to progress. We have:

1. Recognized the need for a well-qualified faculty by making Lafayette's salary scale competitive with those of other leading colleges and universities.
2. (a) Built the David Bishop Skillman Library. Trebled seating in the library and increased the budget by a factor of five to add books and professional staff.
- (b) Reconstructed Pardee Hall as a center for liberal arts, humanities and social sciences, psychology, and mathematics.
- (c) Renovated Van Winkle Hall to secure classrooms.
- (d) Expanded our facilities for science and engineering including the new Charles A. Dana Hall of Engineering.
- (e) Increased space for physics and chemistry in Olin Hall of Science.
- (f) Have completed and approved plans for a new biology building.
3. Continued to broaden and strengthen our engineering and science curriculums. The goal of these curriculums is to instruct

students in basic concepts and principles and to provide graduates with the ability to assimilate new discoveries and apply them under new circumstances.

We have also increased the science requirement to 2 years of science (one with lab) as well as a year of math or logic (including symbolic).

These steps, taken with the aid of alumni and friends not only have benefited Lafayette's science and engineering offerings but they have worked as well to strengthen our excellent liberal arts program.

This is as it should be. Just as scientist-engineers must be grounded in the humanities and social sciences, so must liberal arts graduates be familiar with our scientific and technical heritage. The day is long past when a man in any profession can work securely in a tight compartment, ignoring the impact on modern life of developments in other fields of knowledge. All the leaders of our society must have some insight into the broad direction and meaning of science and technology, as well as the social sciences and humanities.

Although leading educational figures are quite concerned the steps that must be taken to increase the number of scientists available to the Nation in the years ahead, they are also discouraged about the job our schools and colleges are doing in acquainting liberal arts students with the role of science and technology. This concern has probably been expressed most eloquently by Lord Snow, the British author-scientist, who has warned that our educational system is producing two totally different kinds of culture—science and nonscience—with their representatives unable to communicate with each other.

Again, I think we can point with pride to Lafayette's pace-setting role in this area of education. In the 1964–65 school year, Lafayette's Department of Mechanics and Engineering Fundamentals introduced a new, and, as far as I have been able to determine, unique course specifically designed to introduce liberal arts students to the application of computer technology to the problems of information retrieval as well as to the technological, social, and economic significance of computers.

This course, as well as the effort being made to keep Lafayette's science-engineering program abreast of needs, is a testimonial to the vitality and initiative of the faculty and administration of our college. It is also a testimonial to the support received from forward-looking alumni and friends. If we are to meet the challenge to our future posed by science and technology, it is essential that educational institutions continue to develop new concepts of teaching. We at Lafayette College have been doing that for more than a century. And we shall continue to do so.

In conclusion I want to say on behalf of the board of trustees that we are firmly determined to have the best possible teaching and learning conditions at Lafayette. We believe much has been accomplished since the Second World War. We will do everything possible in coming years so that a Lafayette degree may stand in all fields for quality unexcelled. We want this for the young men of the campus. We want them to share with us the glow of appreciation over the years for the personal awakening and growth through studies on the hill. We want quality also for the community and for the country. They have fostered and nourished the college. They will need the very best the college can turn out to meet the problems of the future. We want the best, finally, because with Mr. Pardee we believe the world will be a better place if we can develop in the young men of Lafayette to the highest possible degree what he called the art of living.

UNITED NATIONS SUPERVISED ELECTIONS FOR VIETNAM

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate weeks to come the world's closer attention will focus on the Republic of South Vietnam as that nation prepares for national elections.

These elections, which will establish a constituent assembly for the purpose of writing a constitution, offer a clear opportunity to the people of South Vietnam to join in concert in defining their internal national goals in the true spirit of self-determination. This unification is a must if the dissident and largely independent factions in that country today are to ever achieve government beyond military directorship and if they are to avert anarchy which will permit the Communists to gain control of the government, the countryside, and eventually the will of the people.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Central Government in Saigon has ruled out the possibility of Communist or neutralist candidates, they have given assurances that the elections will be representative and fair.

The integrity of these elections is of paramount importance, because on their integrity hangs the question of whether or not they are to be meaningful or simply another ingredient thrown into the bubbling pot of internal discord and strife.

Any serious disruption of the democratic process during this balloting will, in addition, tend to shatter the faith of the Vietnamese people in the sincerity of the Central Government and in the value of any form of democratic government, a form of government about which most have very little, if any knowledge at all.

It is obviously in the interest of the United States that these elections are carried out in as orderly a manner as possible.

Just how order is to be maintained remains to be seen. This will be one of the tasks of the electoral council which will establish the electoral law for the elections and the guidelines for balloting.

It would seem to me that the United States cannot afford to undertake the policing of these elections even should the electoral council recommend this policy and the Central Government request it.

If responsibility is ours the responsibility for any breakdown in the elective process would fall also to us. Indeed we might well be held to be a part of any organized effort to sabotage the elections should such action take place.

It is in the best interest of the United States that we stand apart, permitting the Vietnamese to vote beyond the shadow of American military might, even though that might was present to insure honest and peaceful balloting.

May 2, 1966

Who then should undertake this task, for obviously policing will be needed. Without it the Communists or any other group will have carte blanche to create havoc either through subterfuge or overt violence.

Should it be the forces of the Central Government?

It seems to me that the same circumstances which preclude this activity from being undertaken by the United States apply to the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. If they should fail to maintain order on election day they will be open to charges of complicity, incompetence, and impropriety. And certainly, these elections are going to be a test of faith for the Central Government and the forces of the ARVN.

Therefore, it seems to me that only an outside agency such as the United States is equipped to undertake this brief but necessary task.

Realizing that it is the Vietnamese themselves who must determine how the elections will be carried out I feel that it is nonetheless incumbent upon this Nation, in Vietnam not only as defenders but as advisers, to recommend as urgently as possible that the United Nations be called upon to undertake this task. In addition I believe that the United States, through Ambassador Goldberg, should call upon the United Nations to offer the Republic of Vietnam its services in this regard.

The fires of anarchy and internal governmental decay glow in Vietnam. But flickering among those fires today are the flames of hope that through the democratic process stability and internal order may be achieved and maintained.

Mr. Speaker, this election may well be the last hope for South Vietnam. But, even so, I feel it must be viewed as their great opportunity to take that first step toward true nationhood. They may not choose our form of government under the leadership of their choice.

United Nations supervision of the elections can assure this choice without intimidation.

NATIONAL CEMETERY IN GLOCESTER, R.I.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year we, who seek proper burial facilities for our honored veterans, hear the same statement voiced: that with the exception of Arlington National Cemetery, further expansion of the cemetery system is inadvisable. However, each year I also hear the vociferous plea from innumerable constituents and State veteran organizations for proper burial facilities in our home State of Rhode Island or in some neighboring area.

From the Civil War until 1899, 81 national cemeteries were established. Since 1900, 17 national cemeteries have been established. Yet we in New England, who gave birth to this great Nation, are deprived of national facilities for the burial of our honored veterans.

In the State of Rhode Island, which I am privileged to represent, we have available to us suitable land owned by the Federal Government that could be used for the purpose of providing proper burial facilities for our veterans. This land, presently known as George Washington Park in Glocester, R.I., could serve as a national cemetery for southern New England or, for that matter, all of New England.

In New England there are 1,412,000 veterans but there is not one national cemetery. Whereas in the South Atlantic region, which has 2,976,000 veterans there are 24 national cemeteries. In every region of the country there are at least four national cemeteries, but in New England there are no national cemeteries.

The distinguished national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Mr. Claude Callegary, in an address before the Committee on Veteran Affairs on February 16, 1966, stated:

[That] which deeply concerns the DAV [is] the growing lack of burial space in the existing national cemetery system.

In Rhode Island, and all of New England, our concern is not the growing lack of burial space but rather the complete absence of a national cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is both intolerable and disgraceful that such an historically rich area as New England and, in particular, the State of Rhode Island which has contributed so much to the greatness and security of this Nation should be denied a national cemetery.

Therefore, at this time I would like to introduce a bill directing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in George Washington Park in the town of Glocester, R.I.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

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

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings last week we made great progress for the cause of traffic safety. The Automobile Manufacturers Association came before us and stated their agreement with the proposition in my bill to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency that Federal safety performance standards for the manufacture of automobiles should be mandatorily set by the Secretary of Commerce.

But, Mr. Speaker, thus far we have not given attention to a major casual element of traffic accidents and the resulting deaths and injuries. I have been stressing and pressing for action by the Commerce Department, the automotive industry, and others, on the proper illumination of our highways and roads. But my inquiries have received complacent replies. I asked Secretary of Commerce Connor at our hearings in March about lighting up the highways and he replied:

The whole Interstate Highway System, of course, is not lighted, by any means. But

at places where experience indicates that lighting is needed, such as interchanges, these are well lighted.

Well, I do not know what experience he is talking about. The facts are that nighttime traffic is only one-third that of daytime hours, and yet the night death rate is 2½ times as great as the day rate—10 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles at night as compared with 4 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles during the day. In other words, although two-thirds of the traffic leaves the roads before dusk, well over half of all traffic accident deaths occur at night.

Translated into numbers, this means that over 25,000 people died on our roads and highways in the nighttime hours last year. The experts say that congestion is a contributing factor in accident causation, and accidents cause death. But the fact is, darkness, the lack of vision, also causes death. It has been conservatively estimated that about 10,000 of the nighttime deaths result directly from deficiency of lighting. In the evening drivers are inclined to be physically tired and mentally irritated. Who could deny that the driver needs every form of assistance possible under these conditions?

I shudder when I say that the more than 25,000 deaths that occur after dark are not so terrible as the injuries—those that leave the driver and his passengers disabled, hospitalized, incapacitated.

Studies have been made in several communities which prove that proper lighting—not the 1907 type we have here in Washington, but modern lighting that gives the road the appearance of being lit by sunlight without the glare—drastically reduces this terrible carnage. And lighting has another direct and immediately desirable benefit; it has been shown that crimes of violence, such as murder, rape, assault, and armed robbery, breed in dark places and do not exist where the darkness has been banished.

I do not profess that lighting is the only answer to our traffic death-and-injury toll, but I am forced into the position of a crusader because this aspect of the problem has been virtually ignored.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the American people, I intend to introduce shortly an amendment to the Traffic Safety Act of 1966 which will provide that no Federal aid highway funds can be parceled out to the States unless their highway building programs include provision for proper lighting of the roads they build, and that within a specified reasonable period of time they illuminate all their roadways. This will be expensive, but it will amount to nothing in comparison to the enormous amounts we are losing every year from the deaths, injuries, and property damage of over 25,000 of our citizens—something exceeding \$4 billion in economic terms and an incalculable loss of human life.

THE 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONVERSION TO CHRISTENDOM

(Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) was granted permission to

This year in America the Methodist Church is 200 years old. To mark its founding, the bicentennial meeting is being held in Baltimore, Md.

From the far reaches of the country, 12 Methodist ministers—including Rev. Sidney Dillinger of McCracken—saddled Old Faithful and are riding there, or have arrived, on horseback. And like the circuit rider of long ago, they have stopped along the way to bring the Word of God to listeners.

The meaning of this—the symbolism—goes beyond merely honoring the Methodist circuit rider. It even goes beyond honoring the pioneer preacher of whatever faith.

Rather, the honor is to a nation whose founders in the Declaration of Independence forthrightly stated "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

H-Bomb Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a unique privilege to be able to recognize within our lifetime, the vision of a group of men who participated in the opening of the earth's last frontier. In early April a hydrogen bomb, lost for almost 3 months, was recovered from the floor of the ocean. What is important here is that a two-man submarine—named *Alvin*—designed and built by American industry in the State of Minnesota, dramatically demonstrated that man now can go down to the bottom of the ocean and perform useful work. The search and recovery was a prophetic fulfillment of the remarks of James H. Wakelin, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy during dedication ceremonies at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on June 5, 1964. He said *Alvin* would be responsive to the interests of the Nation and its people. He went on to say:

This first deep-diving submarine to go into operation anywhere will go places and do things that will undoubtedly make news for many years to come.

Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the University of Minnesota's Institute of Technology was on a National Academy of Sciences Committee that in 1959 urged a broad new attack on the oceans including development of a deep-diving craft. On the same committee was Allyn Vine, for whom *Alvin* was named. Vine led the early definition of requirements for vehicles to perform oceanographic research at great depths and was a key figure in gaining Office of Naval Research support.

In the hands of its capable crew, *Alvin* has made over 150 dives. It has within its potential range an area of the ocean floor greater than the area of the surface of the moon. Chief Pilot William O. Rainnie, Naval Academy graduate and his alternate copilots, Marvin J. McCamis and Valentine Wilson, by finding and initially securing a tether to the bomb, performed a feat requiring great technical competence and operational skill as well as personal dedica-

tion and courage. This outstanding achievement may provide us with the needed force to accelerate the Nation's program to develop the potential wealth of the sea for all mankind.

The remarkable submarine *Alvin*, developed and built by Litton Industries in Minnesota, is officially classified as a deep submergence vehicle. It is a triumph of technical know-how and advanced industrial skills. *Alvin* has successfully performed research and study tests at depths below 6,000 feet. High intensity floodlights, a mechanical arm, and complete maneuverability enable this two-man vehicle to accomplish a variety of underocean assignments more than a mile below the surface. The hydrogen bomb rescue effort was a very sensitive and demanding job requiring outstanding skill and precision. Minnesota is proud of its industrial contribution to technology, personified in this case by Litton Industries and *Alvin*.

Now that the urgency of the search is over and the mission accomplished, *Alvin* is being returned to Woods Hole aboard the ship that served as her mother ship in Spain. There she will be refitted and will return to the realm of scientific research. But I hope all of us will remember that while the world followed the retrieval of a bomb, we here should not lose sight of the true mission of undersea exploration.

Why Not Blockade North Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest recently carried an excellent article entitled "Why Not Blockade North Vietnam?" which I feel every one of my colleagues will benefit from reading.

It was written by Hanson W. Baldwin, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy who served as an officer aboard battleships and a destroyer before switching to journalism. Baldwin has authored many books and has been the military editor of the New York Times since 1942.

A DISTINGUISHED MILITARY OBSERVER WHO HAS JUST RETURNED FROM A 3-MONTH SURVEY OF SOUTHEAST ASIA POSES A COGENT QUESTION: WHY NOT BLOCKADE NORTH VIETNAM?

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Soon—or never—the Nation must take the steps essential to victory in Vietnam. The alternative is to face the terrible consequences of stalemate or defeat.

President Johnson has increased our commitment in men and money in South Vietnam. But until the Navy and the Air Force are authorized to cut off the flow of arms into North Vietnam, our biggest guns are still muted, our strongest cards unplayed.

"If you want to cut off a stream of water, you turn off the faucet," an Air Force officer said recently in Vietnam. So far, we haven't seriously attempted to turn off the faucet of weapons supply for North Vietnam. We have bombed—though in low key—the railroad

from Nanning in China to Hanoi. But ships still move freely into the port of Haiphong, among them Communist bottoms bearing thousands of tons of arms and military supplies.

Effective blockade and effective bombardment of North Vietnam are essential to victory; until they are implemented, neither Hanoi nor the American people will be convinced that we mean business. Have we decided to win? This is still the great unanswered question about our policy, and one that stalks every command post in Vietnam. For it provokes in the mind of every commander another question: "Are my men dying in vain?"

Our fighting men in Vietnam believe that the war they are fighting is worth while, that—in the words of one of them—"Vietnam is the right war in the right place at the right time." They know that it is a war against aggression and to keep a country free, a war to hold communism at arm's length from America—and that unless we win it, the consequences, now and to future generations, will be disastrous. Moreover, without exception, the responsible commanders believe that Vietnam is a "winnable war," that it can indeed be won—though not quickly or easily, and certainly not with half measures.

EASY ROUTES

The arms and other war materials (such as oil) come to North Vietnam from Russia, China and other Communist states. They come in three ways: by sea, by rail from China, and by land from China over roads and trails. The sea route—principally to the port of Haiphong—is the easiest and cheapest. Under the U.S. self-imposed ground rules, the docks at Haiphong so far have been immune to bombing. Ships under Communist and other flags steam past our carriers and destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin and, without molestation, unload anti-aircraft weapons, arms and ammunition. To the fighting man, this makes no sense. Why bomb at all if we are going to let the enemy bring in weapons that will increase the cost of our bombing, decrease its effectiveness, and raise the casualty figures among U.S. soldiers fighting in the south?

U.S. attempts to use peaceful persuasions to decrease the seaborne flow have met with some success. Japan, Greece, Norway, Cyprus, Liberia, and Lebanon have eliminated or reduced visits by their ships to North Vietnam. The number of non-Communist-flag ships calling at North Vietnamese ports was down to an average of about 13 per month in late 1965, compared to 34 per month in 1964. However, these vessels carried mostly nonmilitary items.

British ships, many of them coastal craft, most of them registered in Hong Kong, are still engaged in trade with North Vietnam, and London has shown reluctance to do anything about it. The reluctance is understandable if undesirable. Many of the ships are manned by polyglot crews, including many Chinese seamen; and British, Hong Kong, and other nationals share their ownership. Britain is extremely conscious of the vulnerable position of her colonialism diadem, Hong Kong, which remains nominally British only as long as this is convenient to Peking. Hence she is reluctant to initiate steps which might increase friction with China. All the more reason for blockade. If we faced this issue squarely, it would take London off the hook.

More important, only a blockade will halt the flow of war goods in Communist-flag ships. These have brought a variety of advanced arms and military equipment, principally from Russia, and are still doing so.

SHALLOW AND NARROW

Geographic facts would simplify any sea interdiction program. Haiphong is the only good port. It lies inside the Gulf of Tonkin, and its approaches are shallow, narrow, and

terms subsidies provided credit unions. I ask Mr. O'Keefe if a need for credit unions does not exist, why is it that nearly 20 million Americans are members of credit unions? And, if a need for credit unions does not exist, why is it that servicemen throughout the world have written the Banking and Currency Committee asking about the prospects of establishing a credit union at their installation. And, if Mr. O'Keefe is unhappy with subsidies granted to financial institutions, let him look no further than commercial banking, which is the most subsidized industry in the United States.

What other industry receives millions of dollars in free Government funds for investment in the form of tax and loan accounts? What other industry has the exclusive right to create money? And, what other industry is provided hundreds of millions of dollars worth of free governmental services each year?

Mr. O'Keefe carefully avoids mentioning that the credit union movement is operated almost exclusively on a voluntary basis. He fails to mention that at many military installations credit unions' volunteer officers use their lunch hours and their vacations to perform credit union work. And if Mr. O'Keefe is worried that credit unions may be cutting into the profits of his company, then I suggest that perhaps his company should consider reducing Mr. O'Keefe's annual remuneration which, in 1965, amounted to \$48,150. Incidentally, that is \$3,510 more than the salary of the Vice President of the United States.

There can be no question as to the wonderful service that credit unions have performed for the American people. But when organizations, such as Mr. O'Keefe's, launch a smear campaign, credit unions can no longer rest on their "white hat" reputation. To counter these attacks, make certain that the people in your community and in the business and factories that you serve, know of the work you are doing. Fight Mr. O'Keefe and his group with facts and fight him hard. Keep your Congressman up to date on the work of your credit union. Let him know your legislative positions on key bills. Do not be afraid to tell your success stories to the public. If you do this, I cannot promise that it will prevent the formation of groups seeking to undermine the work of credit unions, but I will promise that these groups will gain little public sympathy and will have to operate in a completely secret manner.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you so much for your kind attention this morning.

Care and Treatment of Laboratory Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives last Thursday passed by an overwhelming vote H.R. 13881, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research and experimentation. Since coming to Congress in 1961 I have had continuing correspondence from citizens expressing the need for such legislation to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in scientific and medical research.

The bill passed by the House demonstrates the concern of an interested public, a responsible press, and an enlightened medical community.

During recent hearings before the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I serve, I had the opportunity of discussing the need for such legislation with Dr. James A. Shannon, Director, National Institutes of Health. Dr. Shannon acknowledged that this is a real problem which must be met by responsible action.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the testimony of Dr. Shannon in response to my question on a reasonable and responsible approach to the care and treatment of dogs and cats used in research:

CARE AND TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. SHRIVER. Last year you discussed this matter. We consistently get a great deal of mail on it. There has been a lot of discussion about maltreatment of dogs and other animals. There are a number of bills this year before the Congress.

What is your judgment as to a reasonable and responsible approach to take?

Dr. SHANNON. We have recommended to the Secretary that he seek broad legislative authority to deal with what, indeed, is a pressing problem. The National Academy of Sciences conducted a study 2 years ago which showed that too many laboratories have inadequate resources for handling animals in a satisfactory way.

This is unsatisfactory, whether viewed from the standpoint of the comfort of the animal or the success of the biological experiment.

It is our conviction that the use of experimental animals can be undertaken with care and consideration, but with the primary purpose being the good of man. The needs of the animal must be subservient to the needs of man.

To move from a situation of inadequate resources to one of adequate resources to insure humane treatment, we must do three things:

First, if we are not to impair the already established biomedical activity we have to broaden the resources available for the care of animals. This means actual construction.

Second, we have to provide for better training in animal caretaking. Too few biological laboratories have full-fledged veterinarians in charge of their animal facilities. They, in turn, have too few properly trained people to take care of the animals.

Finally, there has to be, I think, an objective assessment of the care provisions. We feel that this could be done through certifying procedures in precisely the same way as we now use private agencies to certify the adequacy of hospitals through the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals. We were instrumental in supporting the initiation and development of such a certifying agency which went into business and is now on a trial basis. It has been operating about 9 months.

We feel, furthermore, that in view of the criticism, some of it justified—I am afraid a great deal of it is not but some is justified—institutions have to accept a broad responsibility for what goes on in their own environs. They have to develop a consciousness of their own obligation to exercise discipline over the operation within their facilities. We are pretty much convinced that this can best be done as we do it in our own institutes, by the establishment of a formal committee which concerns itself with the care and the utilization of animals.

We have recommended to the Secretary that these elements of an animal care program be incorporated in a new legislative

proposal and submitted to the Congress. Hopefully, such legislation will have all of the essential features that would give us security in our own minds that these animals are being handled properly and well.

Accompanying this there is a recommendation that there be standards for compliance. If these committees are not set up, the departments which make grants or contracts or awards should withhold funds until objective evidence is produced that the institution meets the minimal criteria.

Quite frankly, it has been a long time. We proposed legislation which is not very different about a year ago. It was decided at that time to defer it until this year. I hope it will not be deferred again. We, too, get letters. I think we have a sense of urgency that this is a real problem. We feel it should be faced up to by the responsible people in the biomedical community, and we believe that there are ways of handling this without in any way deterring the advancement of science. We hope a legislative proposal will be brought up for consideration.

Mr. SHRIVER. A good answer.

Two Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 200th anniversary of the Methodist Church in America. Baltimore was selected as the site for the bicentennial meeting to commemorate this occasion.

Recently 12 Methodist ministers in various parts of the United States saddled horses and headed for Baltimore, and in the tradition of circuit riders of long ago, preached the Gospel as they went. One of the twelve to undertake this arduous journey was Rev. Sidney Dillinger of McCracken, Kans.

Following is an editorial from the April 24, 1966, issue of the Hays Daily News, Hays, Kans., reminding us of the important role played by Methodist circuit riders in the development of our country, and saluting Reverend Dillinger for his participation in this event:

CIRCUIT RIDERS—A LA 1966

History today records that nothing did more to make America great than the tough breed of hardy pioneers who opened up the West. From the earliest days when the country was but a smattering of not cohesive States strung along the Atlantic seaboard, the urge of men and women was to push to the West.

The overwhelming desire, we would suppose, was to find a better life for their children, to find for them something they were denied in their current environment, for them to grow up to be somebody.

Fertile land, the material things of life, were desired. But for their children to achieve the noble goals sought, they were wise enough to know this was not enough.

This explains why, once the land was cleared and the cabin built or cave dug, the first thing they did was send for a schoolmarm and preacher.

In numerous instances that preacher was a Methodist. And because people were mighty few and far between in the wide-open spaces, the preacher more often than not had to be a circuit rider.

easily blocked. A formal naval blockade maintained by the surface ships and planes of the 7th Fleet could easily seal off the gulf and the coast of North Vietnam. A blockade is generally considered an act of war, and usually follows a formal war declaration. It would mean stopping and searching all vessels bringing goods to North Vietnam, including Soviet-flag vessels—a risk, but on the scene there would be nothing much that Russia could do about it. It would involve essentially the same risk as the sea embargo established by our fleet at the time of the Cuban missile crisis.

A variation of the formal blockade, which might ease some of the international complications, would be an "embargo" or "quarantine," or a so-called "pacific blockade." (See appendix.)

Still another possibility, one favored by some of our Air Force officers as least likely to cause international complications, envisages the mining of approaches to North Vietnamese ports and of the ports themselves. The minefields, laid by Navy surface ships and "filled in," if necessary, by mine-laying from the air, would be limited to North Vietnamese coastal waters, thus avoiding the laying of mines in international seas. Nearly all Communist states claim a 12-mile limit, and the shallow Gulf of Tonkin makes mines a particularly effective weapon. All nations would be warned that their ships would approach the mined coastal waters at their own risk. But no attempt would be made to stop and search the vessels.

RESTRICTED BOMBING

Any of these measures could halt the bulk of the seaborne arms flow into North Vietnam, at little risk of escalation. However, most of our military men agree that, to reduce the arms flow, the limitations on our bombing of railroads, roads, and land targets in North Vietnam must also be eased. (See "What We Must Do To Win in Asia," the Reader's Digest, November 1965.) For the bulk of the ground weapons that equip the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces comes from China, by land routes—principally by the railroad from Nanning in China to Hanoi. This railroad changes gage at the North Vietnam border; it passes through defiles and tunnels, over scores of vulnerable bridges and culverts. Bombing has already interrupted it to some degree. But the limitations upon our bombers are many.

First of all, every bombing mission over North Vietnam must be specifically authorized in Washington. In addition, our fliers must not bomb closer than 30 miles from the Chinese frontier; they must stay out of a circle of 30 miles diameter around Hanoi; they must stay out of a circle of 10 miles diameter around Haiphong. Twice last year the Navy was permitted to bomb an important bridge between Hanoi and Haiphong. We have bombed missile sites within the 30-mile circle around Hanoi, a power station within the 10-mile circle around Haiphong—but these are exceptions, not the rule.

A sea blockade would be immeasurably helped by bombing the Haiphong docks. Some of North Vietnam's most important petroleum-storage facilities, many of her powerplants, and all the airports where Mig's and IL-28's are based are out of bounds to our fliers. Easing of these bombing restrictions and intensification of the attacks upon the Hanoi-Nanning railway line—but well south of the Chinese frontier—would make it more difficult for North Vietnam to maintain her anti-aircraft batteries and missile sites, and to supply the Communist forces in South Vietnam. Elimination of her electric power and petroleum supplies would reduce considerably Hanoi's war-making potential, and also reduce the use of trucks for weapons deliveries to South Vietnam.

WHAT RESPONSE?

To compensate the North Vietnamese would undoubtedly utilize their manpower in prodigious numbers (as they did at the battle of Dienbienphu) to move in arms from China. But the roads are few and tortuous, and air attack could make road running difficult, as our air attacks upon the Communist-held corridor in Laos are showing.

So long as we do not bomb China itself, large-scale, overt Chinese intervention is unlikely. China has everything to lose by it, including the very existence of the Peking Government and all of its hard-won industrial and economic gains.

Korea demonstrated that air and sea interdiction, no matter how intensive, will never completely stop the primitive man-back supply route. Some arms will always get through. But applied against North Vietnam and in the corridor in Laos, and coupled with heavy, continuing offensive pressure in South Vietnam, these measures may well confront the enemy with a crisis of supply. Certainly they will make it far more difficult for him to continue fighting, and so will reduce U.S. casualties. While these measures alone will not win the Vietnamese war, we probably cannot win without them. If we try to, the increased price will be in blood—American blood.

APPENDIX

A BLOODLESS USE OF SUPERIOR FORCE

(By Raymond Moley, condensed from Newsweek)

For generations, freedom of the seas existed only because Britain dominated the sealanes of the world, keeping them free to commerce in peace but restricting them in war. Now the United States carries the burden and responsibility of that dominance. Yet we are permitting the ships of our friends, as well as of the Soviet Union and of Red China, to supply through the port of Haiphong the goods of war to Hanoi and the Vietcong guerrillas. Our enemies are enjoying the benefits of a license that we ourselves have created.

The U.S. Navy should be used to cut off all sea traffic in war material into North Vietnam. This is a bloodless use of superior force. Ships carrying contraband are turned back. Thus seapower can choke off the means of warfare, lessen and ultimately stop the conflict.

There are ample precedents for a "Pacific blockade." When the Soviets, in 1962, used the sealanes to build a mortal threat to the United States in Cuba, there were many who said we should impose a blockade, only to be met by the argument that a blockade is an act of war. So when President Kennedy acted—after the missiles were installed—the blockade was called a "quarantine." Whatever the name, the reality was the U.S. capacity to bar access at sea. And the subsequent reaction of the Soviet Union made it clear that the Kremlin understood the nature and capability of dominant seapower. The Soviet ships submitted, stopped and turned back.

The "Pacific blockade" was repeatedly used by Britain and France in the 19th century to enforce their rights or preserve the peace of Europe—in 1824, 1837, 1884, and 1886. It was used in 1902 and 1903, by Germany and Britain, and then by Germany alone, to bring to negotiation a Venezuelan dictator (who name, incidentally, was Cipriano Castro). It is still a legitimate means of arresting traffic where a state of war does not formally exist.

To repeat: It is U.S. naval power that makes freedom of the seas possible. During periods of belligerence, that freedom is subject to control. The bloody Ho Chi Minh trail, by which war materials move from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, is long and winding. It begins at sea.

What It Takes To Win in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials published by Mr. William R. Mathews on our foreign policy in Asia. Mr. Mathews on April 24, 1966, published in the Arizona Daily Star another editorial of such incisive nature, I felt it should be made available to all of the Members.

The editorial follows:

WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN VIETNAM?

(By William R. Mathews)

If there were anything easy to predict, it would be to forecast that the troubled domestic political situation in Vietnam amounts to a continuation of what has gone on in the past, and will continue in the future. There will be elections within 5 months, probably. Once the tallies are made public, there will be losers and victors. The losers will cry about fraud.

If a civilian government is established, the chances are that it will last not many months, and possibly only weeks. Another civilian government will succeed it, and it will go through much the same process. Finally another dictatorship, probably a military one, will take over. It, too, will last only some months, unless Washington gets tough with the religious and political leaders of the country, which will include some generals.

There are some good reasons to justify this forecast. One of the most powerful is war-weariness, which generates religious and patriotic passions, and divides a country into warring political fragments. Because South Vietnam is a country of fragmented political parties, civilian life will continue in a state of anarchy and thus weaken the military effort.

Amid all of this development, America will continue to wage war against the Vietcong as best it can. The South Vietnam Army obviously will be weakened, and will be unable to carry its share of the war load. Our bombing will continue and will have to be enlarged against basic targets, like oil storage farms in North Vietnam. It should be realized that North Vietnam has trucks, and that they run supplies and men south using gasoline or diesel fuel which we permit North Vietnam to import, store and use. If we finally hit those oil installations, the trucks would lack fuel. The supply line would be weakened at the source of its strength.

Thus the situation we Americans find ourselves in will continue probably for years—certainly until we get tired of it, or get tough with the leaders of the numerous religious and political factions. If enough of them do not agree to unify and create a war government with militant leadership, that will not tolerate any organized opposition during the period of the war, we should pull out. Unite and fight must be our policy, and we should mean it and not apologize for it. Our patience is no longer a virtue, because it is taken as a sign of weakness.

That it obviously has encouraged the leaders of North Vietnam is proven by their scorn of our failure to develop a unified war effort in South Vietnam. Until we do that, and add to it the extension of our bombing against military targets in all of North Vietnam, the leaders of North Vietnam will remain firm in their unwillingness to talk.

We have to break the will of their political and military leaders to resist. No war is won or even stalemated, until the will of such leaders is impaired or broken. Our Civil War was not won until the will of Gen. Robert E. Lee was broken. World War I was not won until the will of Von Hindenburg was broken sufficiently to have him demand that his Kaiser abdicate.

In World War II, the Germans were denied victory in their invasion of the Soviet Union by the will of Stalin to unite the efforts of his people in "the great patriotic war." The war was not won until the will of Hitler was broken by his own suicide.

The Korean war was not won by us because we did not have the will to win it. The persistency of the Chinese, led by Mao, endured long enough to win a compromise from us.

The war in Vietnam will not be won until we and South Vietnam unit with the determination to win it. For us to imagine that North Vietnam will talk to us as long as anarchy prevails in South Vietnam, and our political leaders openly proclaim our reasonableness, is wishful thinking.

The leaders of North Vietnam will not talk reasonably until the political Government of South Vietnam unites with our Army, Air Force, and Navy to wage war with a unity that can win and can hurt North Vietnam.

Consequently, if we are going to pet and pamper the political leaders of South Vietnam, and meticulously stand aside and thereby encourage anarchy and disunity, we will be stuck in Vietnam with an ever-increasing cost in American lives and wealth. That could become a devastating political issue by 1968 at least, and possibly in 1966.

Our intensified bombing of North Vietnam could be decisive if it were backed by a unified and competent Government of South Vietnam, whose armies would unite with ours in sea, land, and air operations that would drive the invaders from the country. The Vietcong will not give up until they see that they are licked, and neither will North Vietnam.

Speeches by Ambassador Goldberg, Senator Mansfield, and Secretary Rusk during the past week have been most unfortunate. These expressions of reasonableness will cause the VC and the political leaders of Hanoi to be more adamant than ever. They see them as proof of our political weakness and our lack of will to wage war.

In such circumstances, the confusion in Vietnam will continue; our soldiers out there will be more confused; so will many Senators and Congressmen. This confusion will grow among the people of the United States.

No wonder the Chinese people speak of us as a paper tiger.

Israel's 18th Birthday

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1966

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in 1807, when the United States was 18 years old, we were a little nation situated along the eastern seaboard of a strange land across the sea. We were surrounded by some enemies who were savages, the Indians, and some enemies who were civilized but who acted like savages, the English and the French.

Now, there is a little land across the sea, situated along a seaboard, sur-

rounded by enemies, and it also is now 18 years old.

The Americans of 1807 did not waste time worrying. Instead, they worked, conquered a wilderness, and they laid the foundation for the great Nation we enjoy today. And today, in this little 18-year-old land across the sea—in Israel—the Israelis are not spending their time worrying.

They are working. They are conquering, not a wilderness, but a desert. And they are laying the foundations for a great nation to come in the Middle East.

U.S. Mission to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding public servants of our day is Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg. In a speech at the National Press Club on April 19, Ambassador Goldberg had some trenchant and enlightening comments to make on the state of the U.N. and its possible contribution to the Vietnam problem, on Communist China, and on Rhodesia. I commend this speech to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED
NATIONS

This is a very welcome experience for me. I will remember my first appearance at a National Press Club luncheon early in 1961, in fact less than 2 weeks after I had been sworn in as Secretary of Labor. Mr. Cosgrove has been more generous this time and has allowed me 9 months in which to learn my job before facing this board of examiners.

Your invitation gives me an opportunity which I value highly, because I know well the vital importance of close and frank contact between public officials and you gentlemen of the working press. And there is no area in which this contact is more necessary than in the arduous and complex search for international peace which we pursue at the United Nations.

Today I would like to give you a short progress report on the major questions that have taken up most of our time and energy at the United Nations in these 9 months since it fell to me to succeed—I will not say "replace," because nobody could replace him—the illustrious Adlai Stevenson.

The major questions have been, first, the crisis over the financing of certain U.N. peacekeeping operations; then the Kashmir crisis; then the Vietnamese question which we laid before the Security Council. In the background of Vietnam we have also the question of Red China's relation to the world community and specifically to the U.N. Finally, and most recently, we have had the crisis over Rhodesia. I would like to take up these topics in order, and then I will reply to your questions.

FINANCING AND PEACEKEEPING

When I arrived at the U.N., the organization was virtually paralyzed by the controversy over the obligation of member states to pay their assessed share for its peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. It had become clear that, despite the opinion

of the World Court and our own best efforts, the majority in the Assembly was not prepared to impose upon the delinquent member states the penalty laid down in article 19 of the charter—namely, the loss of their vote in the General Assembly.

In this situation it fell to me to announce our distasteful decision to agree that the General Assembly should resume its normal functioning with all members voting. I have no regrets over this decision. What was most immediately urgent was that the organization be enabled to continue to carry on its business.

But in the long run the U.N. has no more important objective than that of developing its peacekeeping capacity, and we remain very active in promoting that objective. Next week in New York the 33-member Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations will meet to consider changes in U.N. procedures for authorizing and financing peacekeeping operations. We attach great importance to the work of this body. The capacity of the United Nations to help in keeping the peace must not be weakened—it must be made stronger—and the United States will join wholeheartedly with those in the Committee and in the Assembly who work to make it stronger.

KASHMIR

Of course, even now, despite the financing crisis, the U.N. remains a potent peacekeeper. This was proven last September when the long-smoldering conflict over Kashmir erupted into large-scale violence. The United Nations was thereby confronted with what was perhaps the most serious armed clash between two member states with which it had ever dealt. It was, of course, all the more alarming to the United States because India and Pakistan are two very important nations whose friendship and progress we highly value—and because just over the Himalayas, Red China was sitting, eagerly waiting for a chance to pick up the pieces.

The cease-fire—which was the prerequisite to all the steps that followed—was achieved on September 22 as a direct outgrowth of the Security Council resolution 2 days earlier. This in turn paved the way for the Tashkent agreement which followed in January, leading to the withdrawal of forces. Tashkent, incidentally, offers a vivid illustration of a situation in which the Soviet Union perceives that its interest in a step toward peace runs parallel to that of the vast majority of nations of the world. May there be more such situations.

Of course the Kashmir question remains on the Security Council's agenda. It is a deep-lying issue involving long-entrenched interests and emotions on both sides. But by moving the immediate conflict off the battlefield and into the conference room, we achieved something substantial not only for India and Pakistan, but for the peace of the world. If the U.N. had done nothing else in 1965, that achievement alone would justify many times over the annual cost of the United Nations.

VIETNAM

Now let me comment briefly on activity at the United Nations relating to the conflict in Vietnam.

One of my first actions after presenting my credentials last July was to send a letter to the President of the Security Council, emphasizing the United States continued willingness to collaborate unconditionally with members of the Council in finding a formula which would restore peace to Vietnam. This was only one step in a continuous process of consultation with Secretary General U Thant and with many member states—particularly members of the Council.

Then in early January we informed all 117 members of the U.N. of our unprecedented diplomatic effort—unprecedented in in-

VIETCONG TERROR ON VOTE EXPECTED

Analysts Say Front Intends to Boycott Election

By R. W. APPLE JR.
Special to The New York Times

SAIGON, May 1 — The National Liberation Front apparently intends to boycott the forthcoming South Vietnamese national elections while attempting at the same time to do everything possible to disrupt them.

These are the conclusions of analysts who have studied newspaper and radio pronouncements made during April by the front, the political organization of the Vietcong.

The analysts said today that there was virtually no possibility that the Communists would attempt to elect representatives to the constituent assembly, either openly or covertly. Nor was it likely, they said, that the front would endorse the candidates of groups friendly to it.

In public statements, the front's leadership has assailed the whole process leading toward a civilian government as a "deceitful farce."

Referring to the political congress that laid the groundwork for the transition from military to legislative rule, the front's radio said it was "the beginning of the farce of holding dishonest general elections to maintain the dictatorial and country-selling regime."

The congress, convened by Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, South Vietnam's Premier, consisted of 49 members, four of whom represented the Government. Aug. 15 was tentatively set as the date for elections for a constitutional convention, which is referred to by the Vietnamese as a constituent assembly.

The military government, which says it controls about 54 per cent of the population, has been concerned about possible attempts by the Communists to cast ballots. This will apparently not be a problem, the analysts said.

Western diplomats in Saigon said that the front was obliged to convince its adherents that anything sponsored by the military junta and at least tacitly approved by the United States was evil — even national elections, which the front has been seeking for many years.

It would be difficult for the Communists to persuade their followers to vote in an election they have already begun to try to discredit.

Urged to Encourage Extremists

Therefore, the analysts said, the next logical step for the front would be to prevent the elections by encouraging extremist elements to continue their agitation against



Associated Press

SCORED BY THE N.L.F.:
Thich Tam Chau, Buddhist monk, was denounced as an "arm of U.S. octopus" by National Liberation Front, Vietcong's political arm.

the regime of Premier Ky. Such an effort has already begun in the Saigon area.

In a statement issued on April 23, the front's capital district committee called on the people of Saigon to "resolutely unmask and smash all political maneuvers of the enemy"—meaning the United States and the Ky Government.

"Let all classes of people in Saigon continue to fan the flames of national indignation," the statement said. It also urged the continuation of mass meetings, demonstrations, strikes and other unrest.

Apparently appealing to radical Buddhists, the statement assailed Thich Tam Chau, a Buddhist monk, as one of "the arms of the U. S. octopus." It did not mention Thich Tri Quant, the other principal leader of the political Buddhists.

Another front publication concentrated its abuse on the United States, asserting that the political congress had taken place "under the guidance of the old fox," Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

Terrorism Expected

The officers in the junta, the publication added, had used the promise of free national elections to "demonstrate that they had not brought the American elephant in to trample on our ancestors' graves."

"They loudly proclaimed their readiness to withdraw and give way to a civilian government," it said. "But who can believe in the honeyed words of a band of scoundrels?"

If they fail to block the elections, the Communists may resort to terrorism to disrupt the voting. One expert in Vietcong tactics said he expected to see "an assassination or two"

of anti-Communist candidates for the assembly.

In addition, the analysts said, the Government is unlikely to be able to prevent agents of the front from intimidating peasants who want to vote—any more than it is able to prevent such intimidation in day-to-day life.

Before departing for the United States for consultations on the war, Ambassador Lodge indicated in an broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System that he feared the Communists would so terrorize the countryside that the elections would be deprived of much of their significance.