



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1965

No. 138

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.
Rev. R. Cecil Mills, D.D., Canaan Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.

Lord of every land and nation, we thank Thee for men whose faith in Thee has made them great in the history of our country. Make us realize that only those lands are truly prosperous and happy whose leaders are led by the spirit of God. As we give Thee thanks for courageous Christian leadership in the days gone by, we pray Thee for men at the head of affairs in our Nation during these troubled days in whose hearts is the fear of the Lord and whose greatest ambition is to serve Thee and do Thy will. So shall our beloved land fulfill the mission Thou hast appointed unto it.

Give us a consciousness of guilt, not only for personal sins but also for the great collective sins of mankind, from which we cannot escape a share of responsibility. Help us to believe in the saving power of the Gospel when applied through the lives of redeemed men to the sins of society. Let us never be complacent or at ease so long as our fellow men are unjustly oppressed.

And grant unto us universal peace and good will among all men.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 625. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7997) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAIMO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and Bow.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight, July 29, to file reports on the bills H.R. 8027 and H.R. 6964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are those bills?

Mr. ALBERT. The first has to do with the Law Enforcement Association, and the second deals with the rehabilitation of prisoners.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COAST GUARD OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC FINANCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the statements of the President of the United States on July 28, 1965, on the Nation's commitment in Vietnam; and that fifty thousand additional copies shall be printed, of which thirty thousand copies shall be for the House document room and twenty thousand copies shall be for the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

17991

July 29, 1965

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contests for seats in the House of Representatives from the First Congressional District of the State of Mississippi, Augusta Wheadon against Thomas G. Abernethy, the Second Congressional District of the State of Mississippi, Fannie Lou Hamer against Jamie L. Whitten, the Fourth Congressional District of Mississippi, Annie DeVine against Prentiss Walker, and the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, Victoria Jackson Gray against William M. Colmer, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, including the copy of the unsigned notice to contest the election held in the Third Congressional District of the State of Mississippi and related papers.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above cases as seemed proper to the Clerk, there being complete disagreement by the parties as to the portions of the testimony to be printed, the notice of contest, the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be referred to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid cases have been mailed to the contestants, and the same number to the contestees, which together with briefs of the parties, when received, will be laid before the committee of the House to which the matter shall be referred.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

Bonner	Jones, Mo.	Redlin
Bow	Karth	Resnick
Cahill	Keogh	Ryan
Colmer	Lindsay	Shipley
Conyers	McEwen	Sickles
Duncan, Oreg.	Michel	Toll
Halleck	Morton	Ullman
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	Watson

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, CRAMER, and BALDWIN.

H.R. 9750, H.R. 9869, AND H.R. 9875

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to refer the bills, H.R. 9750, H.R. 9869, and H.R. 9875, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state the titles of those bills so we may know what he is dealing with?

Mr. HARRIS. They are identical bills to H.R. 9743 which was re-referred, at the request of the author and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, having to do with the utilization of certain animals on the basis of the method that the animals are obtained.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CONFeree ON H.R. 5401

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add one additional conferee to the conference with the Senate on H.R. 5401, which is the transportation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] as the additional conferee, and the Clerk will notify the Senate of this action.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COM- MITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSU- LAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-

committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 271 OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8856) to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8856, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time this legislation has been brought to the floor for consideration. It was previously brought to the floor under suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds vote in the affirmative. The vote was 216 to 139 and, therefore, the bill having failed to get two-thirds in the affirmative, it was necessary to bring it up under the rule which allows an hour for each side to present their case.

H.R. 8856 would amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The five-member Atomic Energy Commission unanimously supports this bill, as does the Justice Department. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also unanimously recommends that this bill be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this bill, and the reasons why the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommends its enactment, were explained in my statement on the floor on July 12. In view of this fact, and in light of the comprehensive report on this bill filed by our committee, I will simply point out several significant facts about H.R. 8856.

First. Because of the interest which has been generated concerning the dis-

utilization in gainful and suitable employment; and

"(2) to plan, establish, and operate an information service, to make available to agencies, organizations, and other groups and persons concerned with vocational rehabilitation, information on rehabilitation resources useful for various kinds of disability and on research and the results thereof and on other matters which may be helpful in promoting the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals and their greater utilization in gainful and suitable employment.

There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this subsection."

FLEXIBILITY IN STATE ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 8. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 35(a)) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) (A) designate a State agency as the sole State agency to administer the plan, or to supervise its administration in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision, except that where under the State's law the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind, is authorized to provide them vocational rehabilitation services, such commission or agency may be designated as the sole State agency to administer the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind (or to supervise the administration of such part in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision) and a separate State agency may be designated as the sole State agency with respect to the rest of the State plan;

"(B) provide that the State agency so designated to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan, or (if there are two State agencies designated under subparagraph (A)) so much of the State plan as does not relate to services for the blind, shall be (i) a State agency primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, (ii) the State agency administering or supervising the administration of education or vocational education in the State, or (iii) a State agency which includes at least two other major organizational units each of which administers one or more of the major public education, public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State;

"(2) provide, except in the case of agencies described in paragraph (1) (B) (i) —

"(A) that the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) (or each State agency if two are so designated) shall include a vocational rehabilitation bureau, division, or other organizational unit which (i) is primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, and is responsible for the vocational rehabilitation program of such State agency, (ii) has a full-time director, and (iii) has a staff employed on such rehabilitation work of such organizational unit all or substantially all of whom are employed full time on such work; and

"(B) (i) that such unit shall be located at an organizational level and shall have an organizational status within such State agency comparable to that of other major organizational units of such agency or (ii) in the case of an agency described in paragraph (1) (B) (ii), either that such unit shall be so located and have such status or that the director of such unit shall be the executive officer of such State agency; except that, in the case of a State which has designated only one State agency pursuant to para-

graph (1), such State may, if it so desires, assign responsibility for the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind to one organizational unit of such agency and assign responsibility for the rest of the plan to another organizational unit of such agency, with the provisions of this paragraph (2) applying separately to each of such units."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective July 1, 1967, except that, in the case of any State, such amendments shall be effective on such earlier date (on or after the date of enactment of this Act) as such State has in effect an approved plan meeting the requirements of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as amended by subsection (a).

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR THE BLIND AND THE DEAF

Sec. 9. So much of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a)) as precedes paragraph (1) is amended by inserting after the second semicolon "provision, in the case of handicapped individuals, of reader services for such individuals who are blind and of interpreter services in the case of such individuals who are deaf;".

SERVICES TO DETERMINE REHABILITATION POTENTIAL OF RECIPIENT

Sec. 10. (a) Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof: "; except that nothing in the preceding provisions of this subsection or in subsection (a) shall be construed to exclude from 'vocational rehabilitation services' any goods or services provided to an individual who is under a physical or mental disability which constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, during the period, not in excess of eighteen months in the case of any individual who is mentally retarded or has a disability designated for this purpose by the Secretary, or six months in the case of an individual with any other disability, determined (in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to be necessary for, and which are provided for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of goods and services described in subsection (a), but only if the goods or services provided to him during such period would constitute 'vocational rehabilitation services' if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a 'handicapped individual' under such preceding provisions of this subsection".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of expenditures made after June 30, 1965, under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND SUPERVISION OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISES OF THE HANDICAPPED

Sec. 11. Effective July 1, 1966, section 11(a) (7) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a) (7)) as amended to read as follows:

"(7) in the case of any type of small business operated by the severely handicapped the operation of which can be improved by management services and supervision provided by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies; and"

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Sec. 12. (a) Section 4(d) (3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(d) (3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council or at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compen-

sation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

(b) (1) The last sentence of section 4(a), the second sentence of section 5(d) (1), the first sentence of section 4(d) (2), section 5(a) (4), the paragraphs of section 7(a) redesignated (by section 7 of this Act) as paragraphs (1) and (3), the portion of section 11(a) preceding paragraph (1), paragraph (8) of section 11(a), section 11(b), and so much of section 11(c) as precedes paragraph (1), of such Act, are each amended by striking out "physically handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped individuals".

(2) The third sentence of section 4(d) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "physically handicapped" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped".

(3) Section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "Physically Handicapped" and inserting in lieu thereof "Handicapped" and by striking out "handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "individuals".

(c) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "severely handicapped individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "the severely handicapped".

(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 11 of such Act are amended by striking out "remunerative" and inserting in lieu thereof "gainful".

FEDERAL SHARE

Sec. 13. (a) Effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, section 11(i) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The term 'Federal share' for any State shall be equal to its Federal share as determined hereunder for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus one-half the difference between such share and 75 per centum."

(b) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, such section 11(i) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The term 'Federal share' means 75 per centum."

Mr. DANIELS (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments? If not, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Reso-

July 29, 1965

18038

lution 486, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING U.S. GOVERNOR TO AGREE TO AMENDMENTS TO THE ARTICLES OF AGREEMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 494, Rept. No. 698) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1742) to authorize the United States Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

AMENDING TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 699) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7843) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued

leave. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

For the Record
VIETNAM

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last month I traveled to South Vietnam as a member of a Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee on a factfinding tour. Upon returning from that country I made the following observation concerning teachings and demonstrations in this country against our policy in South Vietnam:

The Vietcong, North Vietnam, and Red China are able to capitalize propaganda-wise on such activities. They create doubt in the minds of many that America will stay. They are detrimental to an eventual peaceful solution. They have the effect of encouraging the Communists and directly contribute to the prolongation of the war. American boys are dying in South Vietnam. Many more will lose their lives in the next few months. Even if I disagreed with the policy of the United States, I would find some other way to influence my Government's policy rather than have the stain of American blood on my hands. This is a harsh conclusion, but it is true.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of the Nation's top newspapers, has articulated this problem in a very forceful and outstanding manner in an editorial on June 29, 1965. It is even more timely today than when written and I commend it to the Members without further comment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this editorial of June 29, 1965, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM POLICY

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are proud of the leadership demonstrated by our President yesterday when he conducted his White House press conference.

The President demonstrated his great desire to maintain peace throughout the world. He pointed out that we have learned many bitter lessons during the first half of this century. These experiences have caused us to be involved in great conflicts with other nations who do not understand our representative form of government.

President Johnson recognizes the ambitiousness of the Communist nations, and he is taking definite steps to see that we maintain a strong nation so that we can be independent in the future.

Every effort was made by the President to see that the peace of the world is maintained. He instructed Ambassador Goldberg to present a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations requesting that the United Nations employ all of its resources, energies, and immense prestige to find ways to halt aggression and bring about peace in Vietnam.

America has always been a peaceloving Nation, and President Johnson yesterday reemphasized our desire to maintain peace throughout the world. It is my hope we can accomplish this objective.

SCURRILOUS POSTHUMOUS ATTACK BY DREW PEARSON

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on July 12 of this year, I took the floor to defend our colleague, the late T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, against the scurrilous, posthumous attack by Drew Pearson.

Among the responses I received, was a letter from the vice president of Hercules Powder Co., Mr. J. R. L. Johnson, Jr., which establishes once again that Pearson and the truth are strangers, that he has no compunction against lying if it suits his ugly purpose.

Mr. Johnson's letter further establishes this well-known point and I insert it now with his permission for all to see.

HERCULES POWDER CO.,

Wilmington, Del., July 15, 1965.

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WAGGONER: Thank you for including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1965, your remarks concerning Drew Pearson's article entitled "Chemical Companies Versus Water Bill."

Hercules Powder Co. has a plant at Lake Charles, La., which is located in the Seventh District. I know of no water pollution problem at that location and, so far as I can determine, no one from this company has ever talked to the late T. Ashton Thompson concerning problems of water pollution or his position on proposed water pollution legislation.

Hercules has been concerned with water pollution problems for many years and has spent substantial sums of money studying and eliminating these problems at its various plant locations. This company has also followed proposals in the Senate and in the House dealing with this problem. We feel that some legislation is needed but from our study of Senator Muskie's proposal and the revisions proposed to S. 4 by the House Public Works Committee, we feel that the modified bill suggested by the House version is superior and should be the one adopted if any Federal legislation is considered to be needed at this time.

We appreciate very much your setting the record straight on Drew Pearson's article.

Very truly yours,

J. R. L. JOHNSON, JR.,

Vice President.

July 29, 1965

18039

CHAIRMAN PATMAN CONTINUES THE BATTLE FOR REASONABLE INTEREST RATES

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge no man has done more to advocate the cause of reasonable interest rates for the American people than the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

Chairman PATMAN reiterates his views on tight money in the August issue of the American Legion magazine in a debate with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock]. The title of the article is "Should We Have Lower Interest Rates and More Credit Available?" Chairman PATMAN takes the "yes" position, while the gentleman from Tennessee takes the typical Republican "no" position. In other words, Chairman PATMAN advocates a credit policy that would expand the Nation's economy, while the gentleman from Tennessee advocates a policy that would shut out most Americans in their drive for a better way of life.

In the Legion article Mr. PATMAN points out that there is no reason why a homeowner should have to pay for a house and then pay a second time to cover the interest payments. This is sound, well-founded, and logical reasoning; and if our Nation follows a pattern of reasonable interest rates such as those suggested by Chairman PATMAN, we can look forward to prolonged prosperity.

But, unfortunately, there has been an alarming swing to high interest rates and a tight money policy. The former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter W. Heller, warned in a recent speech:

Economic gains probably will slow down during the rest of the year and in 1966 and these developments could dampen economic spirits and lead to a high level stall . . . not a recession but a marked slow down with a rise in unemployment, falling profit margins, and a cutback in plans for capital expansion.

There is one guaranteed way to make certain that Mr. Heller's prediction becomes a fact, and that is to follow the advice set forth by the gentleman from Tennessee and the rest of the Republicans who advocate a policy of making it hard for Americans to purchase the necessities of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a copy of the American Legion article discussing interest rates: SHOULD WE HAVE LOWER INTEREST RATES AND MORE CREDIT AVAILABLE?

The question that is posed is like asking whether a man who has been without adequate nourishment needs food.

The American Legion took sides on the question when its founders wrote the preamble to its constitution, which sets forth 10 purposes. No. 6 reads: "To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses."

The Federal Reserve System has changed from its well-conceived creation in 1913 to an absolute autocracy of the classes against

the masses in 1965. It is now controlled by private bankers. The President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Congress do not fix our volume of money and interest rates. This is done by the Federal Reserve autocracy, which proclaims that it is independent—Independent of the executive and congressional arms of the Government, yes—but not independent of the money powers in New York.

If the Fed for the past two decades had worked in the interest of the American public as hard as it has for private banking interests, our interest-bearing national debt, heading toward \$325 billion, would be at least \$50 billion less today—it might even have been cut in half. Our carrying charges on that debt, which run pretty close to a billion dollars a month, or \$250 million a week, or around \$35 million a day, would be halved if we were merely to revert to the pre-Eisenhower interest rates of the Roosevelt-Truman days.

Instead, the Fed has caused man-made recessions or depressions every 3 or 4 years by raising interest rates arbitrarily, tightening money capriciously, thereby robbing the masses and enriching the classes.

Think of the schools and hospitals that could be built, the area redevelopment in city and countryside, the idle factory wheels that could be turning and the jobs that could ensue if the excess \$6 billion annual carrying charge were paying on the national debt were turned into the productive economy of America.

There are many reasons why we should have lower interest rates. I think it's a disgrace that when we buy a house or build a school on long-term credit, we actually pay at least twice for them. High interest charges on our mortgages are responsible. And isn't it rather silly for all the folks in town to pay once for the building of the schoolhouse, and once again to the bankers in interest for merely renting money for its construction?

Americans are paying extortionate interest rates which will aggregate over \$75 billion in interest charges during 1965. This means that the consumer is paying far too much for the privilege of owning an automobile, a washing machine, or a split level.

Legionnaires, keep a sharp eye on the autocracy of the Federal Reserve System and those who control it. It must have its power thwarted for the good of nearly 200 million Americans whose pockets are being picked.

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Thirty years ago a buyer virtually had to pay cash for a car or a house, for it was almost impossible to borrow money at any price. Today, almost everything is bought on credit because the American people have saved their money and deposited it in banks where it can be used by others while it's there.

In other words, because the citizens of this country have produced for their families and saved for their security, and because our banking system has become so capable in providing that these savings do not just sit there but are used constantly and securely for even more production and thus even more savings, we have created a truly great society.

The key word is savings. When you and I save money, we put it in the bank. If someone else wants to use it, you do not lend these savings free. Nobody is going to risk his money for less than he can make in a safe investment. That is why Federal restrictions on interest are difficult, at best, and dangerous.

Because money is basically like any other commodity, to make it cheap we have to produce a great deal of it. In the 1940's we were producing for war and consuming little at home. We had laws limiting wages, interest rates, and prices. Later, we expanded

production of consumer goods while not increasing the supply of money. The pressure eased and laws on prices, wages, and finally interest rates were repealed. If Washington had chosen to keep a ceiling on interest, the Government could have done so only by dramatically adding to the supply of money and forcing prices of goods up.

In effect, we were required to impose price controls because there was more money available than there were goods on which to spend it. Obviously, in a free economy, prices would rise in such a situation until the excess cash was sopped up. The result would have penalized the poorer people who had no savings and limited incomes. Thus, the law was passed imposing ceilings on wages and prices.

Higher prices literally destroy the savings of people. Those on fixed incomes such as social security or pensions are hurt first. If the condition worsens, they soon find they cannot afford even basic necessities. Widows, whose husbands had bought insurance once considered adequate, have difficulty meeting bills. For these reasons our Government decided we could not afford the self-delusion of laws setting arbitrarily low interest ceilings. Rather, the people through their State governments attacked excessive charges with usury laws.

In conclusion, if we want to manage one sector of the economy, such as the cost of money, then we must manage the rest through wage and price controls. Thus, the opportunity for all to earn and to save is reduced. If we refuse the alternative of wage and price controls, then we allow and even encourage massive price increases. Here, too, the opportunity for those less fortunate to live decently is reduced. The price of wishful thinking on interest rates is too high. Our freedom is too dear to lose through lack of self-discipline and individual responsibility.

BILL BROCK.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

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

THE 1ST CAVALRY DIVISION (AIR-MOBILE) FROM FORT BENNING, GA.

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today all other news is overshadowed by the sobering reports from Vietnam. The war has taken on new proportions and this Nation must, as always, rise to meet the situation. For this job, the job upon which may well rest the future of the free world, the President has called upon the 1st Cavalry Division—Airmobile—from Fort Benning, Ga. The newly formed 1st Cavalry is a merger of two of this country's finest outfits: the experimental 11th Air Assault, and the famous 2d Division—"second to none."

The people of my district are proud to have provided the home for these units and the proving ground for the air mobile concept. We are proud to have known their fine commander, General Kinnard.

The 1st Air Cavalry has been called to Vietnam because it is trained to handle the job there. The job that they do will require the support of American courage and American strength. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this Nation and its people will pledge every resource to aid these boys in their efforts to defeat communism in southeast Asia.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and the include extraneous matter.)

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

See Mr. Adair
**CONCERN WITH AID PROGRAM TO
SEND COLLEGE GRADUATES TO
VIETNAM AS INTERNS**

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 of this year I rose to inform this body of my concern with an AID program which proposed to send some 20 college graduate students to Vietnam as interns.

At that time I said that I was most concerned about the safety of these young men. AID, I noted, was vague about this aspect of the matter but reportedly had said that the Vietcong usually do not attack AID people. I contrasted this alleged statement with a statement by President Johnson to the effect that AID workers were prime targets of the Communist terrorists.

Now I have been saddened to learn that one of these young men, Theodore M. Smith, of the University of California, has been seriously wounded by a terrorist bomb while serving in the "intern" program in South Vietnam.

In my original remarks I indicated that better uses of AID funds could be found than the financing of a highly dangerous and poorly conceived program such as this. I hoped that AID would drop the program forthwith before any young men could be sent to Vietnam under its sponsorship. Unfortunately, my hopes were not realized.

I am sorry that this has happened. My protest was not heeded and these students were sent. The Agency for International Development should recall the remaining students immediately. We are at war and everyone knows it. It is high time to stop this amateurish and ad hoc approach to the war in Vietnam and let our best professionals get this job done.

Now, for those of you who missed this item in the Washington Post of Tuesday, I will read the item that appeared:

BOMB WOUNDS U.S. STUDENT

SAIGON, July 26.—An American student from the University of California was seriously wounded by a terrorist bomb last Thursday, a U.S. spokesman announced today.

He said the student was Theodore M. Smith, 24, of Fullerton, Calif., 1 of 19 students sent to Vietnam by the State Department in June to familiarize themselves with U.S. aid operations.

Smith was injured in a blast at the home of the U.S. AID mission representative for Lamdong Province, about 100 miles north-east of Saigon, where he was staying. No one else was injured.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon at the time rollcall 208 was taken I was in conference in my office with officials of the Urban Renewal Administration and the mayor of the city of Providence on important business having to do with the operations of that city.

Mr. Speaker, I miscalculated on my timing and was not present for the vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 77. Had I been present my vote would have been against recommitment.

**PICTURES RECENTLY TAKEN OF
MARS**

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at 2:30, in the rooms of the Science and Astronautics Committee, 2318 Rayburn Building, we will have an opportunity to see the pictures that were recently taken of Mars. I have seen these pictures; I saw them at the White House this morning. Dr. Pickering and his staff are coming up to show them this afternoon.

I realize we have important business to dispose of today, but those of you who can get away to see them will be very well rewarded. I should point out that this invitation is to Members of the House only, and not to the staff.

**INVESTIGATION OF BANKING CON-
CENTRATION AND CONTROL IN
CLEVELAND, OHIO**

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a resolution adopted by the Ohio State Legislature indicates that the country is becoming increasingly aware of and alarmed by the tremendous concentration of economic power in the hands of little cliques which control the enormous assets of huge banks.

The Ohio House of Representatives, by a vote of 113 to 2, directed the State's Legislative Services Commission to investigate the legality and propriety of the officers of the Cleveland Trust Co., voting the bank's own shares to perpetuate their own control, and also using the bank's trust department to dominate many major corporations.

Although Ohio law bans corporations from voting its own stock, the Cleveland Trust Co., skirts this rule by assigning the voting rights to a third of its stock—which it holds in trust for various es-

tates—to a dummy partnership known as A. A. Welsh & Co.

Through this same device, using the economic power of stock held for various estates by its trust department, this bank has placed its chairman, George Gund, and its president, George Karch, on the boards of 43 corporations. Through these board memberships, they either control or have a loud voice in the affairs of companies with billions of dollars in assets.

Through a combination of these positions and the power of their bank to grant or deny credit, these men wield vast economic power which would seem to be totally out of keeping with the principles of our economic free enterprise system.

It has long been the public policy of the United States to curb and prevent such concentrations of power of life and death over whole industries and the entire economy.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, in previous investigations, has spelled out the interlocking directorates and close knit relationships through which the Nation's banks and many great corporations seem to be banded together to form a mighty confederation which, in many economic matters, may constitute more power than that held by the Federal Government.

The Ohio Legislature has taken cognizance of this threat to economic liberty and it seems to me that the appropriate Federal agencies should join the investigation.

Surely the Department of Justice has a responsibility to see if Ohio banks are violating Federal as well as State laws.

The Federal Reserve Board has a duty to require the Cleveland Trust Co. and other banks to make full disclosures of their operations, and to determine whether a self-perpetuating directorate is serving the interests of the depositors, or their own selfish self-interests.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should require banks to observe the spirit as well as the letter of National and State laws.

State and Federal authorities should cooperate to assure that the Nation's big banks are law-abiding citizens, and not a group of economic czars who consider themselves above the law, and constantly devise cute tricks to evade and ignore both the letter and the spirit of statutes enacted to regulate them.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 21, 1965 and the Cincinnati Enquirer of the same date carry excellent and timely articles with respect to the Ohio banking investigation.

These articles follow:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer,
July 21, 1965]

**OHIO HOUSE OK'S BANK STOCK STUDY
(By John E. Bryan)**

A resolution to investigate banks, especially Cleveland Trust Co., voting large blocks of their own and other banks' and corporations' stocks was passed yesterday in the Ohio house of representatives by a vote of 113 to 2.

The resolution was introduced in the house by A. G. Lancione, Democrat, of Bellaire, and will be sponsored in the senate by Senators

July 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190008-1

18043

in my opinion, to the executive department.

My bill uses the sound, time-honored mechanism spelled out in the Reorganization Act which permits the President to make orders for reorganizing the executive department, but requires that these changes be filed with both Houses of Congress.

We ask no more than that the President submit to Congress any proposed fee schedules. These shall not become effective if either House passes a resolution against them within 60 days. I believe a serious error was committed when this obligation was delegated to the various executive agencies. Congress must do its duty to the people by retaining some power in its hands over this matter.

These two provisions of the bill would make unmistakably clear that Congress intends to jealously guard the right of our people to fully enjoy public lands and waters without undue charge. We will be saying there is to be no tampering with public policy unless and until Congress has given the matter serious study and review.

When he introduced similar legislation in the other body, the distinguished Senator HARRIS pinpointed the contradiction between these entrance fees and the administration's war on poverty and the "See the USA" programs. How can we spend hundreds of millions of dollars to rehabilitate people, and then make enjoyment of our natural resources dependent on wealth? How can we justify encouraging Americans to see their own country first, and then force them to drop coins in the box every time they turn around?

Many of my colleagues have already experienced the results of these fees. What has happened in my district has happened in theirs. They know of the thousands of impoverished families who can no longer enjoy the natural wonders of our great country because they cannot afford these entrance and user fees.

Mr. Speaker, let us undo the damage that has been done. Let us revitalize the public policy that allows everyone free access to our natural resources, and let us return control of such policies where it belongs—in the Congress of the United States.

Je. O. Goodell
VIETNAM

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the American public are rightly and deeply concerned with our policies in Vietnam. It is an area of interest that must, by its very nature, be scrutinized fully.

It is most distressing, therefore, when efforts at a reasonable discussion are thwarted.

I call to the attention of the membership the statement of July 16, 1965, by the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], chairman of the House Republican conference.

It deserves the attention of the House and I insert it here:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN R. LAIRD, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN

Has critical bipartisan discussion about our policies in Vietnam been abandoned?

It would seem so but I would hope not.

Certainly rational debate and reasonable discussion have been abandoned—not by Republicans, but by the leader of the President's majority in the U.S. Senate.

This fact is inescapable, and the situation it creates is deplorable.

The first attempt to scuttle bipartisan debate occurred on June 30, 1965. It was ignored by Republicans in the hope that the intemperate remarks in that speech were a mere lapse, an accident, and not a deliberate attempt to silence the dialog, impose conformity, and obliterate efforts to arrive at an informed and broadly supported policy toward Vietnam.

It was not a mere lapse.

Any doubt that it was was erased on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader of the Senate again launched a vituperative attack on the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

The natural reaction to the tone and innuendo of the majority leader's two recent speeches would be to reply in kind. This would be the natural reaction—and it would be fully justified.

But it would not be constructive.

Republicans could adopt similar tactics and join personalities rather than issues. We could attempt, for example to impugn this particular spokesman's credentials to question criticism of foreign and military policy. For the Senate Democratic leader has himself contributed to the "dialog"—though not always in support of the President—and has himself participated rather fully in publicly questioning some of the actions taken in southeast Asia.

I suspect that the President may have wished at times that his majority leader and kept to himself such suggestions as the neutralization of all of southeast Asia.

The Senator's more recent statements concerning Republican contributions to the debate on Vietnam are confusing.

It would seem from the Senator's remarks that the distinction between statesmanship and political chicanery goes no further than the difference in party labels of those making the remarks.

If a Republican advocates a particular course, it is politics and irresponsible politics at that. If a Democratic President subsequently adopts that course, it is instantly transformed into statesmanship.

The President's decision last February to go North must have shocked and alarmed the Senator, for on "Meet the Press" just 1 month before (January 3), the Senator said: "I feel just as strongly that we cannot carry the war into North Vietnam because if you carry the consequences of that action to its ultimate conclusion, it means war with Communist China, and a situation will be created which will be worse than it was in Korea."

It should be remembered that at that time the suggestion to go north had been made by some Republicans. It was, in short, politics then. Only later did it become statesmanship.

The natural and certainly justifiable reaction to the Senator's recent statements could proceed along these lines.

But Republicans have proceeded in a reasonable and responsible manner. They have shown a spirit of fairness in standing up for administration policy against Democratic critics of that policy. In this spirit, I want to correct the blatant distortions which the President's majority leader of the Senate has given to Republican pronouncements.

Senator MANSFIELD. "I am somewhat at a loss to understand public expressions from Republicans in which it is advocated, in

view of the extent of the air and naval activity already pursued against legitimate military targets, what can only amount to an indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese by air and naval bombardment—a slaughter of combatants and noncombatants alike, of friend and foe alike."

The truth: No Republican has advocated the "indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese." Some Republicans have suggested and still suggest the more effective use of our air and naval power against more significant military targets in North Vietnam in order to bring about the President's stated objective of bringing the Communists to the conference table. Our suggestions were designed to minimize the possibility of the slaughter of American soldiers when other steps are still available.

Senator MANSFIELD: "Now one can advocate the course of the bombing of Hanoi or Peking or even Moscow and with or without nuclear weapons for that matter—in short, a course of virtually unrestricted violence as a suitable way for the United States, to achieve some worthwhile end in Vietnam."

The truth: Any resemblance between the innuendo and the public statements of any elected national official in either party is so remote as to be totally nonexistent. Such a distortion could be expected from an overzealous freshman assemblyman in the heat of a bitter political campaign, but surely not from the Majority Leader of the greatest deliberative body in the world in a discussion concerning a situation that contains within it the gravest consequences for the entire world.

Senator MANSFIELD: "And one can say too, I suppose, that we want a total victory in Vietnam, but we want it at bargain basement rates in American lives. We want it by firebombs or nuclear bombs and lead and steel or whatever but we don't want any talk about paying a bitter price in American lives on the ground."

The truth: No Republican since the President's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965 has spoken of "total" victory in Vietnam. None has proposed using nuclear bombs. Many Republicans have hoped for victory there, as did President Kennedy when he said on September 12, 1963, "We want the war to be won"; as did President Johnson when he wrote on December 31, 1963, to Gen. Duong Van Minh, "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory"; as did Secretary Rusk when he said on April 29, 1963, "We have no doubt of ultimate victory." By victory, Republicans and these Democrats meant—not the military conquest of Vietnam—but the establishment of conditions of peace and security in South Vietnam and an end to aggression against it. Republicans do want to attain the national objective in South Vietnam with a minimum loss of American lives. Call this "bargain basement rates in American lives," if you will.

Senator MANSFIELD: "And I suppose, finally, Mr. President, one can say that negotiations are bad; that you can't make peace by talking with the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese or anyone else for that matter; you can only make peace by war and more war."

The truth: Every Republican statement to which the Senator's remarks refer were uttered in the context of the pursuit of negotiations. The Senator did not in either statement—nor could he—directly quote any Republican leader as having called for "total victory" as having said "negotiations are bad"; as having stated or implied that "you can only make peace by war and more war."

This Republican would be very interested in seeing any quote that the Senator used upon which he based his gravely serious implications and charges.

The Senator's statements which I have quoted were all contained in his first speech, that of June 30, 1965.

They were met by Republican silence.

It was sincerely hoped that by ignoring this fantastically distorted presentation of the Republican position by the President's majority leader, responsible discussion could be resumed and bipartisanship in foreign policy could be restored.

These hopes received a setback on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader spoke out again—taking up where he had left off—with the same inattention to what had actually been said, thus making efforts at reasonable discussion impossible.

It would serve no useful purpose to respond, point by point and item by item, to the charges and innuendoes contained in the second speech for they are cut from the same artificial cloth as the first statement.

I have been listening in vain since the speeches of the majority leader for some voice of moderation from someone in his party—for calm and objective discussion of proposals made by some members of the minority party.

The stakes in southeast Asia are too high for any responsible official to seek partisan advantage from the situation there. Republicans who speak out on Vietnam are pointing out the course of action which they believe will promote the security of our Nation. If they were motivated by considerations of political gain, they would offer no suggestions. They would simply criticize the consequences of administration policy.

I still hope that someone in the administration will recognize the value of debate and discussion of foreign policy problems, and that Members of Congress again accord to each other the respectful hearing and the reasoned response without which debate cannot be conducted.

TALCOTT BILL TO AID FARM- WORKERS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation—H.R. 10179—for the important twin goals of first, protecting U.S. farmworkers from the depressing effects of cheap foreign agricultural imports, and second, improving the status of foreign farmworkers. It would place Congress on record as opposing the importation of any agricultural commodity which is produced by low-wage foreign labor under substandard working conditions.

Titled the "International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act," my bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor, upon request, to conduct investigations of situations involving the importation of foreign farm products to determine if they were produced under depressive or substandard labor circumstances.

If the Secretary found that the foreign workers had been exploited, he would determine the amount of import duty which would be necessary to remove this unfair cost advantage. He would submit his report and recommendations to Congress for whatever action it might deem appropriate.

The legislation would add an important new dimension to our international relations by imposing import duties on agricultural products to encourage for-

eign nations to elevate the wages and working conditions of their farmworkers. It is a unique and logical extension of our foreign aid program.

Enactment of the International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act would open the way to preventing foreign growers and processors from realizing enormous profits from the sale of farm products, produced with low-wage labor under substandard working conditions, in the affluent U.S. market.

I urge that hearings on H.R. 10179 be scheduled at any early date.

A section-by-section analysis of H.R. 10179 follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 10179,
THE "INTERNATIONAL FARM LABOR AND
WORKING CONDITIONS ACT," INTRODUCED IN
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY CON-
GRESSMAN BURT L. TALCOTT OF CALIFORNIA'S
12TH DISTRICT

Enacting clause institutes the "International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act."

Section 2 sets forth the declaration of policy, wherein the Congress declares it a policy to correct via duties those inequities which, through the use of U.S. commerce, have a deleterious effect on the dignity and welfare of foreign workers and concomitantly on domestic workers.

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of Labor, under certain conditions, to investigate labor conditions, etc., in countries exporting agricultural commodities into the United States. Provides for public hearings and report and recommendation as to remedial action by the Secretary of Labor to the Congress.

Section 2 sets forth the criteria (wage rates, monetary exchange) upon which the Secretary of Labor shall premise his report and recommendation.

Section 2 provides that such report and recommendation shall be submitted by the Secretary to the President no later than 120 days after the application for investigation is instituted.

Section 4 defines agricultural commodity as any agricultural product imported in any form.

Section 5 provides that the effective date of this International Farm Labor and Working Conditions Act shall be 90 days after enactment.

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

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

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE TO RURAL AREAS

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I requested an accounting by the General Accounting Office of the actions of the U.S. Post Office Department in their

curtailment of service to rural areas of the United States.

I called for this accounting in view of the many complaints that have reached my office. There has been no one who has expressed any favor or approval of the changes in service.

I have been meeting with Post Office Department officials in Washington in an attempt to find out their reasoning in the recent switch to star route mail service throughout much of the country, as well as the closing of many mail terminals all over the United States and the removal of mail from Soo Line trains in my district.

This drastic reduction in needed mail service to rural America has been misrepresented as "improved service and savings" by the Post Office Department.

They have stated that these changes would result in a reduced cost of operation and provide better service. Statistics supplied this office do not leave any proof that either of these purposes has been or is being accomplished.

I feel this investigation should include some accounting of the additional cost that would be required in providing the same delivery and dispatch service that was provided to the many rural communities throughout the Nation prior to the July 1 change to the star system.

It should be emphasized that these people are not asking for any improvement in service but only want mail dispatches and deliveries to be on the same basis as before the change was made.

I hope that a GAO investigation of this matter would be as successful as the last one I called for. A year ago, my inquiries led to a GAO investigation of the Post Office Department's printing of stamped envelopes. This resulted in a \$6 million saving to the U.S. taxpayer.

Bureaucracy's war on rural America must be stopped. It just does not make sense to deliberately try to eliminate the very unit of our society that must be maintained if the Nation is to continue as the world's example of greatness through personal initiative.

My letter to the GAO also contained a request for an accounting of the number of summer youth placement personnel that have been placed on the payroll and the total cost of the program in Minnesota.

MYTH OF TRADE EXPANSION

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

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there are endless discussions about our balance-of-payments position, restrictions on foreign investments, tourist expenditures, world liquidity, need for overhauling the international monetary system and other aspects of the standing of this country in the world competitive struggle.

At the same time we are flooded with assurances about the health of our economy, including forecasts about its growth to unheard of heights in 5 years from now.

Not once in these optimistic statements and appraisals is anything said

magazine. Let me say to any who may be interested that, so far as I know, there is nothing particularly new or startling about the information contained therein. This information has been carried at one time or another during the past year or year and a half by, I believe, every newspaper in Washington. Certainly, the newspapers of the country have carried all of this information. It simply has been brought together in one place in one well-written article.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of various manipulations in this little world of make believe in Washington being swept under the rug. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to see any more of them swept under the rug if I, as one individual, can prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

NOMINATION OF ABE FORTAS TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, in further pursuit of the matter of the nomination of Mr. Abe Fortas, that I have no doubt my colleagues who have risen and spoken against him here today would have the courage to make the same statements in public.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this element of courage is the very thing I most respect and admire in my friend the nominee for Associate Justice, Mr. Abe Fortas—the courage to take and espouse the unpopular cause; the courage to represent the man who, in the eyes of the public, is already condemned; the courage, on occasion, to represent without charge those who cannot afford to pay for representation and who are accused of heinous crimes.

This is in the finest tradition of the American legal system and the British legal system. Erskine, of England, was one of the great advocates of this system. Without it the judicial system would crumble in this country; and the same men who attack Abe Fortas today because he has had that courage might be the very people who would rely upon it in the future.

The members of the Supreme Court are often subjected to the pressures of having to take positions which are not in accord with the popular will. When that happens it takes men of courage as well as learning, dedication, and erudition. I am confident Mr. Fortas has that courage. I am confident that that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, he has achieved the high office he has today.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abe Fortas in 1943 was the member of the President's Commission to study changes in the organic law of Puerto Rico. His friendship for that part of our land has been historic. It long preceded the election of the Democratic President, Mr. Kennedy. His representation in this appointment matter, in which innuendo has been made,

was in the tradition of helping that commonwealth, as he has traditionally over two decades.

Mr. Speaker, my objection to the attack that was launched upon Mr. Fortas today is related to some degree to the willingness to those who made it to make it in public; that is, it was more a matter of innuendo than of hard fact. The statement that he enriched himself while on the public payroll insinuates many things but, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that sort of insinuation has gone out of style in this country in most circles, and I would like to hope that the day will come when it will go out of style in all circles. My objection to the attack is based upon that. This was a series of innuendoes a man could make safely anywhere because they contain no substance.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHN-SON'S VIET POLICY

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the decisions announced by the President concerning the turn of events in Vietnam that those decisions have been reached after one of the most careful and exhausting reviews undertaken by any Chief of State in the history of this Nation.

The President has restated that it is the Nation's position to be firm and resolute without being rash and bellicose. America will beckon the Communists toward a peaceful solution to Vietnam with one hand while holding U.S. armed might in the fist of the other hand.

The President has demonstrated to the entire Nation that the gravity of Vietnam deserves the resources of reason, not yielding to the temptations of frustration or temper. His actions demonstrate the leadership which every nation sees in America.

This Nation has a duty to greatness, and in Vietnam and elsewhere on this earth Americans will continue to walk free because they know the consequence of faltering footsteps.

The President's action will continue the consensus of America that freedom will be maintained.

DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this session of the Congress has accomplished much in terms of legislative action, and stands as one of the most productive in the Nation's history although the first session is not yet completed.

Among the most outstanding accomplishments of this Congress is the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965,

signed into law by the President July 15. With this new law we have erected a bulwark against a widespread menace to the public health, especially concerning the young people of America.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, I was pleased to have participated in the formulation of this new law. The hearings conducted by the committee clearly showed that stronger legal machinery was needed to curb the illicit traffic or depressant and stimulant drugs. However, as a member of the committee, I was surprised to learn during hearings that the prescription drug industry itself had taken few if any significant measures toward self-regulation.

For example, the committee's House Report No. 130 reads:

There is no level in the entire chain of distribution from manufacturer to consumer which does not today serve as a source of supply of depressant and stimulant drugs for the illicit trade.

With the exception of the educational programs and the programs of cooperation with law-enforcement agencies and drug identification carried on by Smith, Kline, & French Laboratories of Philadelphia, Pa., to the committee's knowledge there has been little voluntary control activity on the part of those involved in the manufacture and distribution of these drugs to prevent or curtail this illicit traffic. Of course, many persons in the business of manufacture or distribution of these drugs check on the validity of their customers or proposed customers. However, there has been a virtual dearth of voluntary self-regulation or of attempts thereof by the industry at any level.

It was encouraging during the hearings to note that the drug industry itself was trying to bring about approaches toward a solution to the problem of illegal drug traffic in depressant and stimulant drugs. In reference to the committee report above, it must be noted that much can be done by the industry such as the programs implemented by the firm cited in the committee report. Similar measures might well be considered by other companies in the field.

The disturbing misuse of such drugs as barbiturates and amphetamines has been linked to the rising toll of highway accidents as well as a factor in juvenile delinquency and crime. Only through the cooperation and assistance of the industry itself will the fullest benefits of this law lessen the problems linked to the illicit drug trade. Industry cooperation is held to carry out the intent of the Congress that this law be fully operative.

THE NEGRO VOTE IN DETROIT, MICH., AND WHAT IT MEANS IN RACE RELATIONS

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent report on Detroit's progress in race relations, by Stanley H. Brown, in the June issue of Fortune magazine, "Detroit: Slow Healing of a Fractured City."

DETROIT: SLOW HEALING OF A FRACTURED CITY (By Stanley H. Brown)

"City fair,
Shining there,
In your place beneath the sun,
All the world is watching you.
Detroit is marching on."

Thus in their innocence sang the school-children of Detroit a quarter of a century ago. Hardly anyone remembers, let alone sings, that song today, and few recall the emotions and events that made that piece of doggerel so patently false a picture of their city. In the 1920's a politically powerful Ku Klux Klan, said to be the biggest in the country, actually elected a mayor. In the 1930's the city's violent, depression-fanned insecurities produced the xenophobic, murderous Black Legion, while old Henry Ford was financing publication of an anti-Semitic tract called "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and Father Charles Coughlin preached "social justice" and railed against the evils of "International Jewry." In 1937, Ford Motor Co. guards beat bloody two young auto union organizers, Walter Reuther and Richard Frankenstein, in the notorious Battle of the Overpass at the gates of the spectacular River Rouge plant. At the end of the decade a woman's suicide started an investigation of gambling and prostitution that put Detroit's mayor, the county prosecuting attorney, and scores of police in prison. And in 1943 a series of racial incidents finally erupted into the great Detroit race riot, which killed at least 34 and wounded hundred before Federal troops and armored cars occupied the city. The kids obviously didn't know what they were singing about.

Sometime after World War II, however, the dreary, angry factory town began its metamorphosis. Detroit may still be nothing more than a synonym for the auto industry to people who have never been there, and an epithet on the lips of the traveling salesman looking for a good time. The social conflicts, the physical drabness, and the cultural desolation have by no means vanished. Some aspects of the transformation may be nothing more than evanescent byproducts of the bounteous prosperity of the auto industry during the past 4 years. Others may be long overdue for any city the size and age of Detroit. And some of the brave plans and programs are based on unrealistic estimates of the resources and sophistication of the community. The avid boosters who talk of a renaissance are surely being dazzled by their own enthusiasm.

Still, a new consensus is abroad in the city. All the diverse elements that make up Detroit's power structure, once divided and pitted against itself, are being welded together in a remarkable synthesis. Every significant accomplishment in such major areas as race relations, urban renewal, and the arts—whether initiated by a single individual or by one special interest—has become the province of a board or committee that includes representatives of the United Auto Workers, one or more of the city's utilities, the clergy, ethnic groups, retailers, the auto companies, real estate interests, finance, the press, political groups, and any other relevant interests. And the achievement of the city is discernible as much in the almost palpable determination of its citizenry to confront its problems and attempt their solution as it is in the marked changes that these groups have already wrought.

Though the consensus may appear to encompass a breadth of forces unlikely to do much more than create an aura of civic virtue, in Detroit the synthesized power structure has surprising effect. It is true that in most instances the names of board or committee members are no more than names. The presence of an auto executive or a banker on a board offers no assurance that

his employer will supply anything more than good wishes. Nevertheless, sufficient support from diverse and even conflicting interests—particularly from the UAW and the automobile industry—can generally be counted on to elicit enough lipservice, manpower, and money to achieve an objective. Few of the city's leaders are willing to stand in open opposition to the consensus.

Of all the accomplishments in the recent history of the city, the most significant is the progress Detroit has made in race relations. The grim specter of the 1943 riots never quite fades from the minds of the city's leaders. As much as anything else, that specter has enabled the power structure to overcome tenacious prejudice and give the Negro community a role in the consensus probably unparalleled in any major American city. So widespread is Detroit's understanding that the Negro's cry for equality must be heard that in 1963, when Walter Reuther initiated the Citizens Committee for Equal Opportunity to relieve mounting tensions over Negro efforts for civil rights, every business, labor, social, religious, ethnic, financial, and political group of consequence in the city sent its top man. Joseph Ross, president of Federal Department Stores, a chain that finds most of its customers among the city's industrial workers, has been a store executive in New York, Newark, Dallas, Atlanta, and Denver, and he says, "Detroit is more sophisticated in race relations than any other city I know."

THE PRIDE OF CITY HALL

Any effort to attribute the city's awakening to a particular event or individual would be an oversimplification. It would ignore the broad changes in our national life and Federal policy that have affected every city in the last three decades, and would overlook the reaction inevitably generated in Detroit by shame over past neglect. But the new consensus has found itself a most appropriate image in the city's 37-year-old mayor, Jerome Patrick Cavanagh. His record in office and his ability to engender pride and enthusiasm among as disparate a group of supporters as ever a political official is likely to acquire are impressive. And they take on more luster in the light of the fact that during the campaign 4 years ago Cavanagh was virtually unknown, a struggling lawyer with nothing to lose and almost no support from any part of the established leadership. He was opposed then by both newspapers, both political parties, all the business leaders, and by the AFL-CIO.

Cavanagh came to power on a wave of Negro votes. The Negro community had a major grievance against his opponent, the incumbent mayor, and it evidently gave Cavanagh its almost total support. His upset election was, as much as anything, the product of Negro concern that egregious bungling of some recent problems could thwart racial progress in the city. But the margin of Cavanagh's victory (40,000 of 360,000 votes cast) indicated more than that. By electing Cavanagh so resoundingly, the community was expressing a decision that it would not extend the string of mayors who were at best lackluster bureaucrats, that it wanted its change of mood and direction to go all the way to the top. Cavanagh obviously sensed Detroit's new spirit and based his campaign on the city's needs and problems, vigorously countering the city fathers' adamant insistence that everything was dandy.

Once in office, the mayor quickly seized the opportunity to establish himself as the symbol of the city's aspirations. Abjuring the stolid postures of his predecessors, Cavanagh from the outset projected energy, wit, charm, candor, and even intellect. The books on his desk may have their titles deliberately turned toward the visitor, but the mayor reads them, and they include works of St. Thomas Aquinas, Kennedy-

Johnson braintruster Walt W. Rostow, liberal cartoonist Herblock, and Dag Hammarskjöld. Heavily Roman Catholic, predominantly liberal Democratic (though municipal elections are nonpartisan), and eagerly seeking modernity and culture, Detroit has found just the man to embody its collective yearning to remake itself into an authentic metropolis. Significantly, the mayor's first executive order called for equal opportunity for Negroes in city jobs.

THE VOICE WILL BE HEARD

Having been instrumental in the election of Cavanagh, the Negro community was assured that its voice would be heard. Although the Detroit Negro has no single leader who acts as his spokesman, many Negroes have long had access to the power structure and, in fact, several are part of it. Horace Sheffield, a staff employee of the UAW, also happens to be the founder of the Trade Union Leadership Council. Created in 1957 as a protest organization to get more jobs for Negroes in union-controlled skilled trades, the TULC is now active in other aspects of community life as well. Discussing Negro participation in the city's consensus of power, he reflected, "Where else could you arrange to meet with people like Joe Hudson [head of J. L. Hudson Co., after Macy's the country's biggest department store] or the head of the Detroit Bank & Trust Co., or the personnel director of General Motors on 3 or 4 hours' notice?"

Now that it is represented, the Negro community intends to play an increasingly important role in the life of the city. For as long as most white people can remember, Negroes have had access to Detroit's hotels, restaurants, and other public accommodations without incident. But it is only since the days of World War II that the Negro has been able fully to share in the prosperity of the auto industry, largely as a result of UAW insistence that all production jobs in the plants be open to Negroes at pay equal to that of whites. So the Negroes have begun to move out of their once clearly defined ghettos into the middle-class white neighborhoods that increasing numbers of them can afford. Often their way has been marked by a good deal of resistance. Many neighborhoods were finally yielded up to them completely by whites, who fled to the suburbs. Other sections, though, including some choice ones, have arrived at and maintained a fairly stable integrated composition.

Negroes in Detroit have deep roots in the community, compared with the more transient populations of Negro ghettos in Harlem and elsewhere in the North. Homeownership is high; roughly 65,000 families—more than 40 percent of the Negro population—own their own houses. Negroes are sufficiently well organized socially and politically to have elected a member to the Detroit Common Council in a citywide election. They have also elected 3 local judges, 10 State legislators, and 2 Congressmen (Michigan's is the only congressional delegation in Washington with 2 Negroes). Federal District Judge Wade H. McCree, Jr., is a Negro who, before his Federal appointment, sat as a county circuit judge. Mayor Cavanagh's first appointment went to a Negro, Alfred Pelham, a fiscal expert on the staff of Wayne State University.

HANDS ACROSS THE BARGAINING TABLE

Detroit's achievements reach beyond the inclusion on decent terms of the Negro segment of the population. The consensus has also established a profitable stability in the community's industrial relations. Virulent labor hating is now considered bad taste and—in view of the UAW's pervasive social and political power—bad tactics as well. Despite harsh pronouncements from both sides during contract negotiations, once bitterly fought wars have now become hard-played games for high stakes at the bargaining table.

July 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18087

Philadelphia (NL)

	AB	R	H	BI
Gonzales, cf.	3	0	0	0
Rojas, 2b	4	0	2	0
Callison, rf.	2	0	0	0
Briggs, rf.	1	0	0	0
Allen, 3b	2	0	0	0
Amaro, 3b	1	0	0	0
Covington, lf.	4	1	1	0
Stuart, lb	2	1	2	0
Herrnstein, lb	2	1	1	1
Corrales, c	2	1	1	0
Dalrymple, c	2	0	0	0
Wine, ss	4	0	2	3
Burdette, p	1	0	0	0
Johnson, p	1	0	0	0
Belinsky, p	1	0	0	0
Total	32	4	9	4

New York 001 023 010-7 11 0
Philadelphia 000 030 001-4 9 3

E—Burdette, Stuart, Roebuck. DP—New York 4.
Philadelphia 2. LOB—New York 5, Philadelphia 4.
2b—Mantle, Lina, Wine. HR—Boyer, Gibbs, Pepi-
tone, Lopez, Herrnstein, S—Brenneman.

	IP	H	R	ER	BB	SO
Blanco	4 3/4	8	3	3	0	0
Brenneman (W)	4 1/4	1	1	1	3	1
Burdette	5	5	3	2	0	1
Roebuck (L)	1	4	3	3	1	1
Belinsky	3	2	1	1	1	3

WP—Brenneman, Burdette. T—2:19. A—9,850.

CHALLENGE TO THE MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION UNNECESSARILY DELAYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk of the House has informed me that he has transmitted to the Speaker printed depositions filed in connection with the challenge to the Mississippi congressional delegation. This record has been referred to the House Administration Committee.

Resolution of the challenge has already been delayed unnecessarily. Under rule XI, section 24, of the House, the committee was to report its findings by July 4—6 months after the convening of the House. The delay in the printing of the record made it impossible for the committee to act by July 4. Now that the record is before the House Administration Committee it is time to act.

I am impatient with those who call for additional study and committee investigation. Who among us can deny the systematic exclusion of Negroes from Mississippi polls? Who among us has not been convinced by the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 of Mississippi's deliberate violation of the Constitution? Have we not been shown the subtle and the not so subtle techniques used to deny the Mississippi Negro his right to vote? Who can deny the fact that the white power structure of that State has perpetuated itself by trapping the Negro in a poverty of power? Never before, Mr. Speaker, has any issue been so thoroughly documented prior to a committee hearing.

According to the Congressional Quarterly of 1961, the following were the fig-

ures for nonwhite registration in each of the five Mississippi congressional districts: First District, 1.3 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Second District, 6.8 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Third District, 9.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Fourth District, 5.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Fifth District, 12.3 percent of the nonwhites registered to vote.

The exclusion of Negroes from the Mississippi polls is not an accident. As early as 1870 U.S. Senator George, of Mississippi, explained that the purpose of Mississippi voting laws is "to devise such measures, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, as will enable us to maintain a home government under the control of the white people of the State."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the terror, violence, and murder perpetrated last summer upon those who attempted to help their fellow citizens exercise their right to vote. Mississippi tramples upon the U.S. Constitution by denying citizens the right to vote.

I have made this argument on the opening day of Congress when I objected to the seating of the Members-elect from Mississippi. I have listened to those who ask for additional study. But the issue, Mr. Speaker, will not be resolved by statistics. The issues, frankly, are moral and political. They are stark and simple. They involve matters of dedication and commitment to the Constitution of the United States by those who hold high office in the Federal Government.

My plea, Mr. Speaker, is for prompt review and prompt resolution. It is easy to tiptoe through this session of Congress keeping away from sharp corners. But if we do so, we will adjourn without exercising our solemn obligation to the Constitution. We will have forfeited a confidence in this Congress, a confidence which depends on the courage to act on this most fundamental issue.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to read from a message written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Goodman after the murder of their son, Andrew, in Philadelphia, Miss.:

In Washington 4 weeks ago, my wife and I in a sense made a pilgrimage to the Lincoln Memorial in the evening and stood in that great shrine looking down past the Washington Monument toward the soft glow of the light around the White House. Full of the awe of a great nation that surrounded us, we turned to read, emblazoned in black letters on white marble: "It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves that these dead shall not have died in vain."

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson was sober and realistic at his press conference yesterday. He announced that we were increasing our military commitment in order to meet the increasing aggressive activities directed by North Vietnam. He made

clear that we were increasing our diplomatic efforts, that we were willing to discuss Hanoi's proposals or the proposals of any other nation, and that we were once again asking the United Nations to take a larger and more active role in achieving an early and peaceful settlement. He also, for the present at least, rejected the cries of the "war hawks" for a major callup of the Reserves and the use of 200,000 American troops or more.

Let me make it clear initially, Mr. Speaker, that I support the President in his decision to resist the terror and aggression that denies independence of choice and self-determination to the people of South Vietnam.

But let us emphasize that the real issue in Vietnam is not our "honor" or our "word." We did not begin our program of aid and support in 1954 as a test of national honor. Then and now the real test is whether terror and violence are to triumph over the ballot and free choice; of whether so-called wars of national liberation, controlled and directed externally, will supplant peaceful decisions and orderly change arrived at internally.

Our proper goal has and should continue to be to help in every way we reasonable can to insure that the people of South Vietnam will be able to participate freely in the determination of their own future; not that they would have it decided for them, as is the Communist goal today.

But our policy has raised serious questions in the minds of many Americans. When I was at home a week ago, many constituents whose opinions I value and respect, were deeply troubled. They asked many questions which I feel should be publicly discussed and which I have asked both the White House and the State Department to discuss. They wanted to know:

First. What did the 1954 Geneva accords provide with respect to the future government of North and South Vietnam?

Second. Why did the United States not sign the Geneva accords? Did the United States state that it would follow the Geneva accords?

Third. Was a "government" representing South Vietnam a party to the Geneva accords? How did the first South Vietnamese Government come into power? Has there been any government in South Vietnam chosen to any extend by a democratic process? If so, when and how?

Fourth. What happened to prevent the 1956 "free election" contemplated by the 1954 Geneva accords? Did the United States oppose such election?

Fifth. To what extent has there been objective verification of interference by the North Vietnam Government—as distinguished from participation by individual North Vietnamese—in the affairs of South Vietnam?

Sixth. In terms of international law, what is the basis for our present activity in South Vietnam?

Seventh. Is there a legal basis for asking the U.N. to take action in relation to

18088

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 29, 1965

Vietnam? If so, are there practical reasons for our not having made this request up to this time?

Eighth. What efforts have been made by the United States to substitute negotiation for military action?

Ninth. It is often said that we must stay in South Vietnam to prevent the spread of communism in southeast Asia. Is the main purpose of our policy to forestall a Communist government in South Vietnam? Or is it to enable the people of South Vietnam to establish whatever kind of government they want?

Tenth. Assuming that what we are doing in Vietnam is morally and legally justified, is it wise and sound from the viewpoint of effectiveness? Can we, within reasonable and practicable cost considerations, achieve a military victory or are we in effect repeating Napoleon's disastrous march to Moscow? Would we be more likely to achieve the ends we desire if we were to let the people of South Vietnam struggle with this problem by themselves and in the process perhaps develop enough nationalism to resist control by China?

Eleventh. President Kennedy stated on numerous occasions that the war in Vietnam was a Vietnamese war; that it must be won or lost by the people of South Vietnam themselves. Does our increasing commitment of troops, planes and supporting material mean that we have abandoned this policy?

Mr. Speaker, many of these same questions have troubled me and I intend to place the replies in the Record.

But even when these questions are considered, and I think there are reasonable answers to most, if not all of them, I do not believe, considering the alternatives and their implications, that there is any reasonable alternative to our present course of action.

Major escalation on our part could only invite increased efforts by Hanoi and Peiping. It could mean introduction of thousands more troops from North Vietnam, and quite possibly divisions or even armies from China. It could mean stepped up U.S. air attacks. It could mean expansion of these attacks to centers of population and industry in North Vietnam, and it could mean the commitment on the ground of many more American forces and lives.

Leaders of the Republican Party in the House it is true, have argued that "total victory" is possible; that the war, in fact, can be "won" if only we were willing. But it should be noted that this war could be "won" in this way only at a cost far in excess of our goals and our requirements. Such a "victory" in the wake of the destruction, the devastation and the countless maimings and deaths would mark it a hollow triumph at best.

On the other hand, unconditional withdrawal by American forces, as the Communists have demanded, is equally unconscionable. Independence would not only be doomed in South Vietnam, it would be jeopardized from Thailand to Australia, from India to the Philippines.

It would be unconscionable, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations stated

in his thoughtful speech of June 15, "because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanded Communist power."

It would be unconscionable, for if independence is as vital as this country has maintained for nearly 200 years, then it should be the right of all who truly want it and not just of the few who are capable of defending it.

Where then do we go? If both major escalation into a much larger war and the abandonment of independence are intolerable choices, what path should we pursue?

The only reasonable course, it seems to me, was outlined yesterday by the President. First, we must provide sufficient arms to convince Hanoi and Peiping, and Moscow as well, that wars of "national liberation" based on terror and intimidation and naked force will not succeed. Our arms should be used in sufficient force to persuade the adversaries of open societies that discussions and negotiations, not bombs and bullets, are the only sensible way to settle problems. Our arms should be available for as long as they are necessary but for no longer than they are necessary and in no greater strength than they are necessary.

Second, we must continue to follow every path and pursue every opportunity that can lead to negotiations, to a cease-fire and to a diplomatic settlement that can guarantee the people of South Vietnam independence of choice in any future government and any future way of life, free of outside intimidation or intervention.

We should have no quarrel with this choice so long as it is free. We should have no vested interest save that of independence and a better life for our fellow men.

There can be no question that the Communists, whether they be in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, or Communist China, have been deaf to all offers of negotiation which have been made to date. Not only have they rejected our repeated bids for "unconditional discussions." They have refused the plea of 17 non-aligned chiefs of state for negotiations, the French suggestion of a new Geneva conference without preconditions, the Soviet and American endorsement of a Cambodian conference, U.N. Secretary General U Thant's offer of exploration, India's proposal for a cease-fire monitored by an Afro-Asian force, the invitation of the U.N. Security Council for a complete review and discussion, the peace mission of the British Commonwealth Prime Minister, and others.

This record of intransigence is without exception. But it should not and it must not deter our continued and persistent efforts, and our support of the efforts of others, to bring together all of the parties who are involved in the conflict in Vietnam. The so-called National Liberation Front is certainly no more than what its

name implies, a front. But surely there is no reason why North Vietnam could not include its members, the Vietcong, or any other parties it desires, or any team of representatives it sends to the negotiation table. And we should negotiate with that team, whomever it contains.

A much larger presence and a greater role of participation should be encouraged for the United Nations, the world organization which has performed so valiantly and successfully in many trouble spots of the world for the last 20 years. I am particularly pleased that the President is calling on this resource, as I have been urging for some time, and that he has sent a special message with Ambassador Goldberg to U.N. Secretary General U Thant. He is to be strongly commended for this effort and we can only fervently hope that the Secretary General will be able to utilize his offices to good effect. Certainly we should support him in any constructive efforts he is able to initiate. Certainly the United Nations should be encouraged in every way possible to provide the machinery for bringing this matter to the international conference table, for policing a cease-fire, and for insuring free elections.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that Hanoi and Vietcong have no intention of lessening their aggression at the present time. This makes two requirements on our policy, as was suggested last month by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] and which was stressed by the President yesterday.

First, we must sustain the Government and the Army of South Vietnam. We must persuade the Communists that Saigon cannot be crushed and that the forces of the free world will not be driven out by force.

Second, we must practice patience and restraint. We must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable alternative to war, and we must continue to press for a peaceful settlement at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, several leading Republican policymakers have suggested that our country would accept a continued American presence in Vietnam, including any necessary troop buildup, if and only if our objective was total victory; not if it were a negotiated settlement.

I reject this suggestion. I believe it misinterprets and misrepresents the true feeling of the American people. This feeling, I believe, is one of rightful anxiety. It is one of willingness to contribute and to sacrifice; to pay the cost of freedom; to be a leader of the free world. But it is one also which seeks independence and the other legitimate aspirations of men through peaceful means. Our policy and our efforts should be directed at no lesser goal.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I include two editorials from this morning's Washington Post, one by the distinguished columnist Chalmers Roberts, which speak directly and thoughtfully to the points I have discussed:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

THE VIETNAM POLICY

In typically Johnsonian fashion, the President supplemented his announcement of intensified American participation in the Viet-

name war with an escalation of his peace efforts. Draft calls are to be doubled in the months ahead, and there will be a rapid buildup of American fighting men in the besieged southeast Asian country. But the aim of protecting freedom and independence from Communist aggression without resort to general war remains the same.

The President made another graceful appeal to the United Nations to exert whatever influence it can to halt the aggression in Vietnam. At the same time, he offered to discuss Hanoi's proposals along with our own and those of any other interested nation that may care to sit down at a conference table. His sincere desire to substitute the conference table for the battlefield took away any suggestion of belligerence that might otherwise have been read into the announcement of expanding military operations.

The gist of what the President had to say is that the United States places such a high value on peace that it is willing to fight for it. The spread of Asian communism by terror and slaughter is the antithesis of both peace and freedom. The United States has attempted to provide a shield against this menace. It is now called upon to demonstrate that this shield is not an illusion.

We do not see how President Johnson could have explained the necessity of the U.S. course in Vietnam more effectively than he did:

"If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise of protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself. . . .

"We just cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam."

The President's reference to Asian communism doubtless holds special significance. His exclusion of the Russians from his comments was an indirect appeal for Moscow's understanding of why we must do what we are doing. The Soviet Union shares at least some of the alarm in the West over the openly belligerent and recklessly aggressive course of Communist China and the Hanoi government. President Johnson seemed to be saying to Moscow that the United States is doing everything possible to avoid a general war and that the two major nuclear powers have a common interest in not allowing this Asian Communist brushfire to get out of hand for want of a rational confrontation at a conference table.

Within the United States, we surmise that the response to the President's speech will be overwhelmingly favorable. Despite the innate hatred of war, most of the people are aware of the kind of world we live in. They appear to be reconciled to a hard struggle in a faraway land because of the close relation it has to the preservation of our own freedom. Many of those who are committed to the general policy, however, retain some concern over the way it is being carried out.

One would hope that much of the discussion in the White House conferences of the last week has been given to effective employment of the additional manpower and equipment that are flowing to Vietnam. It is not enough merely to build up larger forces and the volume of supplies. With the extension of military might in Vietnam, there will be increasing need for wise decisions and sound strategy. This perceptive statement on the part of the President also greatly strengthens confidence that he will be as firm in pushing for a rational settlement as he has been in trying to teach the Communists that peace cannot be bought with terror and aggression.

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

GUARDIAN AT THE GATE: WORLD SEES A DETERMINED JOHNSON

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

It was not a happy President Johnson the Nation saw yesterday. But it was a determined President.

"We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate," he said, "but there is no one else." That single sentence explains a lot about the man and his approach to the war in Vietnam.

Because of what he said last fall in the presidential campaign against Barry Goldwater, a lot of people concluded that he wanted to liquidate the war as quickly as possible. Indeed, it is clear that a number of Communist diplomats here told their governments just that.

That conclusion was based on a misunderstanding of Lyndon Johnson. He did want to liquidate the war—he does want to liquidate it now—but not on terms of surrender.

For a long time Mr. Johnson resisted saying out loud that the conflict in Vietnam was a crucial one between communism and democracy or between China and the United States. Only slowly and reluctantly did he come to do so.

Like most Americans, as he emotionally made evident yesterday, he would prefer to concentrate on improving our domestic life. But history caught up with him, and he is determined to face history.

The Vietcong attacks on American personnel, the hard words from North Vietnam and the shrill language from China all drove him, however reluctantly, to conclude that here was a place that the United States had to make a stand.

If the Communists had offered to sit down at the conference table, the fighting could have stopped long ago. It is quite likely, too, that the result would have been a gain in the Communist position in southeast Asia. But in rejecting the conference table, the Communists gave Mr. Johnson no option except to fight.

Slowly, then, a rationale for American military activity has been developed. As John F. Kennedy did in the Cuban missile crisis, Mr. Johnson yesterday referred to the appeasement of Hitler in the 1930's and the lesson to be drawn from it.

The furious Communist offensive in Vietnam, coupled with the Chinese demands to smash the United States in that corner of Asia, left him, he felt, no choice but to send in more Americans to act as "the guardians of the gate."

Lyndon Johnson is both a coolly calculating man and an emotionally patriotic man. Both these sides of his personality were evident yesterday.

His new military steps are calculated to deny the Communists a military victory; his diplomatic steps are designed to ease the path to the conference table. But he doubtless has no illusions that the Communists will agree to negotiate until they are convinced that American power is fully committed to the war and that it can be decisive.

Slowly, as he has sought a way out of Vietnam, Mr. Johnson has come to describe the stakes in sharper terms. Now he has reached the point of saying that the United States cannot escape the role of guardian at the gate in this "remote and distant place."

Those who have viewed the President as a reckless plunger should be reassured by his efforts to avoid a rupture with the Soviet Union. Certainly he meant it when he said that "I don't think I have any right to commit the whole world to world war III."

Those who believe he has been too cautious in his application of military force may not be wholly satisfied with the new decisions he outlined yesterday. But they can find satisfaction in the firm determination, now that the United States is so fully committed, to see it through to the end.

Lyndon Johnson yesterday was not a happy guardian at the gate. But he certainly was determined.

The purpose of yesterday's public appearance before the Nation was to show that determination. He succeeded.

A second purpose was to answer the question of the mother who had written to ask "why" her son had to fight in Vietnam. Here, at least, he made a convincing case.

Finally, he sought to show that the United States carries an olive branch as well as thunderbolts. Here he is willing to talk about even the Communist demand that all Americans be withdrawn. It is hard to see how critics could ask for more, unless they would have the United States accept surrender.

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS CURTAILS STATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Missouri is in the forefront of States in this Nation in developing modern roads for its citizens.

Planning and early construction of interstate highway routes in Missouri were under the direction of the Honorable Rex M. Whitton, then chief engineer of the Missouri Highway Department and now Federal Highway Administrator.

Mr. Whitton's work has been carried on by our present extremely able chief engineer, Marvin J. Snider, resulting in continued progress in building Missouri highways.

In a recent speech to the Ozark Chapter of the Missouri Society of Professional Engineers in Springfield, Mo., Mr. Snider outlined the programs and the problems of highway builders in Missouri.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Snider's speech:

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS CURTAILS STATE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

It is a sincere pleasure for me to have the opportunity to meet with your organization this evening to discuss the progress of Missouri's State highway program.

From the outset I would say that State highway progress in Missouri is relatively good. I use the term "relatively good" because, due to a constant lack of sufficient highway funds, our rate of roadbuilding improvements certainly is not what it should be in order to provide an adequate State road system for motorists.

However, the historical shortage of highway funds is a story in itself and I will not go into it further during this meeting.

My remarks this evening will be devoted to a twofold discussion of Missouri's highway progress.

First, I will report briefly on the progress being made by the State highway department with the funds that are available.

Second, and most importantly, I want to explain about a financial difficulty which has arisen at the Federal level in the last few months, and which is causing a curtailment in State highway construction in Missouri this year.

It is a curtailment that we can ill afford because of the extreme importance of building and improving highways as rapidly as possible to serve the constantly growing demands of traffic. Nevertheless, the cutback in highway work is with us, resulting in delays in awarding a number of construction contracts in many areas of the State. I believe it is important for Missourians to know

July 29, 1965

18090

about this situation and understand why it is happening.

PROGRESS IN 1964

As to progress made in calendar 1964, it pleases me to report that last year saw the greatest single surge of State roadbuilding in Missouri's history.

During 1964 the State highway department carried on a construction and right-of-way program amounting to about \$192,500,000. This was some \$17 million larger than the previous high recorded in 1963.

I don't want to confuse you with a lot of figures, but I believe it will be helpful to point out how the \$192,500,000 which made up the 1964 construction and right-of-way program was used:

For actual highway construction, \$156,700,000 was spent or obligated; \$33,600,000 was spent to acquire right-of-way; \$2,100,000 was obligated for the 1965 secondary (farm to market) system road oiling program, work which now is going on since this is a warm weather operation; and \$115,000 was spent to install flashing light signals at railroad crossings.

Even more meaningful than money figures is the fact that 924 miles of highway construction projects were awarded to contract last year. They included:

One hundred and seventy miles of work on the Interstate System, the nationwide super-highway network now under construction throughout America, and which is made up of highways like Interstate Routes 44 and 70.

Four hundred and thirty-one miles of improvements were contracted on the primary system, which consists of conventional trunkline highways like U.S. Routes 54, 63, 65, and 71.

Two hundred and ninety-seven miles of construction on the secondary system, made up mainly of lettered State highways providing local service such as Routes M, FF, C, or TT.

Twenty-six miles of improvements were placed under contract on the urban system of highways, which are extensions of primary and secondary system routes into urban areas.

In addition, about 1,200 miles of secondary system roads now are receiving an oil surface treatment to make them dust free under the oiling program authorized last year.

So by all previous standards, 1964 was a banner roadbuilding year for the State of Missouri. And another substantial year, although not scheduled to be as impressive as the one just passed, was in prospect for 1965.

At the beginning of the present calendar year, the State highway department estimated that it would have a construction and right-of-way program amounting to about \$165,500,000 during 1965. This was to include \$131,600,000 in construction work to be awarded to contract; \$26,300,000 for the purchase of right-of-way; and \$7,600,000 for preliminary engineering, the obligation of funds for the 1966 secondary system road oiling program and the installation of flashing light signals at railroad crossings.

The estimate for 1965 was considerably under accomplishments of 1964 mainly for two reasons. In the first place, it was purposely on the conservative side and represented a figure the department felt certain could be attained. Secondly, we knew there would not be as much money available in 1965. In 1964 the department was anticipating later reimbursement by the Federal Government of several millions of dollars which had been tied up in right of way purchases for a number of years, and therefore was able to obligate against these funds.

LAG IN FEDERAL FUNDS BEGINS

At any rate, the department began the 1965 calendar year on a note of optimism, with an anticipated minimum construction and right of way program of about \$165,500,000.

But then along in late February the Federal funds situation which I mentioned earlier began to develop, and it has worsened gradually ever since.

In beginning an explanation of what has been and still is happening, I want to point out that the financing of State highway construction is a very complicated matter. However, I will try to keep my remarks as simple as possible in order to get this message across.

Missouri's State highways are built with money received from taxes levied by the State and Federal Governments on highway users.

Taxes levied by the State of Missouri include the motor vehicle fuel tax, commonly called the gasoline tax; license fees for motor vehicles; drivers license fees; and the motor vehicle use tax, which is equivalent to a sales tax on vehicle purchases made by Missourians in other States.

Highway user taxes levied by the Federal Government are those on gasoline and other motor vehicle fuel, on tires and inner tubes, on heavy trucks and on new trucks, buses and trailers at the time of manufacture.

The Federal Government provides a very substantial share of the funds used in the construct and purchase of right-of-way for highways in Missouri, with the State providing the remaining share.

Under Federal law, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of building Interstate System highways, leaving the State with 10 percent of the cost to pay. Naturally, a State would be foolish to finance an Interstate System project entirely out of its own funds, since the Federal Government offers a ratio of 9 to 1 aid for this work.

Most primary, secondary and urban system highways are constructed on the basis of 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State funds. Missouri must match dollar for dollar all of the Federal aid available for building these three categories of highways.

With whatever construction funds the State still has available, after matching all Federal funds, it finances projects on the primary, secondary, and urban systems with 100 percent State money. The wisdom of using all available 100 percent State construction funds in this manner is readily apparent, since the Federal Government offers so much more aid in the building of Interstate routes than it does for the other three systems of highways.

That gives a fairly complete summary, I believe, on where the money comes from to finance the acquisition of right-of-way and the construction of State highways. Now let's look at how the Federal aid funds actually are made available for use to the States.

One thing which is important for the public to understand is this: The Federal Government does not pay any Federal-aid road funds to the State before the State buys right-of-way for a project or constructs a highway. The State pays for the work out of its own pocket, and later is reimbursed a share of the costs by the Federal Government on Federal-aid highway projects. But you will see how the system works as we proceed in this explanation.

There are three key words at the Federal level in the process of providing Federal-aid road funds to the States. Those words are "appropriation," "apportionment," and "release."

Federal funds for highway work are appropriated by Congress. Right now those funds are totaling about \$3.8 billion a year. This money goes into the Highway Trust Fund in Washington, D.C., the fund through which all Federal aid road money is administered. Under Federal law, the Highway Trust Fund must at all times be solvent—no deficit financing is permitted.

The next step in the process is apportion-

ment of each fiscal year's Federal highway funds to the 50 States. This is done on a formula basis and is handled by the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads. Apportionment merely is the announcement of each State's share of Federal road funds for a particular fiscal year between July 1 and June 30.

Neither the appropriation of funds nor the apportionment of funds allow the States to award a single dollar of a Federal-aid highway construction contract or buy one piece of right-of-way.

The award of a contract or purchase of right-of-way for a Federal-aid job can come only after the release for obligation of the previously appropriated and apportioned Federal money. This release of the funds to States also is done by the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is the step in which the States are, in effect, told: "You may proceed to obligate Federal-aid funds for highway projects because we now can guarantee that there will be enough money in the Highway Trust Fund to reimburse you the Federal share of the cost when you present a bill for payment at a later date for completed work."

Release of a year's apportionment of funds is done on a quarterly basis during the fiscal year. If a normal procedure was being followed, this would mean the release of one-fourth of a year's money to the States on each of these dates: July 1, October 1, January 1, and April 1.

Release of the Federal money for obligation is done on a quarterly basis to insure the future solvency of the Highway Trust Fund. In other words, if a full year's apportionment was released all at once, the States would obligate so heavily against it in just a few months that the trust fund would be unable to meet all payments when bills for reimbursement on completed work were presented later. Such a situation would be in violation of the Federal law requiring the trust fund to be solvent at all times.

That sets the stage so far as background is concerned. Now let me explain what has been happening at the Federal level which is causing a curtailment in State highway construction in Missouri.

In a nutshell, it can be summed up as a delay in the release of quarterly Federal funds to the States for obligation—a delay which has lengthened in the last few months until we now are behind a full quarter, or 3 months. Each quarter for Missouri, under the present apportionment, represents about \$24,425,000.

A year ago today—or on July 1, 1964—Missouri and the other States should have received release of the first quarter funds, if things were going according to schedule. However, the release did not come until last August 20. Second quarter funds, due for release October 1, were not made available for obligation until November 16.

Although both these releases of money were some 6 weeks late, no real serious damage resulted since the delay in getting projects under contract was not particularly great.

But the situation certainly has had an effect during the first 6 months of the present calendar year.

The third quarter release of Federal funds, scheduled for January 1, did not come until March 15, or 2½ months late. And fourth quarter funds, due April 1, were not released until yesterday (June 30), a full 3 months behind schedule.

The delay in releasing the funds has been due to a shortage of money in the highway trust fund. Because of this shortage, the Secretary of Commerce has had to stretch out the release times.

You will recall that I earlier said the State highway department expected to have a construction and right-of-way program of about \$165,500,000 during calendar 1965.

July 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190008-1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18111

Since the feasibility report was completed, the committee also has received the revised benefit computation from the Corps of Engineers reflecting the flood experience of last December and January. The average annual flood benefits attributable to Dayton Dam are now \$49,500, compared with the \$42,150 used in our feasibility report.

Local administration of recreation facilities

The port district of Columbia County, Wash., has indicated its interest in assuming the responsibilities required of a local public body under section 3 of S. 1088.

Costs allocated to new purposes

The Executive recommended to the Congress allocation of costs to two relatively novel purposes: water quality and highway improvement.

The legislative basis for the first such recommendation to the Congress is found in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, and the basis for the second recommendation is to be found in the Flood Control Act of 1962.

The committee concurred with these two recommendations.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

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

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

Fe. (Dm) Mans.
OUR PURPOSE IN VIETNAM—THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT TO THE COUNTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President's statement to the press and the country of yesterday and his calm and candid answers to questions were very helpful in making clear our purposes in Vietnam. He is seeking an honorable and prompt end to that conflict, not the beginning of a new war. Whatever additional military measures he has had to take are cast in that vein. He has opened the door wide to diplomats, to the United Nations, all nations, to join in a quest for a prompt peace under honorable conditions on all sides.

As one who participated in the three discussions he had with Members of the Congress—discussions which covered approximately 6 hours within a 24-hour period—I can state that they were conducted on a give-and-take basis, that all sides were heard and all sides considered. The decision which the President arrived at was not an easy one, but was one of five options which he gave consideration to and on which he did not make up his mind until almost the last moment. I know of no President who has discussed a situation of this nature with so many people to get their viewpoints or held so many meetings with his chief advisers in the executive branch of the Government, as well as with the legislative branch. He is deeply and personally immersed in what is going on and no one worries more about the possibilities and

the potentials involved. He has had frank and candid advice which he has sought but he has arrived at his own decisions because they are, under the Constitution, his responsibility.

Mr. President, to indicate the lengths to which the President has stated publicly he will go, I ask unanimous consent that various excerpts from his press conference of yesterday be included at this point in the Record and that following them, the transcript of the President's news conference be incorporated in the Record en toto. Before this request is acted on, I would urge my colleagues and the public in general to note the nine excerpts which are taken out of the speech so that we will all have a better understanding of just how far the President is prepared to go in bringing the Vietnamese situation to an honorable conclusion through negotiations based on the Geneva accords, the proposals of the Government of North Vietnam, the use of the United Nations, representation by the Vietcong, and any other avenues which are open or can be opened. In my opinion, these are worthy of note and worthy of consideration by all who can read, who can see, and who can hear.

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

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table.

I have stated publicly and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time.

Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer. But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposals. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield. And in this pursuit we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations.

And if the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

I've directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all the resources and the energy and the immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

But we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

As I just said, I hope that every member of the United Nations that has any idea or any plan, any program, any suggestion, that they will not let them go unexplored.

And as I have said so many times, if any one questions our good faith and will ask us to meet them to try to reason this matter out, they will find us at the appointed place, the appointed time and the proper chair.

I have made very clear in my San Francisco speech my hope that the Secretary General under his wise leadership would explore every possibility that might lead to a solution of this matter. In my letter to the Secretary General this morning which Ambassador Goldberg will deliver later in the day, I reiterate my hopes and my desires and I urge upon him that he—if he agrees—that he undertake new efforts in this direction.

Ambassador Goldberg understands the challenge. We spent the weekend talking about the potentialities and the possibilities, our hopes and our dreams, and I believe that we will have an able advocate and a searching negotiator who, I would hope, could some day find success.

We have stated time and time again that we would negotiate with any government, any time, any place. The Vietcong would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides that she wants to cease aggression, and I would not think that would be an insurmountable problem at all. I think that could be worked out.

[From the New York Times, July 29, 1965]
TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

OPENING STATEMENT

South Vietnam

President JOHNSON. My fellow Americans. Not long ago, I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam. I have a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served in World War II. Our country was a war. But now, this time, it's just something that I don't understand. Why?"

Well, I've tried to answer that question dozens of times and more in practically every State in this Union. I have discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, in San Francisco in June. And let me again now discuss it here in the East Room of the White House.

Why must young Americans, born into a land exultant with hope and with golden promise, toil and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place?

The answer, like the war itself, is not an easy one. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century.

Three times in my lifetime—in two World Wars and in Korea—Americans have gone to far lands to fight for freedom. We have learned at a terrible and a brutal cost that retreat does not bring safety, and weakness does not bring peace.

And it is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam.

This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own Government.

But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Vietnam and it is spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, to defeat American power and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism.

And there are great stakes in the balance.

July 29, 1965

18112

A Vital Shield

Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves and alone, resist the growing might and the grasping ambition of Asian communism.

Our power therefore is a very vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise or in American protection.

In each land, the forces of independence would be considerably weakened, and an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would certainly imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else. Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country, and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and your present President—over 11 years have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. And we just cannot now dishonor our word, or abandon our commitment, or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow.

This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

What are our goals in that war-stained land?

First, we intend to convince the Communist that we cannot be defeated by force of arms or by superior power. They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have greatly increased their fighting forces and their attacks and the numbers of incidents.

I have asked the commanding general, General Westmoreland, what more he needs to meet this mounting aggression. He has told me. And we will meet his needs.

Increase in Strength

I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later and they will be sent as requested.

This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft call from 17,000 over a period of time to 35,000 per month and for us to step up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded that it is not essential to order Reserve units into service now. If that necessity should later be indicated, I will give the matter most careful consideration and I will give the country due and adequate notice before taking such action, but only after full preparations.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam lately the steps that will—we will take to substantially increase their own effort, both on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages. Ambassador Lodge is now formulating a new program to be tested upon his return to that area.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to the Congress to review with these committees—the appropriate congressional committees—what we plan to do in these areas. I have asked them to be able to answer the questions of any Member of Congress.

And Secretary McNamara, in addition, will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of this new cost until a supplemental measure is ready and hearings can be held when the Congress assembles in January. In the meantime, we will use the authority contained in the present defense appropriation bill under consideration to transfer funds in addition to the additional money that we will ask.

These steps, like our actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement.

We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can foresee, nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power. But we will not surrender, and we will not retreat.

For behind our American pledge lies the determination and resources, I believe, of all of the American Nation.

Ready To Negotiate

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table.

I have stated publicly and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any Government at any place at any time.

Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer. But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposals. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any Government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meetingroom no more than we fear the battlefield. And in this pursuit we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations.

And if the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

Letter to U Thant

I've directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all the resources and the energy and the immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

I made a similar request at San Francisco a few weeks ago because we do not seek the destruction of any government nor do we covet a foot of any territory. But we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government, imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have now cruelly shattered. And if the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes still guide our action. And as battle rages we will continue as best we can to help the good people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their life, to feed the hungry, and to tend the sick, and teach the young, and shelter the homeless, and help the farmer

to increase his crops, and the worker to find a job.

It is an ancient but still terrible irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of men are really united in the simple, elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

As I said in Johns Hopkins at Baltimore. I hope that one day we can help all the people of Asia toward that desire—and Eugene Black has made great progress since my appearance at Baltimore in that direction—not as the price of peace, for we are ready always to bear a more painful cost, but rather as a part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

Painful Duty

And let me also add now a personal note. I do not find it easy to send the flower of our youth, our finest young men, into battle. I have spoken to you today of the divisions and the forces and the battalions and the units, but I know them all, every one. I have seen them in a thousand streets of a hundred towns in every State in this Union—working and laughing and building and filled with hope and life. And I think I know, too, how their mothers weep and how their families sorrow.

And this is the most agonizing and the most painful duty of your President.

And there is something else, too. When I was young, poverty was so common that we didn't know it had a name. An education was something that you had to fight for, and water was really life itself. I have now been in public life for 35 years, more than three decades, and in each of those 35 years I have seen good men and wise leaders struggle to bring the blessings of this land to all of our people.

And now I am the President. It is now my opportunity to help every child get an education, to help every Negro and every American citizen have an equal opportunity, to help every family get a decent home, and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, that is what I've lived for, that's what I've wanted all my life since I was a little boy, and I do not want to see all those hopes and all those dreams of so many people for so many years now drowned in the wasteful ravages of cruel wars. And I'm going to do all I can do to see that that never happens.

But I also know, as a realistic public servant, that as long as there are men who hate and destroy we must have the courage to resist or we'll see it all—all that we have built, all that we hope to build, all of our dreams for freedom, all, all—will be swept away on the flood of conquest.

So, too, this shall not happen. We will stand in Vietnam.

Voice of America chief

Now what America is and was and hopes to stand for, as an important national asset, telling the truth to this world, telling an exciting story, is the Voice of America. I classify this assignment in the front rank of importance to the freedom of the world, and that is why today I am proud to announce to you the name of the man who will direct the Voice of America.

He is a man whose voice and whose face and whose mind is known to this country and to most of the entire world. His name is John Chancellor.

Mr. Chancellor was born 38 years ago in Chicago. For more than 15 years he has been with the news department of the National Broadcasting Co. During that time he has covered the world, in Vienna, London, Moscow, New York, Brussels, Berlin, and Washington.

Since 1964 he has been with you, one of the White House correspondents.

This, I think, is the first time in history of the Voice of America that a working

newspaperman, a respected commentator, and experienced independent reporter has been given the responsibility of leadership and direction in this vital enterprise. I think he understands the challenges that are present and the achievements that are possible. And I am satisfied that the Voice of America will be in imaginative, competent, reliable, and always truthful hands.

Stand up, John, will you, please?

Fortas to Supreme Court

The President has few responsibilities of greater importance or greater consequence to the country's future than the constitutional responsibility of nominating Justices for the Supreme Court of the United States.

I am happy today here in the East Room to announce that the distinguished American who was my first choice for the position now vacant on the Supreme Court has agreed to accept this call to this vital duty. I will very shortly, this afternoon, send to the U.S. Senate my nomination of the Honorable Abe Fortas to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

For many, many years I have regarded Mr. Fortas as one of this Nation's most able and most respected and most outstanding citizens, a scholar, a profound thinker, a lawyer of superior ability, and a man of humane and deeply compassionate feelings toward his fellow man, a champion of our liberties. That opinion is shared by the legal profession and by the bar of this country, by Members of Congress, and by the leaders of business and labor and other sectors of our national life.

Mr. Fortas has, as you know, told me on numerous occasions in the last 20 months that he would not be an applicant or a candidate or would not accept any appointment to any public office. And this is, I guess, as it should be, for in this instance the job has sought the man. Mr. Fortas agrees that the duty and the opportunity of service on the highest court of this great country is not a call that any citizen can reject.

So I am proud for the country that he has this morning accepted this appointment and will serve his country as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

I will be glad to take your questions now for a period. I'll have a little water here.

QUESTIONS

1. If Hanoi escalates

Question. Mr. President, in the light of the decisions on Vietnam which you've just announced, is the United States prepared with additional plans should North Vietnam escalate its military effort? And how do you anticipate that the Chinese Communists will react to what you've announced today?

Answer. I do not want to speculate on the reactions of other people. This Nation is prepared and will always be prepared to protect its national interests.

2. Duration of War

Question. Mr. President, you haven't talked about a timetable in connection with Vietnam. You have said and you repeated today that the United States will not be defeated, will not grow tired.

Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, went over to Vietnam in the spring and later called on you. He told White House reporters that he could imagine the war over there going on for 5, 6, or 7 years. Have you thought of that possibility, sir? And do you think the American people ought to think of that possibility?

Answer. Yes. I think the American people ought to understand that there is no quick solution to the problem that we face there. I would not want to prophesy or predict whether it would be a matter of months or years or decades. I do not know that we had any accurate timetable on how long it would take to bring victory in World War I. I don't think anyone really knew that it would be 2 years or 4 years or 6 years to meet

with success in World War II. I do think our cause is just. I do think our purposes and objectives are beyond question.

I do believe that America will stand united behind her men that are there. And I plan as long as I'm President to see that our forces are strong enough to protect our national interests and our right hand constantly protecting that interest with our military and that our diplomatic and political negotiations are constantly attempting to find some solution that would substitute words for bombs.

And as I have said so many times, if anyone questions our good faith and will ask us to meet them to try to reason this matter out, they will find us at the appointed place, the appointed time, and the proper chair.

3. Ghanaian's mission

Question. With the representative of the Government of Ghana in Hanoi now talking with the foreign minister of North Vietnam about the war in Vietnam, do you see any indication that something good will come of these talks?

Answer. We are always hopeful that every effort in that direction will meet with success. We welcome those efforts, as we welcomed the Commonwealth proposal, as we welcomed Mr. Davies's visit [Harold Davies of Britain's Labor Government] as we welcomed the Indian suggestion, as we welcomed the efforts of the distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, and others from time to time.

As I just said, I hope that every member of the United Nations that has any idea or any plan, any program, any suggestion, that they will not let them go unexplored.

4. Guns and butter

Question. Mr. President, from what you have outlined as your program for now, it would seem that you feel that we can have guns and butter for the foreseeable future. Do you have any idea right now, though, that down the road a piece the American people may have to face the problem of guns or butter?

Answer. I have not the slightest doubt but whatever it's necessary to face, the American people will face. I think that all of us know that we are now in the 52d month of the prosperity that's been unequalled in this Nation, and I see no reason for declaring a national emergency, and I rejected that course of action earlier today when I made my decision.

I cannot foresee what next year or the following year or the following year would hold. I only know that the Americans will do whatever is necessary. And at the moment we enjoy the good fortune of having an unparalleled period of prosperity with us, and this Government's going to do all it can to see it continue.

5. Missile site in north

Question. Mr. President, can you tell us whether the missile sites in North Vietnam that were bombed yesterday were manned by Russians, and whether or not the administration has a policy about Russian technicians in North Vietnam?

Answer. No, we have no information as to how they were manned. We cannot speak with any authority on that matter. We made the decision that we felt our national interest required, and as those problems present themselves we will face up to them.

6. Chiang Kai-shek's role

Question. Mr. President, sir, I wonder if you've had any communications from Chiang Kai-shek that he's ready to go to war with you.

Answer. We have communicated with most of the friendly nations of the world in the last few days, and we have received from them responses that have been encouraging. I would not want to go into any individual response here, but I would say that I have indicated to all of the

friendly nations what our problems were there, the decision that confronted us, and asked for their help and for their suggestions. Mr. Roberts.

7. Soviet confrontation

Question. Mr. President, given the Russian military involvement, or apparent involvement, on the side of Hanoi on the one side, and the dialog which Mr. Harriman has been conducting for you on the other, as well as the disarmament talks in Geneva at the moment, could you tell us whether you believe this war, as you now call it, can be contained in this corner of southeast Asia without involving a United States-Soviet confrontation?

Answer. We would hope very much that we could, and we will do nothing to provoke that confrontation that we can avoid. As you know, immediately after I assumed the Presidency, I immediately sent messages to the Soviet Union. We have had frequent exchange of views by letter and by conversation with Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Dobrynin, and we are doing nothing to provoke the Soviet Union.

We are very happy that they agreed to resume the disarmament conference. I went to some length to try to extend ourselves to make the proposals that I would hope would meet with acceptance of the peoples of the world. We would like to believe that there could be some success flow from this conference, although we haven't been too successful. I know of nothing that we have in mind that should arouse the distrust or provoke any violence on the part of the Soviet Union.

8. Reliance on Saigon

Question. Mr. President, does the fact that you're sending additional forces to Vietnam imply any change in the existing policy of relying mainly on the South Vietnamese to carry out offensive operations and using American forces to guard American installations and to act as an emergency backup?

Answer. It does not imply any change in policy whatever. It does not imply any change of objective.

9. United Nations move

Question. Mr. President, would you like to see the United Nations now move formally as an organization to attempt to achieve a settlement in Vietnam?

Answer. I have made very clear in my San Francisco speech my hope that the Secretary General under his wise leadership would explore every possibility that might lead to a solution of this matter. In my letter to the Secretary General this morning which Ambassador Goldberg will deliver later in the day, I reiterate my hopes and my desires and I urge upon him that he—if he agrees—that he undertake new efforts in this direction.

Ambassador Goldberg understands the challenge. We spent the weekend talking about the potentialities and the possibilities, our hopes and our dreams, and I believe that we will have an able advocate and a searching negotiator who, I would hope, could someday find success.

Miss Craig.

10. Presidential powers

Question. Mr. President, what are the borders of your power to conduct a war? At what point might you have to ask Congress for a declaration?

Answer. I don't know. That would depend on the circumstances. I can't pinpoint the date on the calendar or the hour or the day. I have to ask Congress for their judgments and for their decisions almost every hour of the day. One of the principal duties of the office of President is to maintain constant consultation. I have talked to, I guess, more than 50 Members of Congress in the last 24 hours. I have submitted myself to their questions and the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense will meet with them tomorrow and they're

July 29, 1965

18114

ready to answer any question that they may need.

Up to now, we have had ample authority, excellent cooperation, a united Congress behind us and—as near as I could tell from our meetings last night with the leaders and from my meetings today, with the distinguished chairmen of committees and the Members of both parties—we all met as Americans united and determined to stand as one.

11. Hatfield's remarks

Question. Mr. President, in this connection, however, last night one of the leading Governors of the Republicans said some rather strong things. Governor Hatfield, of Oregon, said the most recent escalation of action in Vietnam is moving all the people of the earth closer to World War III and we have no moral right to commit the world and especially our own people to World War III unilaterally or by the decision of a few experts. This seems to imply rather strong criticism of present policies. Do you care to express any reaction?

Answer. Yes, I don't interpret it that way. I think there are dangers in escalation. I don't think I have any right to commit the whole world to World War III. I'm doing everything I know how to avoid it. But retreat is not necessarily the best way to avoid it.

I've outlined to you what I think is the best policy. I would hope that Governor Hatfield and the other Governors, when they understand what we are doing and when I have a chance to submit myself to their questioning and to counsel with them, would share my view.

I know they have the same concern for the American people and the people of the world as I do. And I don't believe our objectives will be very different.

As a matter of fact, I asked the Governors, if they could, to come here at the conclusion of their deliberations and I will ask them—I will have my plane go to Minneapolis tomorrow—and I believe 43 of the 48 have indicated a desire to come here.

I will give them all the information I can—confidential, secret, and otherwise—because I have great respect for them and their judgment, their opinions, and their leadership. And it's going to be necessary in this effort. I will also have the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense review with them all their plans and answer any of their inquiries and we hope resolve any doubts they might have. Miss Nancy.

12. Personal feelings

Question. Mr. President, after the week of deliberations on Vietnam, how do you feel—in the context of your office? We always hear it's the loneliest in the world.

Answer. Nancy, I'm sorry, but the camera and the microphone—I didn't get your question. Raise the microphone up where I can hear, and you camera boys give her a chance.

Question. Mr. President, I say, after the week of deliberations on Vietnam, how do you feel personally? Particularly in the context that we always hear, that your office is the loneliest in the world.

Answer. Well, I don't agree with that. I don't guess there's anyone in this country that has as much understanding and as much help and as many experts and as good advice—many people of both parties trying to help him as they are me. Of course, I admit I need it more than anybody else.

Question. Mr. President, would you be willing to—

Answer. Nancy, I haven't been alone in the last few days. I've had lots of callers.

13. Talks with Vietcong

Question. Mr. President, would you be willing to permit direct negotiations with the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam?

Answer. We have stated time and time again that we would negotiate with any

Government, any time, any place. The Vietcong would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides that she wants to cease aggression, and I would not think that would be an insurmountable problem at all. I think that could be worked out.

14. Gardner appointment

Question. Mr. President, to shift the subject just a moment. Does your appointment of Mr. Gardner suggest that there will be less interest now in the creation of a separate Department of Education?

Answer. No, not at all. My appointment of Mr. Gardner suggests that I looked over America to find the very best man that I could to lead us forward to become an educated Nation where every child obtains all the education that he can take, and where the health of every citizen is his prime concern, and where the social security system is brought into needs with the 20th century.

And after canvassing some 40 or 50 possibilities, I concluded that Mr. Gardner was the best man I could get, and I asked his board to relieve him of his duties and release him to the Government so that he could furnish the dynamic leadership officially that he has been furnishing unofficially to us. And he told me yesterday morning that he was prepared to do that. And I remembered that I hadn't asked him what State he lived in, where his permanent residence was, so I could put it on the nomination paper, or what party he belonged to. And he rather—well, maybe somewhat hesitatingly said, "I'm a Republican."

I don't mean that his hesitating meant any particular significance.

But I was happy that he said that, because a good many Republicans voted for me, and I don't want to be partial or partisan in this administration. And I like to see leadership of that kind come from the Republican ranks, and so I told him that if he had no objection I would announce very promptly his appointment, and I hoped that he would give us American leadership without regard to party, and that's what I think he will do, and I believe all the Nation will be proud of him, as we are of Secretary Celebrezze.

Question. Thank you Mr. President.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. To the extent that I may be permitted to say so, as a member of the minority, I join the leader of the majority party in the Senate in the statement which he has made. The painful and tragic decision made by President Eisenhower was one that was inevitable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Speaking for the American people, the President had no other choice. As I said in the Senate a few weeks ago, the cause of freedom in the world is in danger.

The people in the Government of the United States have a responsibility for the cause of freedom. Cringing in the face of danger, retreat before the Red menace facing South Vietnam will not bring peace with honor.

There are two ways of life on this globe: First, the way of freedom as we know it; the other, as practiced by communism and, in this instance, fanat-

ical, implacable Asiatic communism. In time of danger the American people rally behind their President. This is such a time.

The hour is late, but the door to peaceful discussion remains open, as the Chief Executive made very clear, once again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the senior Senator from California, the assistant minority leader.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say, in support of the statement of the majority leader, that in spite of the fact that the President has called for 50,000 more troops in South Vietnam at this time, his statement of yesterday was the most encouraging and the farthest step toward peace, if the rest of the world wants peace, that we have had up to date when he stated that we were willing to sit down at the table, even with Hanoi, to discuss means of settling the southeast Asia situation.

That was a very long step toward going at least halfway, and probably a little more than halfway. As I see it, much now depends upon the United Nations. The United Nations has an opportunity to demonstrate whether it is an effective agency to bring about peace and to maintain peace in the world.

I am optimistic over the appointment of Arthur Goldberg as our Ambassador to the United Nations. But whether peace or war comes is largely a question which is up to the Communist countries, particularly Russia, to answer. If Russia desires peace, President Johnson has indicated that we will meet them halfway.

There are two countries—the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—that can restore and maintain peace in the world if they so desire. I would warn, however, that we cannot expect peace to come overnight or reassurance of peace to come overnight. It is necessary to save face. There is the matter of national honor, or call it what one will. I do not know how national honor would be served by having several hundred million dead people in the world, or what it would be worth to us afterward; but we cannot expect the nations most seriously involved to back away from their positions overnight. It will have to be an inching operation, possibly. If Russia is unwilling to attempt to settle this matter, she must bear the major part of the responsibility if a greater war should come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I join in the remarks of the majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

There has been considerable talk about the failure of the President attempting, at a peace table, to bring to an end the violence that now exists in South Viet-

July 29, 1965

18115

nam. An examination of the record will disclose that President Johnson has repeatedly and strenuously attempted to bring about an understanding that would end the violence. It began in 1962 with the creation of the Laos accord. The U.S. Government yielded and agreed to create a three-headed government in Laos. That yielding was prompted by the desire to restore peace in southeast Asia.

However, instead of the accord working as anticipated by the devotees in the free world, the Laotian border, on the eastern side, has been used as the means of transporting equipment and troops into South Vietnam.

Since 1962, repeated evidences have appeared concerning the efforts of President Kennedy and President Johnson to bring about an understanding. I shall not mention them all, but I shall mention a few.

We used other states as a medium of contacting Hanoi and Russia to bring about an understanding. We used U Thant, of the United Nations. Hanoi refused even to listen to us and did not grant him an audience.

We used the Cambridge speech made by the President a short time ago. The Commonwealth Nations of Great Britain assembled a delegation which was sent to Hanoi to attempt to reach an understanding. That delegation was not granted an audience.

I concur completely in the statement of the Senator from Vermont. We have gone beyond the half way mark. We have yielded to the point where some people can justify saying that we have gone too far.

I have the deepest compassion for the President with respect to the decision he had to make. It was not an easy one. The Nation was listening with avid ears to what he would say upon the subject.

But there are times when cold reality demands courageous action, action that is reflective of what needs to be done to preserve the Nation and to guard against future unlimited loss of life.

I listened to the President's talk yesterday. I could not help having the deepest sympathy for him in the burden he had to carry. But a realistic study of the facts leads me to believe that there was no other course for him to follow. It was painful for him to say to the youth of the country, "I am calling upon an increased number of young men to join in the national defense"; but that was all he could do.

I commend the Senator from Montana for his statement. I join other Senators who have spoken in the utterance of a judgment that may seem heavy to the people of the country; but it is the only judgment that is available at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join the majority leader and other Senators who have spoken on the President's statement of yesterday.

I reiterate one point made by the majority leader: For the first time, the President said that we will negotiate, we will discuss, we will deal with the

North Vietnamese on their terms—I repeat on their terms—not ours, thanks.

As the majority leader indicated, "their terms" means that the Vietcong may be brought in. We are not necessarily agreeing that the Vietcong be given status; but we are willing to discuss the situation with them, as the President has said, at any time, anywhere, and unconditionally.

However, at this point, one other element of the President's speech should be stressed. Grim and difficult as it may be for many Senators to accept the situation, it seems to me that if peace with the Communists is to be achieved, it is necessary not only to speak soft words but also to carry a big stick. It is necessary to make the kind of commitment in force that will prove that the President means it when he says that we will fight if we have to, however long it may take to fulfill whatever commitment the United States must make. Only this kind of concrete action will really convince the Communists that the losses they will suffer—the economic devastation—if they persist in this aggression—will not be worth while. Only this really makes negotiations and peace sensible to them.

The big stick was there.

The President has shown that he means business by saying that he will double our troop commitments and double the draft calls. This is just as necessary an element in achieving peace, in my judgment, as the constructive and positive elements of the President's excellent speech.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in saying a word about the message of the President yesterday.

I addressed myself briefly to this subject yesterday, and my remarks today are made upon reflection. Laying aside the tremendous value to be gained from congressional consideration of what is being done—which I believe would result in a real crystallization of sentiment behind the President and behind the basic objectives of our country in South Vietnam which are now very clearly shown to be modest and restrained, and without in any way repeating what has already been magnificently said—I wish very much to associate myself with the point made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] that if the Russians willed it, they and the United States could see that peace was brought to Vietnam through the assistance of NATO countries and other organizations of which we are a member.

I agree thoroughly with the point raised by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] that the statement of the President is a great step forward. It demonstrates our willingness to negotiate even upon the proposals put forth by Hanoi and, as the Secretary of State had already made clear, to proceed to negotiate even if the Vietcong are represented in the North Vietnamese delegation.

I should like to add to all of those points, with which I thoroughly agree, and to the backing of the President es-

entially, with which I also thoroughly agree, that we must constantly appraise the military feasibility of our presence in South Vietnam. I do not wish to see the United States get itself involved in another Dien Bien Phu.

It is for that reason that I believe the President of the United States acted very wisely when he used such restraint in limiting the amount of force to be used in the struggle to the amount of force required, instead of endeavoring to employ overwhelming force.

I am sure that the President had two contrary courses open to him: to take the restrained and modest action which he did take or, on the other hand, to use a vastly increased force of equipment and men in an effort to overwhelm the Vietcong with the determination of the United States to win this struggle, to declare a state of national emergency and to call up the reservists.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President made one determination very clear; at the same time, he demonstrated our willingness to negotiate and buttressed his statement of willingness by stressing the use of the United Nations and our readiness to negotiate even upon the proposals of Hanoi.

I believe that the President has stated a most wise course in this respect. However, I still hope that we may have the opportunity for a definitive debate which would marshal the country behind a moderate and reasonable American policy.

I hope very much that the President will take comfort in the fact that this moderate and reasonable policy is the right approach, as evidenced by the fine reception which his statement to the country has received, and by the support of myself and many others who have from time to time asked questions and expressed serious doubts concerning the policies being pursued.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE MEMORIALIZING OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED REAPPORTIONMENT CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing Congress and the State legislatures to oppose efforts being made to amend the Constitution with respect to the apportionment of legislatures.

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

18116

NEW YORK SENATE RESOLUTION 168

(Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of all the States to oppose efforts which are being made to promote an amendment to the constitution which would permit one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than equal treatment of citizens or residents)

Whereas efforts are being made in the legislatures of the several States and in the Congress of the United States to promote an amendment to the Constitution which would permit one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than equal treatment of citizens or residents; and

Whereas such an amendment would partially nullify the historic and salutary decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that people must be given equal privileges of representation regardless of their place of residence, by permitting an unrepresentative house to veto the actions of a more representative house; and

Whereas the unequal representation of States in the U.S. Senate is not pertinent in this connection because the States were sovereign and independent entities whose equal representation was naturally demanded and necessary in order to create a Federal union and there is no such sovereign status in the districts of a State legislature; and

Whereas there are at least as many special interests requiring representation in proportion to population in the thickly settled areas of the States as in the sparsely settled areas; and

Whereas the principle of majority rule requires that districts with a minority of the people of a State should not be able to out-vote in a legislative body districts with a substantially greater number of people, as has often happened in this and other States and will happen again if the proposed amendment should prevail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislature of the State of New York strongly opposes the proposed amendment and supports the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring equal treatment of a State's people in its representative bodies as a fundamental bulwark of democratic self-government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governors and the majority and minority leaders of the legislative bodies of all the States and to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

By order of the senate,

GEORGE VAN LINGEN,
 Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY WESTERN GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE RELATIVE TO WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a number of resolutions passed at the Western States Governors' Conference held recently in Portland, Oreg., contained recommendations for action by the Congress. Among the important subjects which were discussed and upon which the assembled Governors offered counsel were oil shale leasing, public lands administration, minerals taxation, import controls to protect domestic resources industries, and others. I assure our Western Governors that we in the Congress will heed the words they have written.

To my mind, however, far the most significant resolution passed was their

first one, which was unanimously adopted, and which established and financed a Western States Water Council, with a permanent staff and central office, to effect cooperation among the Western States in integrating water resource development.

The resolution recognizes that the water problems of one State or one area of the West are the water problems of all Western States and areas, and that full integration may require the removal of water from areas of water surpluses to areas of water deficiencies. The resolution, of course, recognizes the rights of upstream users of water which originate in their area, or which flow through it, and these rights must be safeguarded. But the approach is realistic and practical in the resolution. It serves no purpose to have water wasting away in one part of the West while communities and farms are withering up in another part for want of that water. The West can prosper most, and best, if it prospers together.

I ask unanimous consent that this history-making resolution establishing the Western States Water Council be printed in the RECORD.

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

WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, PORTLAND, OREG., JUNE 10-13, 1965

WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL

Whereas the future growth and prosperity of the Western States depend upon the availability of adequate quantities of water of suitable quality; and

Whereas the need for accurate and unbiased appraisal of present and future requirements of each area of the West and for the most equitable means of providing for the meeting of such requirements demands a regional effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the western Governors' conference, That it approves the creation of a Western States Water Council to be established in general conformity with the organizational pattern of the attached suggested rules of organization developed by the Western Water Resources Task Force appointed by the members of this conference; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this conference will take all feasible steps to provide the support to give effective meaning to the creation of such a council, including the establishment, upon recommendation of the council, of a staff and central office to be financed in an amount not to exceed the sum of \$150,000 for the first year from appropriations by each of the member States equally.

SUGGESTED RULES OF ORGANIZATION
 WESTERN STATES WATER COUNCIL

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of this organization shall be "The Western States Water Council."

ARTICLE II—PURPOSE

To accomplish effective cooperation among Western States in planning for programs leading to integrated development of their water resources.

ARTICLE III—PRINCIPLES

Except as otherwise provided by existing compacts, the planning of western water resources development on a regional basis will be predicated upon the following principles for protection of States of origin:

1. All water-related needs of the States of origin, including but not limited to irrigation, municipal and industrial water, flood

control, power, navigation, recreation, water quality control, and fish and wildlife preservation and enhancement shall be considered in formulating the plan.

2. The rights of States to water derived from interbasin transfers shall be subordinate to needs within the States of origin.

3. The cost of water development to the States of origin shall not be greater than would have been the case had there never been an export from those States under any such plan.

ARTICLE IV—FUNCTIONS

1. Encourage large-scale, comprehensive planning for regional water development by State, Federal and other appropriate agencies.

2. In the formulation of plans for regional development of water resources, criteria be prepared to protect and further State and local interests.

3. Undertake continuing review of all large-scale interstate and interbasin plans and projects for development, control or utilization of water resources in the Western States and submit recommendations to the Governors regarding the compatibility of such projects and plans with an orderly and optimum development of water resources in the Western States.

ARTICLE V—MEMBERSHIP

1. The membership of the council shall consist of not more than three representatives of each of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the respective Governors. The States of Alaska and Hawaii shall be added to membership if their respective Governors so request.

2. Member States may name alternate representatives for any meeting.

3. Any State may withdraw from membership upon written notice by its Governor.

ARTICLE VI—EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

The Governors of the member States shall be ex officio members and shall be in addition to the regularly appointed members from each State.

ARTICLE VII—OFFICERS

The officers of the council shall be the chairman, vice chairman, and secretary-treasurer. They shall be selected in the manner provided in article VIII.

ARTICLE VIII—SELECTION OF OFFICERS

The chairman and vice chairman, who shall be from different States, shall be elected from the council by a majority vote at a regular meeting to be held in July of each year. The secretary-treasurer shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the chairman and need not be a member of the council. The chairman and vice chairman shall serve a 1-year term but shall be eligible for reelection.

ARTICLE IX—VOTING

Each State represented at a meeting of the council shall have one vote. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the member States. No matter may be brought before the council for a vote unless advance notice of such matter has been mailed to each member of the council at least 30 days prior to the meeting at which such matter is to be considered; provided, that matters may be placed on the agenda at any meeting by unanimous agreement of those States represented at the meeting. In any matter put before the council for a vote, other than election of officers, any member State may upon request obtain one automatic delay in the voting until the next meeting of the council. Further delays in voting on such matter may be obtained only by majority vote. No recommendation may be issued or external position taken by the council unless by unanimous vote of all member States, except, however, on all

July 29, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18117

internal matters action may be taken by majority vote.

ARTICLE X—CONDUCT OF MEETINGS

Except as otherwise provided herein, meetings shall be conducted under Roberts Rules of Order, Revised.

ARTICLE XI—MEETINGS

The council shall have one regular meeting each year in the month of July at a time and place to be decided by the chairman. Special meetings may be called by the chairman or by a majority of the member States upon 30 days' written notice.

ARTICLE XII—LIMITATIONS

The work of the council shall in no way defer or delay authorization or construction of any projects now before Congress for either authorization or appropriation.

ARTICLE XIII—AMENDMENT

These articles may be amended at any meeting of the council by unanimous vote of the member States represented at the meeting. The substance of the proposed amendment shall be included in the call of such meeting.

SHOWING OF FILM "AFRICA TODAY" ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1965

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that I made an extensive trip of Africa during 1962. I took about 7,500 feet of film on that trip.

From that film I produced a full reel entitled "Africa Today." I have shown this film on several occasions in the Senate auditorium. I have been asked by quite a few Senators and others to have another showing.

So I have decided to show "Africa Today" in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on Thursday, August 5, at 2:30 p.m. for one showing, and at 7 p.m. for another showing. I am hopeful that Senators who wish to see the film will take this opportunity to do so.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday I listened with keen interest to the remarks of the President of the United States at his press conference with respect to the unhappy situation in Vietnam. I have not made any comment on the President's address. I do not intend to do so for the time being, other than to ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "This Is Really War," which appeared in today's New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and to indicate my general approval of the point of view expressed in the editorial.

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

THIS IS REALLY WAR

The President's measured speech to the Nation yesterday could leave no doubt about the seriousness of the situation in which this country finds itself today in respect to the war in Vietnam.

The United States is now fighting a land war in Asia—a limited one so far but nevertheless a war on the Asiatic Continent. It is a war to which more men, materiel, and money must daily be committed—not to achieve an evanescent victory but to prevent further deterioration in the American mili-

tary position. It is a war in the jungles of Asia against an ever-growing and well-trained guerrilla force that is fighting in its own kind of country among its own people to overthrow a government, of no popular standing or strength, with which the United States is allied.

It is a war the primary goal of which now—so far as the United States is concerned—is to convince the Communists that they cannot achieve their aims in Vietnam by force of arms. And it is a war which, as both the President and Ho Chi Minh have indicated, could go on for months, years, or decades.

Despite the deep difficulties of the present and the tremendous implications for the future, few Americans will quarrel with President Johnson's determined conclusion to hold on in Vietnam. This is quite different from saying we will bring the other side to its knees.

The President is now encouraging Ambassador Goldberg to see what the United Nations or any member country can do to bring about negotiations. It is vital to keep open the door to a parley, and Mr. Johnson specifically mentioned his willingness to discuss Hanoi's own proposals. The possibilities of utilizing the 1954 Geneva Agreement need further exploration, as the President again indicated. However, it should be recognized that the breakdown of the 1954 treaty was as much the fault of Saigon and Washington as it was of Hanoi.

But—no doubt because of the deteriorating military situation which President Johnson has just taken steps to arrest—the Communists in recent months have shown no indication whatsoever of a willingness to negotiate. Therefore, the problem that faces the President and the American people today is to convince the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists that, as Mr. Johnson said, "a violent solution is impossible." This goes for both sides. The Government of the United States knows this and publicly recognizes it, and is ready "to move from the battlefield to the conference table" without preconditions.

The President made it very clear yesterday that he intends a controlled and severely limited operation on the part of the United States; and this is as important a point as could be made. It is fruitless at this stage to argue over errors of past policy, going back to 1954 and even further beyond. What is vital is that this war of the United States in Vietnam be held down to the absolute minimum necessary to prove to Hanoi and Peking that military aggression is not worth while and never will be.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that in the conduct of the war in the months ahead every effort will be made to minimize American casualties without in any way weakening our position in defending those parts of Vietnam which are controlled by ourselves and our allies in Saigon.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS BEFORE NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on July 27, at Minneapolis, Minn., at the National Governors Conference, the Vice President of the United States delivered a fine address, which I believe should be called to the attention of my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the address may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JULY 27, 1965

Our Government, over these past few days, has been reaching important decisions.

Such decisions challenge us. They test our fiber.

We face adversaries who are tenacious and strong and arrogant.

We face a new and sophisticated assault—an assault from an enemy organized in detail, trained in depth, skilled in a kind of warfare we Americans have only begun to understand.

South Vietnam is the testing ground for the so-called war of national liberation—a contest in which totalitarians believe they can defeat the forces of the most advanced of all democratic nations. In South Vietnam our adversaries seek to demonstrate decisively that arrogant militancy—and not peaceful coexistence—is the path to follow.

But, great as it is, the challenge we face today in Vietnam is only one of many challenges which confront us.

We no longer live safe in our continental refuge. There is no place to hide. There is no security in isolation.

While our Nation enjoys the greatest prosperity in history, and possesses unequalled power, we also live in mounting danger and uncertainty.

The world is filled with disorder, violent change, yes, revolution.

We must face the fact that there are modern weapons which can destroy the civilized world in a half-hour's time.

We must face the fact that two-thirds of the world is poor, hungry, and sick, and the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations widens each year. These restless, poor and yet proud people demand by whatever means, something better. This two-thirds of the world is the target for those who promise quick and easy solutions to old and complex problems.

The globe is exploding with people.

We are engulfed in great waves of scientific and technological change which we do not fully understand and which can overcome us or save us.

We must master science and technology so that it may serve man.

We must learn the techniques of defeating the new tactics of aggression.

But we must also learn this truth: The mere existence of deep poverty in the world is not only unjust—it is an invitation to freedom's destruction.

And we must realize that this gigantic task of helping others to help themselves, of resisting aggression and protecting freedom can only be sustained if America, the leader of free nations, is powerful and united.

Today in southeast Asia, and elsewhere, we carry burdens. They require great allocation of our resources to national security and defense.

Nevertheless, even should these burdens grow heavier, we must still devote ourselves to building a better society here at home.

For our wealthy Nation has resources for both defense and social justice, for national security and domestic well-being.

Today we face no choice between guns and schools, ammunition and medical care.

We face instead long-term, continuing necessities on many fronts—necessities which are within our power to meet.

For the only way we Americans will be able to carry out world burdens in the years ahead will be by creating today a strong, healthy and cohesive society.

We know there are great tasks ahead in our own country.

In 5 years, 211 million people will live here. Half of them will be under age 25. Within 10 years we will need—each year—over 2 million new homes, welfare and health facilities for 5 million more people over age 65, trans-

18118

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 29, 1965

portation systems to move goods and people, fresh air and light and open space.

United we can size the future and shape it for the good of man. Divided we will become the future's victim.

I have seen the great American space launchings at Cape Kennedy. I have seen Americans working together there—scientists and technicians, military officers, men from our universities, the giant prime contractors, the smaller subcontractors, officials of Government, business, labor, and medicine.

I have seen these people—not defending their separate sovereignties but contributing to a partnership, a common cause, for the benefit of this Nation and all people. I have seen them there—dedicated to excellence and success.

To see Cape Kennedy is to know what men can do.

It is a great lesson for our time.

That same dedication and unity of effort that have vaulted us into the far reaches of space must be applied throughout all our society.

We can no longer afford the debility of disunity. We can no longer tolerate the cancers of hate and discrimination.

We must no longer divide ourselves by emotional appeals and labels—northerner, southerner, labor boss, economic royalist.

In interdependence is the new dimension of international security, it is even more so a fact and requirement of domestic strength.

Today there are those who take for granted our role as leader of the free world—just as some take for granted our democratic American heritage. But I ask you to consider that role.

The mantle of leadership is not a cloak of comfort, but rather the robe of responsibility.

Leadership does not permit a person or a nation license or luxury.

Leadership imposes responsibility and affords few privileges.

Today, to deserve and insure that leadership, we must build a nation of men and women able to fulfill the hopes of those who came before us and to lay the groundwork for the yet-unborn generation to follow us.

Today the world asks: What is the nature of today's America?—this American being tested as never before.

I see today's American as the same restless, adventurous, citizen as his forebears.

I see this fellow American as the son or daughter of a rich Nation and yet a person of conscience, with a deep concern for the fate of his fellowman.

I see him as one who has defeated the enemies of freedom, yet extends the hand of friendship and cooperation to build a new and better world community.

I see today's American surrounded by materialism, yet questioning its value. Impatient with things as they are, but not impetuous in remedy or judgment. Generous but not patronizing. Motivated by ideal, but satisfied only with accomplishment. Strong, but not belligerent. Willing to debate, but able to decide.

And the American of this generation believes that the world need not destroy itself by war. He knows that the pursuit of peace is an act of courage and that resisting aggression is the duty of free men.

Perhaps the qualities I see in today's American are those I wish to see. For these are the qualities that must strengthen our people in a time of trouble and danger.

But I believe my thinking is not wishful. For today in America we are increasingly agreed upon common goals, in our States, in our cities, in our country.

Today in our society we increasingly recognize that what we do today will make tomorrow.

Together, as Americans, we are forging a society of strength and justice and opportunity. And, despite those who would turn us in other directions, we must move ahead in our determination.

That all Americans will have an education which can give them opportunity to lift themselves.

That all Americans will have an equal right to vote.

That older Americans will have adequate medical care.

That we can make our cities better places in which to live and work in safety and health.

That we should preserve this Nation's beauty, history and natural resources.

That we must give the aging, poor and by-passed hope for life and work.

That we should open our doors again to immigrants who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life.

That we should help others too in less-fortunate places to find a better life.

That we shall defend our Nation, and those who seek freedom, against attack.

That we shall not drop the torch of international leadership.

We will need patience, perseverance, inner strength to meet the forces moving through the world, to preserve the peace above all, in the words of our President, "to press forward, not for our gain and our greatness alone, but rather for the gain and the good of all mankind."

I believe we Americans will prove equal to the hard tasks ahead.

We shall pursue, with resolution, the restoration of peace in southeast Asia. We shall prove to the aggressors that the cost of aggression comes too high and that they must leave their neighbors alone. We shall once again demonstrate by unequivocal action and deed that force of arms will not drive freedom from the field.

And, make no mistake about it, if aggression succeeds in one part of this world, it will quickly follow elsewhere. If we fail to stand today, we shall have to stand tomorrow.

We shall uphold freedom's cause wherever that cause is threatened—in another corner of the world or even in a darkened corner of our own country.

I believe that Americans will not only embrace, but lead, the real revolution of our times—the revolution which took flame from our own in America—the revolution toward opportunity, human dignity, self-determination and self-respect for each child entering life.

We are the progenitors of this world revolution of emancipation and liberty. It is our obligation. In our strength and wealth, to give it continued life.

We are the defenders and the advocates of that immortal and continuing commitment to all mankind:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

We cannot stand aside and let totalitarians seize and distort to their own diabolical purpose the hopes and aspirations of the needy, the poor, the weak.

We can and we will make the promise of America come true: One nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

We must, with strong and active faith, move forward. If we do, I believe that, in the end, history will say that this was a time when man's free spirit came under mortal threat, and man prevailed.

ACTION ON THE HOME FRONT—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. PRICE, M.D., DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have for many years been convinced that governmental action as well as private and civic

action in the area of population control was required if we are to leave our children and grandchildren a country, and indeed a globe, which they can inhabit.

I ask unanimous consent that a speech entitled "Action on the Home Front," delivered by David E. Price, Deputy Surgeon General, presented to the Symposium of Population Growth and Birth Control at Boston University on April 23, 1965, may be printed in the *Record* at this point in my remarks.

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

ACTION ON THE HOME FRONT

(By David E. Price, M.D., Deputy Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, presented to the Symposium of Population Growth and Birth Control, Boston University, Boston, Mass., Apr. 23, 1965)

I welcome the opportunity provided by this Symposium on Population Growth and Birth Control to discuss the domestic activities of Government in this field.

Tracing the events that lead to Federal action back to their early beginnings—or, more exactly, attempting to trace them—is almost certainly a futile, but nevertheless a fascinating, exercise. Somewhere, sometime, of course, one first person has to have recognized an existing or impending problem and to have suggested, in broad terms at least, the remedy that eventually will be adopted. Typically, he will find few followers and a notable lag phase occurs.

But if the problem is real and the remedy a sound one in the context of the knowledge of the times, it is bound to occur to others in due course. The discussion widens—gradually at first, and then rapidly—and in the process two purposes are served. Definitions of the problem and of methods for dealing with it are refined and updated, and the public is informed of the issues.

Since we are a democracy, and since the powers of our Government are derived from the consent of the governed, it follows that considerable public discussion and agreement on the need for action, and on the feasibility of the action, must occur before a governmental program can be effective. Unless there is something approaching a consensus before a program is initiated, and unless a consensus is maintained thereafter, that program is not likely to have a long life. As an example, I give you prohibition.

Population problems have usually been seen from two separate viewpoints. One sees the problem of total population in relation to natural resources and the state of technology—an economic viewpoint. The other considers the problems of individuals, whether the total population is expanding or not—I'll call it a humanitarian approach. It has taken some time for these separate schools to make common cause.

The economic viewpoint, the recognition of the problems to be created by limited natural resources in relation to an expanding population, is usually traced back to Thomas Robert Malthus, although (and here I take Lord Keynes as my authority) the principal point had been largely made by several earlier 18th century writers, but without creating any particular stir. It was not an argument to impress this country during the 19th and early 20th centuries, especially since it appeared to have been refuted, for all practical purposes, by the industrial revolution.

Our natural resources seemed inexhaustible. American communities competed with each other for population and boasted of their successes. Rapid growth of population was considered to be synonymous with prosperity. And of course it was, at least for some.

July 29, 1965

18121

dent-elect Edward W. Kuhn of the ABA, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach and other law leaders proclaimed the first World Law Day ever to be held saying:

"The foundation for the peace of mankind within and among nations is a system of law and legal institutions. * * * We seek to assure substance for the dream of a world that is ruled by law * * * this year, in September, the leaders of the law of many nations will assemble here in Washington * * * they will confer on this most vital and most basic subject of strengthening the hope for world peace by strengthening the rule of law among nations of the world. And so to honor this significant occasion, I am today proclaiming September 13, 1965, as World Law Day."

President Johnson is right in his assessment of the importance of the great World Law Conference that is to take place in Washington, D.C., this September 12-18, 1965. It will be a truly unique peace gathering and a major milestone along the ever more discernible road to a world ruled by law. Two thousand leading judges, lawyers and law professors from over 100 nations will sit down together to consider and adopt a program of research, education and cooperation designed to give increased momentum to the growing initiative to make law and courts a major factor in world affairs. The greatest men of the law from all over the world will take part. Concrete steps will be considered and adopted to translate man's age-old ideal of a world ruled by law from dream into reality. A world law code, a world court system, as well as numerous other law rules and legal institutions are being formulated. They will not be presented as a finished product at the conference for it will take years of concentrated effort to accomplish this. But my story is that this work is in fact underway and the Washington conference will give impetus to these essential tasks.

All nations have a law system and a court system—be it weak or strong, usual or unusual by our standards, decreed by one man or adopted by a democratically elected legislature. Law is the foundation of society and civilization. History teaches that in nation after nation law has replaced force as the controlling factor among each nation's peoples. A handy example is shown daily on TV where "the law" replaces the six-gun in western movies. A program whereby the law replaces atomic bombs is a must if nuclear holocaust is to be prevented. That the task is difficult, should not be a deterrent to a generation that has split the atom, put a man into space and will soon put a man on Mars and the Moon.

From the four corners of the globe, speaking all languages, belonging to all creeds or none, living under all political systems, those attending the Washington world conference will be the greatest international assemblage of high court judges, practicing lawyers, Government lawyers and teachers of law in the history of mankind.

Headed by the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, and the Chief Justice of the World Court (International Court of Justice), Sir Percy Spender, the array of legal talent thus generated has never been exceeded. Because of the prestige, learning and capacity of the participants, the actions of the Conference should make a tremendous impact on the ever-accelerating program for world peace through law.

The Conference is private and financed from private sources such as foundations and corporations, but chiefly by law firms and individual lawyers. These contributions now add up to more than \$400,000. In amount they range from \$5 to over \$1,000 and more are being received daily from all over the world as contributions from lawyers in any amount are most welcome. The more money we have the better job we can do. If you are wondering whether I am asking you for money, I am.

These Conference documents demonstrate that the 8-year-old research program designed to collect the basic information needed for the work program to strengthen the world's law and judicial institutions has been largely successful. Concrete facts and results are thus available to undergird this program and to assure its future progress. The facts contained in these documents also record the ever-growing worldwide dialog on improvements and reforms in the field of law. From the report on newly developing Afghanistan and its new constitution to England's current drive to update its ancient criminal law and our own dramatic advances in the field of civil rights and individual liberties. In fact, in many nations including Russia the major reform in law is more protection and rights for the individual. And the major reform in international law is the new trend toward providing protections and liberties for the individual under the new world law rules and in the new international courts and legal institutions now coming into being. For centuries international law and courts related to and were largely confined to nations and the new trend is most meaningful in its obvious importance. This new status under world law for the individual accounts in no small measure for the new and growing interest and support which are making international law a major factor in world affairs.

The Conference documents to the non-lawyer are a fascinating panorama of a little known part of civilization for today; as in the past, law and courts remain mysterious to most of the world's nonlawyers. These studies further prove that everywhere law is taken for granted like the air we breathe, or the water we drink, and that it is a new idea to consider that law can indeed grow and be expanded through concentrated research as did science in splitting the atom and conquering space. Science has proved that growth progress flows directly from the concentration of sufficient manpower, brainpower, and money. And public support for a research and development program in law, similar to that of the past 20 years in science, is a major part of the picture before the legal profession at this great World Conference. These Conference law studies prove that just as the world's peoples slowly awakened to the benefits to them from expanded scientific development and then wholeheartedly backed that expansion, so too are the world's peoples slowly but surely awakening to the promise and potential of a peaceful world ruled by law.

The collection of information in the Conference documents is not only more comprehensive in scope but it is also unique. No such overall compilation on the law and courts in the world—both nationally and internationally—has ever been done before as the basis of work by such an international law Conference. In past Conferences there has been a separation of national and international law without full realization of the fact that a strong international law system must be based upon strong national law systems and that the two go hand in hand. This law Conference will thus have the best broad overview of the world's law and courts ever put together to serve as a foundation for their effort. And because they will have the whole picture they will be able to work better on its weaknesses and gaps. Further, the volume entitled "Law and Judicial Systems of the World—Lawyer and Law School Directory" will also serve as a fund of information whereby the delegates may know what law exists in other nations, and how their own law systems compare. The directory will enable continuous contacts with each other for further information. This sharing of the law heritage of the world is bound to help improve the law of all nations as well as international law.

That this new private initiative is effective worldwide is shown by the attention

governments are giving to it. As in the case of President Johnson, heads of State, Governors, and mayors all over the world are proclaiming World Law Day and encouraging their lawyers and judges to attend the World Conference. Local exhibits of law codes and other law instruments are also being planned throughout the world on World Law Day.

This Conference is one of those great moments in history when men of good will gather to advance the cause of world peace. These men and women of the law will have no trouble understanding each other. They speak a common language. The language found in universal principles of the law. But sessions of the Conference will be simultaneously translated into French, Spanish and English. All books, work papers and other documents will also be in these three languages. But special arrangements for Russian, Japanese, Chinese and other languages have been made through use as interpreters of foreign law students from abroad now studying in the United States who will serve as aids to the distinguished visitors.

As we of the law counsel together on specific steps to fulfill the law's historic mission of assuring peace within and among nations, we will, however, have more aids going for us than ever existed before. We will have more information on national and international law, more ways of understanding each other, and more preparation work than ever yet done on a world law conference.

The delegates will have 4 basic documents before them to assist them in their work: (1) a workbook of 300 pages summarizing existing international law and international judicial institutions; (2) a summary of existing national law, and national judicial institutions in 103 nations plus a lawyer, law school, and judicial directory covering judicial and law leaders of these 103 nations; (3) a special work paper giving more detail than is contained in the workbook by one of the world's leading experts on each subject to be covered in 12 work sessions; and (4) the first volume of a world law code containing the treaties of most effectiveness on a worldwide basis.

The subjects to be covered by the 12 work sessions are: (1) increasing use and usefulness of the World Court; (2) creation and jurisdiction of regional, trial and specialized courts; (3) existing and proposed international arbitration tribunals; (4) international law in domestic courts; (5) international and satellite communications; (6) law guarantees for foreign investments; (7) space law; (8) laws affecting human rights; (9) international judicial cooperation; (10) disarmament law; (11) protection of patents and copyrights; and (12) law problems of multinational corporations in international trade.

But above all, these compilations for the Conference on both international and national law prove that the rule of law is growing stronger day by day and that law is more used and useful day by day. For example, the United Nations itself and its specialized agencies have generated more law and more legal institutions in the past 20 years than was created in all the past years of recorded history. This contribution to law growth alone proves the U.N.'s great value but it is often overlooked in the dire moaning over the veto in the Security Council and dues impasse in the Assembly. And this fact will give Mr. Justice Goldberg a real foundation for his law leadership through the U.N. The facts in the work book on the Common Market also prove the great value of an international court for there it is recorded that this Market's Supreme Court of Justice has decided over 1,000 cases over the past few years between nations that formerly used war as their ultimate method of decision. The Conference documents are

July 29, 1965

literally chuck-full of similar facts proving law's recent dramatic growth and usefulness internationally.

The Conference has generated a number of "firsts," all designed to bring law sources, traditions, and heritage to bear on the work program to expand and create more law, more courts, and more legal institutions to further world peace. Among these are: (1) the first world gathering of high court judges of nations; (2) the first World Law Day; and (3) the first World Exhibit of Law Codes and Historic Instruments of the Law, collected from all over the world including England's Magna Carta (750 years old this year), our own Constitution, Bill of Rights, and similar documents from many nations. Current law codes of nations, law books and United Nations and other international law documents will also be exhibited not only at the Conference but in national and state capitals, city halls, courthouses, bar headquarters, libraries and other public buildings all over the world in honor of World Law Day.

Copies of the provisional program, and brochures in three languages, on World Law Day and the World Exhibit of Law Codes, and Historic Instruments of the Law have been released. There have been all kinds of world exhibits on everything from airplanes to waste disposals for kitchens but this is in fact the first law show ever held on a world basis. It should be interesting to view the law codes of nations in their native languages and thrilling to see the great historic law instruments which have meant so much in humankind's slow crawl upward from caveman to the space age. All the "golden" eras of history where man benefited most from improvements in his economic and social status have been eras of great advances in law. From the oldest known law code, Hammurabi's Babylon law code in 2000 B.C., to the Law of Moses in 1450 B.C., to Justinian's Roman Law Code of A.D. 6, to our own Constitution in 1787, growth in the field of law has been synonymous with recognition of human liberties and advancement of the status of the individual.

While the conference is the major legal event of International Cooperation Year, this agenda of research, information, and cooperation contains ideas of advance law in the world which have been 8 years in the making. This program was launched by the American Bar Association during its historic meeting in London in 1957. Since then the interest, support, and cooperation has been secured of the leaders of over 1 million judges and lawyers in 120 nations. A meeting has been held for the lawyers on each continent, i.e., in Tokyo for Asia, Lagos for Africa, Rome for Europe, and San Jose, Costa Rica, for the American Continent, and a World Conference attended by over 1,000 delegates from 102 nations was held 2 years ago in Athens, Greece. At the World Conference the World Peace Through Law Center was created to serve as the secretariat for the work program there adopted and is entirely self-sustaining from dues paid by lawyers. The center now has a worldwide membership, a staff of 27, monthly and other publications and will shortly open a world headquarters in Europe for which it has been given a grant of \$100,000 to erect a building. Already the 60 working committees of the center have generated a plan for a new court system, new law rules and similar programs. Ideas talked about for centuries are being hammered into concrete programs by these committees. The volume containing the Athens proceedings—a veritable storehouse of fact and history on international law—was published by West Publishing Co., and is available to anyone who wishes to purchase it.

To the past conferences heads of state sent over 100 messages attesting to their belief in the ultimate goal of a world ruled

by law. Already similar messages are being received for the September conference.

The friendship created at these conferences among law leaders of the world and the resulting ever-accelerating worldwide dialog on law, its processes and institutions, and their aid to world peace, have been major contributions to the advance of world peace through law.

I would like to stress that this new initiative for the triumph of the age-old idea of world peace through law has become more than an American initiative, it has indeed become the program for peace of the world's legal profession.

The Washington world conference will consider and adopt a program to give substance to the towering ideal that a world ruled by law will be a world at peace. This means expansion and acceleration of the work program adopted at Athens 2 years ago. It also means approval of concrete steps to match our words with a program to give them substance.

This is a once-in-a-lifetime conference for the lawyers of the United States. Future world conferences will be held in other nations. So be sure you attend. I remind that every judge, lawyer, or law professor may attend. Laymen may also attend as observers. Advance registrations from 96 countries now total over 1,200, insuring that our goal of 2,000 judges, lawyers, and law professors from over 100 nations will be achieved.

The eyes of the legal world most certainly, and perhaps those of the lay people of the world as well, will be focused hopefully on this Washington World Law Conference. I believe that this is the time and we are the people to give reality to the great ideal which is our goal. As the Conference labors to create conditions for world peace by strengthening the world's law and judicial institutions no one can wish it ill. Every man, woman, and child is bound to benefit, and no one can be hurt by its endeavors. Delegates will not seek St. Thomas More's utopia or offer their program as a panacea. The rule of law allows man diversity and differences in a framework of peace. These workers for peace under law are practical and down to earth, not dreamers. Lawyers and judges realize that nations are run by men and disputes are inherent in human nature. A lawyer or judge lives a life attuned to the fact that the very nature of society is such that it creates divisions, struggles, differences, and conflicts.

So the delegates at the Conference will not seek impossible perfection but merely strive to create a legal harness for man's great new power which will cause its use for mankind's benefit rather than his death. They know that where law rules disputes are less likely to occur, and that if disputes can be directed into courthouses the bloodbath of the battlefield can be avoided. This fact is proved by every area where law is both worldwide and universally observed. Good illustrations are the law of the sea, diplomatic immunity, and the postal convention. All over the world in nation after nation and internationally, all a law and judicial system consist of are law rules to avoid conflict and a forum for peaceful resolution of those conflicts that do occur. So the effort of the Washington Law Conference will be to increase the amount of law rules and to start the building of a world court system. Thus will law and courts perform more and more the same function internationally they now perform within nations. By action to generate more law and more courts, the delegates at the Conference will draw mankind close to the towering ideal of a world ruled by law. Their initiative will thus give concrete meaning, validity, and continued forward movement to the age-old aspiration for a peaceful world order under the rule of law. All men

must concede that whenever the rule of law becomes strong enough to be a controlling factor in the world community, then, and then only, will any man be able to go anywhere on the face of the earth (or travel in endless space) in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

I summon each of you to this the greatest endeavor of our great profession.

Jefferson
THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH
ON VIETNAM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MOSS. No American who saw President Johnson on television yesterday as he discussed our commitment in Vietnam could doubt his personal concern, his reluctance to escalate further our military involvement there, or his earnest search for a nonmilitary solution to the conflict through the United Nations or otherwise. Neither could any American doubt the dedication of the President firmly to make good the commitment of this Nation to keep its word to a small country now cruelly attacked by its neighbor and torn internally by defections of its own citizens. To keep our word, we must send still more troops, spend more money, and risk increased reprisals. As the President said "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate." But since there was no one else, we stepped forward to aid a beleaguered, friendly, free nation. And we will not be driven out, nor quit the field in weariness or fear. We earnestly seek a peaceful settlement and will sit at the conference table anytime with North Vietnam, or "any government whose people may be affected." This is broad enough to include the whole world. We fear no meeting, in fact, we welcome any such opportunity to discuss a settlement.

With touching eloquence, the President answered the groping question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" Our citizens who honestly are puzzled or uninformed now have, once again, a clear answer. And those who refuse to listen or who seek to stir division and dissent, must do so in face of the simple, clear, and moving explanation of our President.

We are in Vietnam to fulfill our pledge to support freedom and resist aggression. Our national word is at stake. We seek no selfish gain. We yearn for peace. We will do any honorable thing to terminate combat.

Like most Americans, I have deep misgivings about our involvement in Vietnam. I feel frustration with shifting succession of governments. I recognize the perils for our soldiers. With all my heart I wish that this ordeal would pass from us. But there is a greater need in this world, pointed out by President Johnson—a need for governmental freedom from aggression, a need for world order and world law, a need for honorable commitments honorably kept, a need to halt world lawlessness.

So I give to President Johnson my full support in this dangerous time of trial. I applaud his motives. I commend his search for a peaceful solution. I back

his firmness with the aggressor. I take pride in his integrity.

HEW SECRETARY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in July 1962, when Anthony J. Celebrezze moved into the Cabinet post of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a newspaper article commented on "Tony's Impossible Task."

This month, July 1965, having secured 3 years as Department head of one of our Nation's busiest, most diverse governmental agencies, he is leaving to continue his public service as a Federal judge—after having worked longer at his "impossible task" than any of his predecessors.

As a commentary on the good will, intense energy, and devotion to duty with which Mr. Celebrezze discharged his responsibilities, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated "I have both a feeling of pride in Secretary Celebrezze's accession to this high court—and a reluctance in seeing him depart the Department he has guided so skillfully."

I, personally, shall remember with appreciation his sympathetic understanding of my hopes to bring an environmental health center to my own State of West Virginia. He, at all times, was mindful of the needs of West Virginians and desirous of meeting those needs as best possible within the scope of his Agency. I feel that the final determination to place an Appalachian Regional Environmental Health Center in West Virginia owes much to his realization of its value in the rejuvenation of the State, and the Appalachian region, as well as to his assessment that the State's attributes are peculiarly adapted to accommodate a center of this type.

I feel, too, that because Secretary Celebrezze is a man who understands well that America is a land of ever-expanding opportunity, he worked to give all Americans a better chance, through the programs of his Department, at the dignity, health, self-respect, and economic well-being which are a part of the basic promise of our Nation to its citizens.

SEVEN YEARS OF PROSPERITY WITHOUT INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article entitled "U.S. Inflation Discounted in Chase Report," published in the financial section of the Washington Post, is an extremely interesting news item. It reads, in part:

The Chase Manhattan Bank says the widely held belief that we are living in an era of price inflation is erroneous.

In its publication, *Business in Brief*, the bank notes that the United States had no significant inflation during the past 7 years.

This is a most remarkable economic achievement. The United States has had 7 years of prosperity and has enjoyed the highest income the country has ever had. The economy has had a tremendous surge in the past 4 or 5 years without price inflation. This is a great tribute to our Government and to Mem-

bers of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in its entirety be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. INFLATION DISCOUNTED IN CHASE REPORT

NEW YORK.—The Chase Manhattan Bank says the widely held belief that we are living in an era of price inflation is erroneous.

In its publication, *Business in Brief*, the bank notes that the United States had no significant inflation during the past 7 years. It cautions, however, that "we must be constantly alert to the danger of inflation and that excessive Government spending, credit expansion, and wage increases can lead to serious inflation."

The report suggests that the major reason why people think prices have been rising is that they fail to take account of the upgrading of their purchases. The bank says people are eating better, buying better clothes, spending more on travel and recreation. In the sense, however, that monthly spending has increased, the bank adds, the cost of living has climbed.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as an outgrowth of President Kennedy's Commission on the Status of Women, 44 States have set up continuing studies in the form of Governor's Commissions on the Status of Women.

Representatives of these State commissions are now meeting in convention in Washington and their opening meeting was highlighted by an address by the Vice President. In his remarks he said:

The talent of the American woman is an important resource in this Nation.

He further pointed out the efforts of President Johnson to find qualified women for appointment to high Government positions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Vice President's remarks to the opening session printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CONFERENCE OF GOVERNORS COMMISSIONS ON STATUS OF WOMEN, JULY 29, 1965

It is my honor to address leaders in Governors' programs for strengthening opportunities for American women.

You represent an outstanding cross-section of civic leadership in every aspect of American life.

The very increase in the number of Governors' commissions—now 44—shows the vital interest in your mission.

In State after State you have held up a public mirror to the legal framework which can foster or hinder women's rights. And where the mirror has revealed flaws—archaic, discriminatory statutes, or gaps in protective law—commissions have served as catalysts for improvement.

At the same time you have broadened the "bridges" of education, training and counseling, so that more and more women can realize their highest potential.

Most important, you have helped bring about a new climate of public opinion.

Step by step, you have helped translate into reality more and more of the goals en-

visioned in the historic report submitted to President Kennedy by the Commission on the Status of Women in 1963.

We owe a great deal to the Chairman of that Commission, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who did not live to see the report completed.

Today, more Americans than ever before, in public and private life, are committed to helping women achieve their birthright as citizens.

The talent of the American woman is an important resource in this Nation.

But I must be frank.

All too often it is a wasted resource.

Only 14.1 percent of working women are in the professions or in technical work. And only 4.5 percent are managers, officials, and proprietors.

The worst of it is that there has been an almost continuous decline in the percentage of women working in these jobs.

One of the reasons, of course, why women's employment opportunities are limited is that their education is too often limited.

Women comprised 51 percent of the 1964 American high school graduating class.

But when it comes to college the girls, their parents and even their teachers and counselors have some second thoughts. And so, looking again at the 1964 record, we find that while 51 percent of the June high school graduates were girls, in the fall, only 45 percent of the students entering college were girls.

Nor has the American woman's record in college been as high as we would like.

There has been an actual decline, since 1930, in the percentage of higher degrees earned by women.

But education isn't the only factor limiting woman's opportunities.

There are restrictive hiring practices and a disinclination to promote women or to give them the same on the job training men receive.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women has taken the lead in opening more opportunities to women. Its work has continued under President Johnson through the interdepartmental committee and the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Your Governors' commissions are working to improve the status of women at the State level.

These commissions and committees are concerned with a good deal more than job opportunities for women. They are interested in the education of girls and in continuing education for women. They are stressing the need to strengthen the home by providing more community services. They are particularly concerned that working mothers have adequate facilities for child care while they work. They are investigating the possibility of more work opportunities for women who must also maintain their homes.

In 1962 the Attorney General reviewed an 1870 law which Government hiring officers used as the basis for specifying man or woman in filling vacancies. The Attorney General held that the old law did not give appointing officers that prerogative and that the President had authority to regulate the right of appointing officers in this matter. Immediately the President directed heads of agencies to make future appointments solely on the basis of merit.

But it was President Johnson's talent search for qualified women which really opened the doors for women in Government.

Shortly after the President took office he announced that Government would no longer be for men only.

Since January 1, 1964, he has appointed more than 115 women to high-level Government positions. In addition, Government agencies have appointed or promoted more than 2,800 other women to jobs paying \$10,000 or more a year.

18124

In the President's words: "We can waste no talent, we can frustrate no creative power, we can neglect no skill in our search for an open and just and challenging society."

Private industry is following the President's example.

One factor helping this trend is a shortage of skilled workers in such fields as engineering, science, mathematics and business administration.

Qualified women can fill these jobs. Those not today qualified can become qualified through study and work.

Private employment practices also are being affected by steps being taken by the U.S. Employment Service. The Employment Service is urging acceptance and use throughout the country of hiring specifications based exclusively on job performance factors.

There is other progress:

Last year the Equal Pay Act established the principle of equal pay as national policy.

Now it rules out all discrimination in employment on the basis of sex and applies in interstate commerce.

But the greatest barriers are the psychological barriers.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission has done research on widely held views and attitudes. It has defined a whole series of myths—some held by men, others held by women, some by both.

I refer to myths such as "women do not make good bosses," or "it is inefficient to train women because of high turnover." The facts prove otherwise.

If we would clear the road ahead for both men and women, we must clear all of our minds of these mental cobwebs.

An open mind, like an open heart, is the prerequisite for an open door.

And here we might recall the words of America's first woman Cabinet member, Mrs. Frances Perkins. She used to say that her grandmother had taught her: "If anyone opens a door, one should always go through."

The doors of opportunity are opening today.

Working together we can reach our goal: full and equal opportunity for all the women of America in all parts of American life.

President Johnson is committed to that goal. I join him in that commitment. With your continued help we will succeed.

RUSSELL: FIT AND READY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on the day of the return to the Senate after an illness of my warm friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, many Members of this body rose to extend their congratulations and to salute DICK RUSSELL for his long and dedicated outstanding service to his State and Nation.

Since his return, Senator RUSSELL has resumed his position of leadership and responsibility in the Senate and his vital duties as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. As the Atlanta Journal commented editorially on July 27, Senator RUSSELL is indeed "fit and ready."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is a well-deserved tribute to a Senator who already has done so much and who is prepared to do more, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RUSSELL: FIT AND READY

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL's resumption of command (or chairmanship) of the Senate Armed Services Committee is timed propitiously inasmuch as military business and Georgia politics are concerned.

He returns to the leadership of his committee just as a vital and controversial piece of legislation comes up for consideration—the military pay bill.

And his return to active chieftanship should be one more indication that he is ready and willing and able to handle the duties incumbent on a U.S. Senator.

The military pay bill has passed the House of Representatives, but not in the form requested by the Johnson administration. The House increased it beyond the administration's limits. And the administration has made no secret that it hopes to gain support for limited raises within the Senate.

But Senator RUSSELL has made it plain that he is prepared to do battle with the administration on this point. He advocates raises more in line with those approved by the House.

His point is that if the Reserves must be called up and if those already in the Armed Forces must be held beyond their discharge point, then there should be some compensation in the form of a sizable increase.

It is a point well made.

Senator RUSSELL could have taken it easy. He could have gone on record as supporting the administration's stand on military pay. He could have done so in the name of loyalty. He could have rationalized such a stand with no trouble. And in so doing he could have assumed leadership of his committee in name, and faced no great task or problem.

But Senator RUSSELL obviously feels a great responsibility for his nation and for the men already in uniform and those who will be in the near future. And so he is choosing to do battle with the administration's position.

If any evidence were needed to show that Senator RUSSELL is fit and ready for his job—fit and ready for a long time to come—then his resumption of active leadership has eliminated that need.

He has shown he is ready, and the men in uniform may well be grateful that he is.

"A MOMENT OF TRUTH"—ADDRESS BY JUSTICE EDWARD F. CARTER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the preservation of the liberties and privileges of every citizen of this Nation deserves our continuing attention.

A thoughtful speech was recently made on this subject by Edward F. Carter, an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska. Justice Carter is one of our State's leading jurists. He is the dean of the Nebraska Supreme Court on which he has served since 1935. In 1947 and 1948 he was one of the judges on the 5th Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, Germany, presiding at the trials of major German war criminals.

During his long experience on the bench, he has seen many disquieting trends in our Government.

Speaking before the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce in North Platte, Nebr., on July 13 of this year, Justice Carter recounted the worries of some drafters of the Constitution. He described the extent to which these prophetic worries have come about. While drafting the Constitution, and during the debates in Virginia on ratification, patriots like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Edmund Randolph voiced many doubts about the new Constitution. They feared that the Central Government would become so powerful

that it could destroy the States by absorbing the powers reserved to them.

These men realized that the very general words used in the Constitution could be given meanings totally different from those intended by the framers. These men saw tyranny approaching, not in the form of a foreign nation, but in the very government that they were creating for themselves.

The 10th amendment was added to the Constitution to prevent encroachment by the Federal Government, but, as Justice Carter showed, many of these gloomy predictions have become reality. Mr. President, we should all consider Justice Carter's speech, for his remarks reach to the heart of one of this Nation's most dangerous problems. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A MOMENT OF TRUTH

(By Edward L. Carter, Justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska)

Nearly two centuries ago an embryo nation of a little more than 3 million people occupied part of the eastern coastal area extending from southern Maine to northeastern Georgia. All but 10 percent of the people lived in small villages and remote agricultural areas, connected only by trails that for the most part were passable only for men on foot or horseback. Only six cities had a population exceeding 8,000; the largest, Philadelphia, numbered only 42,000.

The industrial revolution had hardly reached this side of the Atlantic. The first cotton mill in America had not been established, and other industries were in a primitive handicraft stage. For manufactured goods the people were dependent almost entirely on imports from England. To the north of this little country was Canada, a colony of Great Britain; to the south and southwest a vast area held by Spain; and shortly the whole Mississippi Valley area was claimed by the French under Napoleon. Compared with those giants of their times, the new nation was but a pygmy with a total population about that of the city of Chicago today.

Nevertheless, the people of this little nation refused to tie up with any of the great powers of their day and found the courage to stand alone. They raised their own food, made their own clothes, and hewed their homes from native timber. Times were hard, but they were free. To become free they fought a war with Great Britain, the most powerful nation in the world at that time. They determined to create a government that would guarantee freedom and liberty for its people and the generations that were to follow them. A written constitution was formulated, finally adopted and ratified, and the United States was born.

They had lived many years under the tyranny of British Kings, primarily George III. They had lived a dozen years under the Articles of Confederation which was nothing more than an alliance of the sovereign States, without an executive head or a system of courts. The Congress of those times was so limited in power that it was almost nonfunctional as a governing agency. They well knew of the tendency of all men in places of power to exercise more authority than was lawfully given to them. They knew also that there was a general tendency for governmental powers to gravitate toward a central authority and to become dictatorial and tyrannical. The conceived a new philosophy of government, generally referred to

Electronic engineering company, Cumberland County—NASA project: Inventory—Result: Declined (three times).

Electronic laboratory company, Cumberland County—NASA project: Inventory—Result: No response (twice).

Plastic company, York County—NASA project: Inventory—Result: Declined.

Major engineering company, Cumberland County—NASA project: Track and data system, in-house R. & D. project—Result: Declined first; no response second.

Manufacturing company, York County—NASA project: In-house R. & D. project—Result: No response.

College, Aroostook County—NASA project: Research—Result: No response (twice).

Science foundation, Knox County—NASA project: Research—Result: No response (five times).

Major engineering company, Cumberland County—NASA project: Data not available—Result: No response (twice).

Machine company, Cumberland County—NASA project: Data not available—Result: Declined.

College, Cumberland County—NASA project: Research—Result: No response (twice).

Now that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been convinced that Maine industry is space-capable, I hope that Maine industry will respond more to invitations to bid and provide greater participation, having in mind the huge business potential that will accrue to Maine as a result of the new space center being constructed in Boston.

TRUST AND RESPECT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is an easy thing to clobber a Secretary of State. It is an old American pastime. Cordell Hull, Dean Acheson, and John Foster Dulles did not escape criticism when they held the office and certainly our present Secretary is having his share.

What makes it easy to attack a Secretary of State is what makes his job so hard. He is charged with the direction of our foreign policy to see that it conforms with our long-range, overall national interests and ambitions. In line with this is the responsibility of keeping our allies friendly and our enemies from war; the maintenance of our allied shield and the preservation of peace. And so the Secretary must place a restraining hand on the adventurers who would risk long-range welfare for short-range gain; the traders who would destroy an ally to get rich quick, and the war hawks who call for gunboat diplomacy abroad for political advantage at home. All of these must be restrained if our Nation's long and lasting interests are to be served. It is not a simple job. The Secretary is exposed to well-nigh unimaginable pressures from both without and within the Nation.

To support him in withstanding this pressure, the Secretary has but the support of the President, which is unswerving, the support of the bureaucracy, which is unavailing and the Congress. It is important the Congress give the Secretary its confidence and its trust.

We are fortunate to have Dean Rusk as Secretary of State. For over 4 years he has borne the mankilling responsibility of his office. With calm high intelligence and quiet good judgment he

has acted with balance and restraint through the Berlin crisis of 1961, the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban missile crisis, the Dominican crisis, the collapse of Laos, and the deepening tragedy of Vietnam.

He has no flair for or interest in drama, publicity or quick, false solutions. He does a job and he does it well.

We are lucky, Mr. President, to have such a man as Secretary of State.

By now no doubt he has learned to cope with the slings and arrows and the potshots to which he is exposed. But for once I would like to say—clearly and for the record—that Secretary Rusk has my respect, admiration and trust. I am certain the great majority of the Congress and of the country join with me in this statement.

EFFECTS OF SUPREME COURT DECISION ON APPORTIONMENT HAVE BEEN GOOD

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very able editorial published in the Chicago American on Monday, July 26, 1965, be printed in the Record.

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

DIRKSEN'S UPHILL FIGHT

Illinois' Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN plainly intends to fight one of the major campaigns of his career on the issue of the Supreme Court's reapportionment ruling. DIRKSEN is trying to push through the Senate a proposed constitutional amendment that would overturn the Court's one-man, one-vote ruling, which required that both houses of a State legislature must be elected from districts of substantially equal population.

We find ourselves sympathizing with DIRKSEN, while feeling no enthusiasm at all for his resolution. When the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote ruling, we criticized it on the same grounds as DIRKSEN: that it was an unwarranted and dangerous extension of power on the part of the Court to start tampering with the political makeup of States. That we think is still true, but some further practical considerations need to be added.

One is that, whether or not the Supreme Court had any business making such a decision, the ruling did put an end to an unfair situation that could not have been ended in any other way. In many States, the majority of the senate represents a minority of the population; rural districts representing, say, one-fourth of the population may have a greater voice in the senate than urban districts representing half of it. Unless you can argue convincingly that State senators should represent something other than people, this is plainly inequitable.

One often-heard contention is that State legislatures must be patterned after Congress, where each State is entitled to two Senators and elects them without regard to population. But there is no necessary parallel here. The States were in existence before the Federal Union was (as the name "United States" implies), and have a political entity of their own. That is not true of senatorial districts of other subdivisions within States.

Moreover, the unfairness of the old system was built into it and is self-perpetuating. Obviously, no majority of a State senate would ever vote to become the minority; only some outside agency could change the system. And now that the Supreme Court has done so, we see no reason why the majorities that benefited from its ruling

should penalize themselves by backing DIRKSEN's amendment.

In short, even if the Supreme Court acted wrongly in making this decision, its effects are good. Congress no doubt should act to curb the Supreme Court and reassert its own lawmaking authority; but it will have a better chance of success if it concentrates on court rulings that have had bad results.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The editorial expresses sympathy with my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN], although declaring no feeling of enthusiasm for his joint resolution. While the writer was not enthusiastic about the fact that the Supreme Court made its rulings on reapportionment, it concludes that the effects of those decisions were good.

The editorial states that Congress "will have a better chance of success if it concentrates on court rulings that have had bad results."

Since the editorial states that the rulings of the Supreme Court on reapportionment have had good results, I assume that it is a polite way of opposing the so-called Dirksen amendment.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 13 and 14 hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 936 providing for the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

This year's hearings showed increasing and significant support for this proposal reflecting the growing desire in Michigan that this bill be enacted into law in the present Congress. Among the important additional evidences of support was a letter from the American Automobile Association received after the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1965.

HON. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The American Automobile Association supports and calls for early enactment of S. 936, by Senator HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and Senator McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, providing for the establishment of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan.

AAA policy, as established in annual convention, calls for an expansion of recreational facilities:

"Development of recreation and vacation areas has not kept pace with the requirements of the American people, nor can these regions continue to meet the needs of an expanding population. The AAA believes that government—State and Federal—must place increasing emphasis on the creation of new recreational travel resources throughout the country."

Development of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will provide 46,100 acres of scenic land and 31 miles of shoreline. High dunes, inland lakes, and green forests make this area outstanding in terms of scenic beauty. This area will provide excellent swimming, sun bathing, fishing, water ski-

July 29, 1965

ing, boating, camping, and picnicking for American people on vacation.

Within a 300-mile radius are the great midwestern cities of Chicago and Detroit. It is also estimated that some 20 million people reside within 1 day's drive of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

In 1964, according to the National Park Service, a total of 102,375,100 people visited U.S. national parks and other areas administered by the National Park Service. Of this total, it is estimated that 96 percent visited these national parks and recreational areas by automobile.

The AAA supports the establishment of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore because we feel it will help fulfill the need for additional recreational service facilities such as boating, swimming, fishing, hunting, touring, camping, picnicking, etc.

It is requested that this letter be made a part of the official hearings of your subcommittee.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS R. GRAY,
Director, Legal Department.

HYRUM DAM PROJECT IN UTAH PROVIDES BENEFITS TO PUBLIC

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, 30 years ago valuable irrigation water was first released from behind Hyrum Dam in northern Utah to begin feeding a highly productive farm area along the Little Bear River in Cache County.

Since that time, millions of gallons of almost priceless water has been captured in the relatively small Hyrum Reservoir, where it could be held and released as needed.

Construction of the Hyrum project was approved by the President in 1933, with funds made available under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 in the amount of \$930,000.

Hyrum Reservoir holds 18,700 acre-feet of water and in its 30 years of operation there has never been a year when the reservoir did not fill to overflowing. Three canals take irrigation water from the 116-foot-high dam to delivery points to the north and south.

The Hyrum project is the primary source of water for about 4,000 acres of productive farmland, and a supplemental source of water for an additional 3,000 acres.

As many of my colleagues are aware the Mormon pioneers, led to the Utah territory by Brigham Young, are credited with devising the first system of irrigation applied by Anglo-Saxons to arid and semiarid lands. This was an absolute necessity, since the springs and rivers along the mountains did not provide water for enough farmland to feed a growing population in this desert area.

Planning and investigation of reclamation and irrigation projects came early in Utah's modern history. The Hyrum project was first studied shortly after the turn of the century.

Now, the number of subscribers to the Hyrum project increases annually as attempts to dry-farm prove futile. The subscribers are repaying the cost of the Hyrum project in annual payments based on crop valuation.

Other benefits are now accruing to the public because of the Hyrum project. Recreation features of the reservoir have been administered by the Utah State

Park and Recreation Commission as the Hyrum State Park. A boat ramp and campgrounds had almost 19,000 visitors last year, a figure which is small in number but highly important to the northern part of Utah.

The Hyrum project is one of the Bureau of Reclamation's smaller projects, but its 30-year-old success story is a prime example of beneficial Federal, State, and local cooperation which has provided an improved economy and multiple benefits to an important segment of our population.

While the reclamation work Congress considers today often runs into cost figures in the millions of dollars, the compensation we receive through more usable water, better flood control, and greatly increased recreation for a growing population will be measured in the billions of dollars in years to come.

Mr. President, I am proud to call to the attention of the Senate this success story, and I will continue working for a better America through conservation of one of our most important natural resources—the water in our streams and rivers.

APPRAISALS OF HAPPENINGS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is important that we keep up with what is going on in the Dominican Republic. Three interesting presentations—one by Juan Bosch, the deposed President in whose behalf the current revolution started, which appeared in the July 24 issue of the New Republic; and another one by Tad Szulc, probably one of the most knowledgeable experts among newspapermen on Latin America, which appears in the July 31 issue of the Saturday Evening Post; and the leading comment in the current issue of the Vision Letter, of which the former President of Colombia, Dr. Lleras Camargo, is an editor, are of interest and value.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed in the Record.

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

THE DOMINICAN REVOLUTION (By Juan Bosch)

In most Latin American capitals newsmen writing about the Dominican crisis are still asking: "Why didn't Juan Bosch return to his country?" Some say that in the first moments of the Dominican revolution a rebel plane landed in San Juan in Puerto Rico to take me home and I refused to use it. This is a lie.

The constitutionalist revolution began at noon on April 24, in the city of Santo Domingo; the so-called government of Reid Cabral immediately closed the international airport at Punta Caucedo. Because San Isidro, General Wessin y Wessin's base, lies between Punta Caucedo and the city of Santo Domingo, Wessin y Wessin's base, lies between Punta Caucedo and the city of Santo Domingo, Wessin y Wessin's control over the airport was complete from the very beginning. By 4 in the afternoon Wessin's tanks were blocking entrance to the city via Punta Caucedo, which is the same as the route from San Isidro; and it was only after 4 in the afternoon that I received my first news of the revolution. I received it through a radio station in San Juan.

Thus, from 1 in the afternoon of April 24, to this day, Wessin y Wessin's forces, which control the Dominican Air Force, have completely controlled the airways and the roads to the airport.

Two Dominican Air Force planes came to Puerto Rico—the first a Mustang P-51 fighter which landed on Monday, April 26, I believe, in Mayaguez, and a Douglas transport which landed next day in San Juan. Both were grounded by U.S. military authorities and have remained grounded.

I did try to reach my country. I made such efforts with Abe Fortas, the well-known American lawyer, who in the first days was unofficial liaison between the U.S. Government, and Rector Jaime Benites of the University of Puerto Rico. On Saturday, May 1, Mr. Fortas informed me that a battle was imminent between U.S. Marines and Dominican constitutionalist forces. I explained to Mr. Fortas that all I could do in these circumstances was to go to my country and I asked him for a plane to take me there immediately. Mr. Fortas did not reply. Early on May 2, in the presence of Rector Benites, I made the same request to Ambassador John Bartlow Martin and he refused even to consider the matter, saying that if I went to Santo Domingo I would be killed. According to him, that should not be allowed to happen as it would leave my country without leaders.

During its initial phase, for 2 months, the Dominican revolution was confined to the capital of the Republic; as it entered its third month, the movement began to spread to the interior of the country. This was inevitable, since a revolution is not a unified military operation which can be contained within set boundary lines by military forces. Washington has remained inexplicably unaware of what is really happening.

In bottling up the revolution and keeping it confined to a portion of the city of Santo Domingo, the United States Government was appraising the situation in terms of force: The revolutionary element represents a given number of men with a given number of weapons; therefore, we can subdue them and knock them out with a given number of soldiers and a given amount of arms.

It is easy to think in terms of force in this day and age, especially in the United States, where a battery of electronic computers comes up with plausible answers to problems of this type in a few minutes, perhaps even in a few seconds.

A revolution, however, is an historical development which is ill-adapted to this type of automated reasoning. Its force is derived from the hearts and minds of people. Neither of these can be measured by electronic computers.

The Santo Domingo uprising was—and is—a typical people's democratic revolution in the historic Latin American manner, generated by social, economic, and political factors at once Dominican and Latin American. It is like the Mexican revolution of 1910. The United States reacted to the Dominican revolution of 1965 almost exactly as it did to the Mexican revolution of 1910. Why? Because, traditionally, the official world of North America has been opposed to democratic revolutions in Latin America. With the exception of the Kennedy years, the policy has been to reach a meeting of minds with local power groups, and to use force to back them up. During the Franklin Roosevelt era the use of armed intervention was abandoned, but the policy of supporting local power groups was continued, and in the case of the Cuban revolution of 1933 North American warships made their appearance in Cuban waters as an ominous reminder. It was John Fitzgerald Kennedy who transformed outmoded concepts by putting new policies into practice; but after his demise the old

July 29, 1965

idea once more took hold that power can only be exerted by means of force.

Yet this idea has been disproved by history. A revolution is not a war. Traditionally, the defeated ones in revolutions have been those who were stronger in weaponry. The 13 American colonies were weaker than England, yet they won the War of Independence; the French masses were weaker than Louis XVI's monarchy, yet the people won in the French Revolution; Bolivar was weaker than Ferdinand VII, yet he won the South American revolution; Madero was weaker than Porfirio Diaz, yet he triumphed in the Mexican revolution of 1910; Lenin was weaker than the Russian government, yet he won the revolution of 1917 in Russia. Without a single exception, all the revolutions which have been victorious throughout the course of history have been weaker than the governments against which they were rebelling. It is clear, therefore, that revolutions cannot be measured in terms of military power; other values must serve as their yardstick.

To distinguish between a true revolution and a mere disorder or struggle for power among rival contenders, one must study the underlying causes of the uprising, and the stand taken by the various sectors of society as it developed. It must also be viewed in its historical context. The U.S. officials failed to consider any of these aspects of the Dominican revolution. In Washington, word was received that at noone on Saturday, April 24, there had been some restlessness in certain quarters of Santo Domingo and among the people of the city; a little later it was learned that the commander-in-chief of the Army had been taken prisoner by his subalterns. Immediately, plans to land U.S. Armed Forces in the little Caribbean country were contemplated. President Johnson himself so stated when, at a press conference on June 17, he affirmed that "as a matter of fact, we landed our people in less than 1 hour from the time the decision was made. It was a decision we considered from Saturday until Wednesday evening."

Since Saturday, therefore, the U.S. Government had considered it necessary to land troops in Santo Domingo; and we may be sure that at the time the U.S. Government did not know what kind of revolution was developing or was going to develop in the Dominican Republic. It was obvious that the policy of the North American government was to defend the status quo in Santo Domingo, without any regard for the will of the Dominican people. The reaction in Washington was, therefore, the usual one: The controlling group in the Dominican Republic was threatened, and had to be defended.

This controlling group was pro-United States, without a doubt; but it was also anti-Dominican Republic, and this to an extreme degree. During its 19 months of government, this preferred regime of Washington had ruined the Dominican economy, established a system of corruption and daily ridiculed the hopes of the people for a dramatic solution to the country's problems.

The Dominican revolution of April 1965, was not an improvisation. It was an historical event, the origin of which was clear to see. It had been developing since the end of 1959, through the death of Trujillo in May 1961, the elections of December 1962; and finally the strike of May 1964. The coup d'etat of September 1963, was unable to stamp out this revolution. It was a delusion of sociological and political ignoramuses that when the government over which I was presiding had been overthrown, the revolution would be vanquished. It was a delusion to believe, as did those responsible for formulating Dominican policy in Washington, that a man of "good" social and business background was the kind of person to handle the Dominican situation.

From the time of the 1963 coup d'etat, the country was returned to the same lack of freedom and contempt toward the mass of the people which prevailed in the days of Trujillo. Corruption of the Trujillo type became more widespread and more shameless than under the tyrant himself. The Cabral regime sought a return to Trujilloism without Trujillo, an historical absurdity which could not be continued. The middle classes and the masses came together as allies, united in a common cause, to restore the country to a regime of lawfulness.

In April 1965, a second Cuba could not have been in the making in Santo Domingo. What erupted was—and is—a democratic and nationalistic revolution. No Latin American nation today can accept a democracy which does not also offer social equality and economic justice. It was a costly political blunder to look on it as a revolution which was in danger of drifting toward communism.

The United States will pay a high price for this blunder and, in my opinion, it will be paid within our time. A measure of the grossness of the mistake is the size of the forces originally deployed to bottle up the revolution. In April, the United States had 23,000 men in Vietnam; it landed 42,000 in Santo Domingo. Washington officials looked upon events in the Dominican Republic as so fraught with danger that their preparations seemed like those of a nation waging a life-and-death war. A tiny, impoverished nation, making the most heroic effort of its history to achieve democracy, was overwhelmed by huge quantities of cannons, planes, warships, and by a propaganda campaign which presented completely distorted facts to the world. The revolution did not shoot a single person; it decapitated no one, burned down not a single church, nor raped one woman. Nevertheless, allegations of these horrors were proclaimed to the world at large.

The Dominican revolution had nothing to do with Cuba, or Russia, or China. It would have ended in April had the United States not intervened. Instead, it was bottled up and consequently began to generate a force of its own, alien to its nature, and including hatred of the United States. It will be a long time before this anti-U.S. feeling disappears. When democratic nationalism is thwarted or strangled, it becomes a breeding ground for communism. I am certain that the use of force by the United States in the Dominican Republic will produce more Communists in Santo Domingo and in Latin America than all the propaganda of Russia, China, and Cuba combined.

It will be difficult to convince the Dominicans that democracy is the best system of government. They were paying for their democracy with their lives and with their blood, yet North American democracy represented their tremendous and heroic struggle to the world as a work of bandits and Communists. Force was used to prevent the Dominicans from achieving their democracy. Many Americans may not believe this is true, but I am expressing here what the people of the Dominican Republic feel and will continue to feel for many years to come, rather than trying to describe what the intentions of the United States were.

The United States was obliged to have recourse in Santo Domingo to an expedient which would permit it to use force without exposing itself to world opprobrium. This explains the military junta headed by Antonio Imbert. This junta was the brainchild of Ambassador John Bartlow Martin—of the United States, in other words. Rarely in modern history has so costly an error been committed in terms of U.S. prestige as placing in the hands of Imbert the power of armed Dominican troops, then advancing as an excuse for his crimes the argument of fighting communism in Santo Domingo. The

brutal killings of Dominicans and foreigners—including a Cuban priest and a Canadian priest—which were committed by Imbert's troops on the pretext of wiping out communism will, in Dominican history, be forever laid to the account of the United States, and particularly to Ambassador Martin. These killings occurred while North American forces were in Santo Domingo; moreover, Ambassador Martin knew what kind of man Imbert was before inviting him to lead the junta. Imbert's tyranny was established beyond a doubt, and following as he did on the heels of Trujillo, there was no pretext strong enough to justify setting up the tyranny of Imbert.

Under the revolution, no one was shot or decapitated; but Imbert's forces shot and decapitated hundreds of persons. These crimes were not given the publicity they should have had in the United States, but they are cited in the documentation of the Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States and of the United Nations, with all their ghastly details of skulls crushed by gun butts, of hands lashed behind backs with wire, of headless corpses floating in rivers, of women executed by machine guns, of fingers smashed with hammers to prevent identification of the dead. Most of the victims were members of the Dominican Revolutionary Party (a party recognized as democratic), since the function of Imbert's "democracy" is to wipe out all democrats in the Dominican Republic. It is a bloody irony of history that the crimes imputed to the Dominican revolution were actually committed by Imbert. The blame will also fall on the United States and, unfortunately, upon democracy in general as a system of government. If I know my people, when the day of reckoning comes, it will be hard for the Dominicans of today and of tomorrow to be indulgent toward the United States and harsh only in their judgment of Imbert and his soldiers.

The Dominican people will not soon forget that the United States brought into Santo Domingo the Nicaraguan battalion named for Anastasio Somoza, that Central American emulator of Trujillo; that it brought in Stroessner's Paraguayan soldiers, of all elements those least qualified to represent democracy in a land where thousands of men and women had just died fighting to establish democracy; that it brought in the soldiery of Lopez Arellano who, so far as the Dominicans are concerned, is a sort of Honduran Wessin y Wessin. A highlight in all future history texts of the Dominican Republic will be the bombardment of the city of Santo Domingo for 24 hours on June 15 and 16.

All these flow from the use of force as an instrument of power in the handling of political problems. An intelligent evaluation of the events in Santo Domingo would have prevented them. President Johnson said that his Marines went into Santo Domingo to save lives; what they really did was to destroy the democratic image of the United States throughout the South American continent.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, July 31, 1965]

WHEN THE MARINES STORMED ASHORE IN SANTO DOMINGO, U.S. OFFICIALS DIVED FOR COVER

(By Tad Szulc)

This spring the United States became engaged in one of the most hectic, bizarre and controversial diplomatic and military operations in recent history, highlighted by the landing of 22,000 troops in the Dominican Republic to protect American lives and to prevent what the Johnson administration feared might be "another Cuba" in the Caribbean.

July 29, 1965

By late June, after the United States had bounced back and forth several times between contradictory policies, a commission from the Organization of American States—heavily influenced by its American member, white-haired, professional diplomatic troubleshooter Ellsworth Bunker—finally came up with the compromise proposals designed to satisfy two sides in the civil war. But looking back at the massive bloodshed and wild confusion of that savage Dominican spring, one finds it hard not to wonder why the same ideas could not have been advanced at the outset of the crisis, or shortly thereafter.

The story of the Dominican intervention would have been merely a comedy of errors and inconsistencies, a mixture of Hamlet and the Marx Brothers, if it were not for the thousands of Dominican dead and wounded in the 8-week civil war and for the deep involvement of American prestige.

The direct cost to the United States was some 25 lost lives of marines and paratroopers, over 100 casualties and many hundreds of millions of dollars. It is impossible to estimate the cost to America in lost confidence among people throughout the world who regarded the episode—rightly or wrongly—as an imperialist military move by the United States. The Dominican crisis created sharp divisions within the Administration in Washington. How the Government handled that crisis—with apparent confusion at the local embassy, at the State Department and in the Central Intelligence Agency—deserves close scrutiny, for American embassies are everywhere much the same, and similar problems may erupt anywhere at any time. The Dominican experience is not the sort that it would be beneficial to undergo more than once.

A good part of the reason for this drawn-out torture of the ancient city of Santo Domingo and its 460,000 inhabitants, if not the whole reason, seems to lie in the nature of the initial reporting on the Dominican crisis to the administration in Washington by the U.S. Embassy in the Dominican capital. This frequently overemotional, exaggerated and partisan reporting went far to influence decisionmaking at the State Department and the White House, thus becoming the prime cause of most of the subsequent events. Later, the embassy's recommendations played a part in undermining, in effect, the peace-making efforts of special White House envoys on the scene.

For this reason, much of what happened in the Dominican Republic is essentially the story of the American Embassy in Santo Domingo, the people in it and its "special guests" from Washington. It is the tale of an embassy that was at first caught unawares by events and then seemed panicked by them, and of otherwise competent diplomats who allowed themselves to lose contact with the real facts of the situation and then made it a policy to ignore them. No definite report can be provided on Washington's role, but it is plain that during the initial period no effective brake on the wild procession of events was applied by the State Department, which seems to have let itself be stampeded by reports from the field.

In this atmosphere of unreality and intrigue there inevitably arose episodes that served almost as comic relief in the impossibly tense and chaotic situation. There was the picture of American Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., sitting under his desk throughout a strafing by friendly planes and the scene in which a White House emissary climbed through a window for a secret meeting with the rebel chiefs.

And, as the constant counterpart to the political and diplomatic maneuverings, there were the sounds and the smells of the civil war. From the moment that I landed in Santo Domingo on Thursday, April 29—having been ferried by a marine helicopter from

the U.S.S. *Boxer* along with other reporters—I lived for 5 weeks with the barking of machine guns, the thud of mortars and the sudden dry crackling of snipers' rifles. There was the sweet, sickening smell of death in the overcrowded hospitals and the pungent odor of decay in a city which for weeks had no water and no garbage collection; and there was the quiet heroism of American Peace Corps nurses working under fire in the hospitals, the taut discipline of marines holding fire until the last possible moment.

But for the sake of coherency, this complex story of the U.S. involvement in the Dominican Republic must be told chronologically. It began with the revolt in Santo Domingo on Saturday, April 24, by a group of civilians and young military officers, who set out to overthrow the provisional government of Donald Reid Cabral and to bring back deposed President Juan Bosch.

But it is really necessary to go back even further, for the recent history of the Dominican Republic is a confused mesh of tawdry events. The country was for 31 years the personal fief of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, an iron-fisted dictator whose rule ended with his assassination on a lonely Santo Domingo boulevard in May, 1961. After seven confused months, a Council of State was installed with U.S. support and with the intention of preparing democratic elections. Some council members subsequently lost interest in holding elections, and it was largely through the efforts of Donald Reid Cabral, a slim but wiry automobile dealer, that the elections took place in December 1962. But "Donnie" Reid was surprised by the victory of Dr. Juan Bosch, an idealistic writer, social reformer and self-taught political scientist who had lived in exile for 24 years. Reid refused to participate in the Bosch government and instead aligned himself with the rightwing opposition.

On September 25, 1963, Dr. Bosch, the Republic's first freely chosen President in 38 years, was deposed by a military coup. The Trujilloist generals and colonels who overthrew Bosch explained their move as a necessary counter to the President's alleged—but never proved—Communist proclivities. Reid Cabral became Foreign Minister under a new triumvirate—in a government unrecognized by the United States, for President Kennedy angrily broke diplomatic relations after the coup and withdrew all aid. The Johnson administration reestablished the relationship 3 months later, and not long thereafter Reid was elevated to the top post in the triumvirate. Reid became known in Santo Domingo as "el Americano," so closely was he linked with U.S. interests.

Reid Cabral meant well, but somehow he never impressed his fellow Dominicans who became increasingly impatient for the democracy, jobs, and bread that had been promised since Trujillo's death. His rule, though authoritarian, was not dictatorial as Dominicans knew dictatorship, and he even tried to put a rein on the armed forces. This helped seal his fate. Resentment among old-line military, wistfully remembering the easy Trujillo days, converged with active plotting by young officers who were weary of the triumvirate and wanted democracy reinstituted under President Bosch.

It was the "young Turks" group that set off the crisis. The conspiracy of these officers and of civilians from Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party (P.R.D.)—mainly middle-class persons—began last September. The target date was June 1, but the capital grapevine became active in March with rumors that a coup was in the works.

After Easter Sunday, April 18, the coup rumors grew more persistent. A few days later, Santo Domingo's newspaper *El Caribe* published a front-page story reporting unusual military movement around the presidential palace. And finally on Thursday, April 22, Donnie Reid himself heard enough

details of the plot to fire seven air force officers involved in it. This move shocked the conspirators into acting.

Rebel civilians suddenly captured the city's main radio and television station in the early afternoon of Saturday, April 24, and announced—prematurely—the government's fall. Two army camps on the outskirts of town declared themselves in rebellion. Crowds poured into the downtown streets to celebrate what they thought had already become a victorious revolution, but loyalist forces soon recaptured the radio station and arrested eight rebels there. Although the rebels at the two army camps ignored a 5 p.m. ultimatum to surrender, Reid Cabral broadcast that evening an announcement that the uprising had been stamped out.

The American Embassy, which had been completely surprised by the original revolt, dutifully passed on to the State Department the announcement that the revolt was now over, along with its own conclusion that, indeed, Donnie Reid had weathered the storm.

A possible explanation for the Embassy's failure to properly assess what was happening may be found in the absence of Ambassador Tapley Bennett, who had left Santo Domingo on Friday, April 23, the day before the rebels made their move. Mr. Bennett later explained that he had expected trouble, and for precisely that reason had gone to Washington, feeling that it was his last opportunity to discuss the Dominican problem before trouble came. However, on Thursday Bennett had sent his regular weekly report to the State Department, and in it he mentioned new talk in Santo Domingo that some generals might try to oust Reid during the weekend. But, Bennett noted, this seemed to be one of those "usual Santo Domingo rumors."

From Santo Domingo the Ambassador went to Georgia to visit his mother. It was there that he first heard of the Saturday revolt, and only the next day did he go to Washington, where the initial plans for a large-scale U.S. intervention were already being considered—partly on the basis of increasingly nervous reports from Santo Domingo that leftists and Communists were dominating what was supposed to be a pro-Bosch movement.

Also absent from Santo Domingo that crucial weekend were 11 of the 13 officers attached to the U.S. military assistance advisory group, whose job it was to train Dominican troops and be in touch with their leaders; they were in Panama attending a routine conference. The Embassy's naval attaché had left Friday for a weekend of dove shooting in the Cibao Valley with Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, one of the two survivors of the group that ambushed Trujillo in 1961—and a man who was to play a vital role in the days ahead. The senior American present in Santo Domingo was Bennett's deputy, William Connert, a thin, bespectacled diplomat who had arrived 5 months before. At 46, he had served in four Latin American posts during his 14 years in the Foreign Service.

In Washington it was a quiet spring weekend. Secretary of State Dean Rusk on Saturday made a statement about U.S. policy on Cambodia. President Johnson's top Latin American adviser, Thomas Mann, was relaxing at home. And Jack Hood Vaughn, who only a few weeks earlier had succeeded Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs when Mann was elevated to the post of Under Secretary, was attending a conference in Cuernavaca, Mexico. As far as anyone in the administration seemingly could determine, this was one of the quietest periods that Latin American politics had undergone in a long time.

By any standards Tap Bennett's Embassy was a good Embassy, staffed by about 30 Foreign Service officers. All were career men with good records, and most had Latin

July 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190008-1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18133

American experience. Its only visible weakness was that all ranking officers, including Bennett, had served there for a relatively short time. This was because diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic were restored only late in 1963, and a whole new team was assigned there with the new Ambassador, Bennett, serving in his first ambassadorial post, had been in Santo Domingo 13 months, as had the chief of the Embassy's political section. Only the CIA contingent, operating out of the political section as an independent unit, had been in the Dominican Republic longer.

Bennett was the classic State Department career ambassador—with all that this implies in advantages and drawbacks. At the age of 48, his ambassadorial appointment to Santo Domingo climaxed 24 years of a Foreign Service career that had not been spectacular, but, in State Department parlance, had been a good one. A tall, amiable man from an established Georgia family, Tap Bennett graduated from the University of Georgia, then spent a year at the University of Freiburg in Nazi Germany between 1937 and 1938 before obtaining his law degree from George Washington University. His first Foreign Service post was, interestingly enough, in the Dominican Republic. Afterward he specialized in Caribbean and Central American affairs, becoming in 1951 the Deputy Director of the State Department's Office of South American Affairs.

This backlog of experience made Tap Bennett a Latin American old hand, and in 1953 he was picked as personal assistant to Dr. Milton Eisenhower, who then was surveying hemispheric problems on his brother's behalf. Doctor Eisenhower described Bennett as "an engaging, sensitive, tireless worker." Married to the daughter of a well-known former ambassador, Bennett carried a pleasant social cachet, and in time he was sent on pleasant assignments to Vienna and Athens.

After his arrival in Santo Domingo last year, the new ambassador established close and cordial relations with President Reid Cabral and with businessmen, landowners and military officers who supported the regime. While this was entirely proper, the ambassador and his top associates seemingly maintained few contacts or friendships with the followers of Doctor Bosch, other opposition politicians or any of the young officers. As a high administration official in Washington said later, wondering aloud about the ambassador's selectiveness in his contacts, "Tap didn't seem to know anyone who was to the left of the Rotary Club."

Bennett was conscientious in carrying out his ambassadorial functions, and he traveled almost everywhere in the Dominican Republic, dutifully visiting aid projects and Peace Corps centers. But, as one of his embassy associates once remarked, "Tap seemed ill at ease with people who were not well dressed and to whom he had not been properly introduced." When the revolt broke out, Bennett almost reflexively gave his full commitment to people whom he knew. And he subsequently found himself in a maelstrom set in motion by men he had never met and by powerful forces that he had never discovered.

After reporting Saturday night that the rebellion seemed to have fizzled out, Bennett's deputy, Bill Connnett—whose views apparently coincided largely with the ambassador's—found out Sunday morning that the situation had changed—although quite un-dramatically. Not only had the government's planes and tanks refused to attack the two rebellious army garrisons, but the old-line commanders had apparently decided to finish off in their own way what the young officers had started the day before. By Sunday morning Reid Cabral's term in office had ended—all the military leaders, rebels as well as loyalists, agreed on that. Donnie Reid signed his resignation on the under-

standing that a junta would be formed and that elections would be held soon.

Then developments became more confused. The young military officers who hoped to bring Doctor Bosch back to power refused to go along with the junta plan. Instead they and their followers moved into the presidential palace, announcing that they were establishing a provisional regime until Doctor Bosch could return from exile in nearby Puerto Rico. Because most of the troops under command of officers favorable to the junta were across the Ozama River at San Isidro Air Force Base, the pro-Bosch officers momentarily had the upper hand. They immediately swore in as provisional president a mild-mannered P.R.D. politician named José Rafael Molina Ureña, who had been president of the Dominican Chamber of Deputies which became extinct at the time that the military overthrew Bosch in the 1963 coup. Under the 1963 constitution, suspended at the same time, Molina Ureña was next in line for the presidency in the absence of the vice president and the president of the senate, both of whom were in exile. Because Bosch's supporters regarded the 1963 coup as illegal, they claimed that the constitution was still in effect and that Molina Ureña was the rightful provisional president. The rebels' characterization of their movement as "constitutionalist" proceeds from this interpretation.

The installation of Molina Ureña that sunny Sunday marked the real beginning of the Dominican civil war. The other military commanders who had helped to dismiss Reid Cabral a few hours earlier now felt betrayed. And the most indignant among them was Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, the officer who had himself led the coup against Doctor Bosch 19 months before and who was not now prepared to see him brought back to power. General Wessin had the allegiance of the officers of the aviation infantry and armored brigade, as well as of most of the air force. Wessin's troops—who at peak strength numbered about 2,500 combat soldiers—were the elite of the Dominican armed forces, and now they were poised to smash the rebels.

Early Sunday afternoon two of General Wessin's P-51 fighters came out of the sun over the sea beyond George Washington Boulevard and strafed the sprawling yellow palace. A Gloster Meteor jet followed in a screaming dive, hurling rockets. Across the Ozama River Wessin's tanks rumbled toward the bridge leading into town. Simultaneously the San Isidro radio station broadcast that the pro-Bosch rebels were Communist-dominated.

Although Doctor Bosch had formerly been one of Fidel Castro's favorite targets as a "Yankee puppet," the American Embassy apparently concurred in General Wessin's assessment of the revolt. In one of his earliest cables to Washington, Connnett, acting as chargé d'affaires in Bennett's absence, warned that Doctor Bosch's return would mean extremism in the Dominican Republic within 6 months—by which he presumably meant communism and, therefore, "another Cuba" in the Caribbean.

The rebels had by now opened the arsenals at the two army camps they controlled and at the few downtown police stations they had captured. A truck loaded with guns pulled up at the tree-shaded Parque Independencia. Men, women, and teenagers—Communists and non-Communists alike—were allowed to help themselves to anything they wanted. Suddenly the city turned into an armed camp. Connnett cabled Washington that there were armed leftists on street corners. There were unquestionably Communists and pro-Castro elements in the revolution from the outset, but there seems to have been no basis for the embassy's warnings that extremists were about to capture the movement. The leaders at this early point were

career army officers and Molina Ureña—none of whom are regarded as Communists.

In Santo Domingo, at 5:45 p.m. on Sunday, a delegation of top officials of Bosch's party went to the embassy to ask that the United States use its influence to halt the Wessin air attacks. The group included Silvestre Antonio Guzmán, a wealthy planter and former minister of agriculture in the Bosch cabinet, who was to emerge a few weeks later at the administration candidate to end the Dominican civil war.

The chargé, Bill Connnett, did not see them. Instead they were received by the embassy's second secretary, Arthur E. Breisky, who, according to Guzmán's subsequent account, called the rebels irresponsible and said they were Communist-dominated. When one of the visitors heatedly denied any Communist link, Breisky reportedly responded that "now you ask for U.S. help after having sent your people in the streets. If I had Wessin's power I would use it."

Wessin did. On Monday his tanks continued their assault upon the Duarte Bridge, where they were resisted for hours in what was virtually hand-to-hand combat. Occasionally a Wessin tank succeeded in reaching the city end of the bridge, but then rebel bazooka and machinegun fire turned it back. Near the bridge rebel soldiers and civilians, some of them teenagers, crouched behind barricades among exploding missiles. By now automatic weapons were being handed out to anyone who asked for them. Aircraft bombed the city, where armed bands—not necessarily connected with any political movement—fired at anything that moved.

There was soon a complete breakdown of order, and the city had no government. Presently, serious fears developed for the safety of the 2,500 Americans living in Santo Domingo. Embassy officials monitoring the rebel-controlled radio and television began to discover a leftist-revolutionary accent creeping into the programs. The rebel announcers began broadcasting the names and addresses of "enemies of the revolution," an apparent invitation to violence. Though no anti-American incident had occurred, the embassy feared this as a predictable next step in the chaotic situation. Late on Monday the embassy recommended that the U.S. Navy, which had a task force standing offshore, immediately evacuate those Americans who wished to leave. Nobody in Santo Domingo, on any side, questioned the wisdom of this decision.

Because logical analysis cannot prove a negative argument—e.g., there are no snakes in Manhattan—there is no way of establishing that the pro-Bosch revolution would not have become dominated by the Communists. They are, however, a small minority in the Dominican Republic. And many foreign diplomats in the capital—even some officials at the Embassy—point out that the United States, while fearing a Communist takeover, did nothing in the revolt's early days to encourage democratic elements among the rebels. Instead the Embassy became increasingly identified with the Wessin forces, even though the San Isidro general personified, to a great many Dominicans, the threat of a new dictatorship.

Returning to Santo Domingo from Washington on Tuesday, April 27, Tap Bennett immediately passed to Washington, along with his own endorsement, the Wessin command's urgent request for radio equipment. The Wessin forces had still not managed to break into Santo Domingo, and the San Isidro leaders pleaded for U.S. walkie-talkies and other radio equipment to help provide tactical control of their tanks and aircraft.

Even before Bennett returned to his post, the administration in Washington was—quite properly, in a situation of such extreme uncertainty—already actively considering both a landing of marines, to protect the evacuation of Americans, and a large-scale military

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190008-1

July 29, 1965

intervention. Intervention was planned to fend off what the Embassy had represented to Washington as the imminent danger of a Communist takeover. (The Embassy warnings, however, were still couched in generalities, and none of the alleged Communist leaders in the rebel command had been positively identified.) At 4 o'clock on Tuesday, therefore—before the Navy began evacuating the first Americans from Santo Domingo—the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., was placed on alert. Briefing his officers, division commander Maj. Gen. Robert York said the mission would be a parachute assault to secure San Isidro, the highway leading to the Ozama River and the Duarte Bridge.

On Tuesday afternoon the military picture in Santo Domingo shifted—the Wessin troops appeared to be gaining the upper hand. The tiny Dominican Navy, which had until then remained neutral, suddenly went to the side of the San Isidro generals, and its frigates lobbed a few shells at the rebel-held presidential palace. Then a new act in the Dominican drama—and in the Embassy's drama—began. A group of rebel military commanders suddenly appeared at the Embassy and requested an interview with Ambassador Bennett. After checking their weapons at the door, they were ushered into the ambassadorial office. They were told the Ambassador that it was now necessary to end the bloodshed, and they asked him to mediate in negotiations with General Wessin.

Tap Bennett replied that he had no authority to mediate. But he said that because he was in contact with San Isidro, he would be glad to transmit messages there. Some of the officers, apparently believing their own entreaties lacked sufficient force, then suggested that the Embassy help persuade Acting President Molina Urefia that the time had come to seek a truce. Bennett assented. He instructed Benjamin J. Ruyle, head of the political section, to drive to the palace and deliver the message to the Acting President from his military associates.

Ruyle found the sprawling palace deserted. There were broken windows everywhere. Bits of masonry lay strewn around where rockets and machinegun bullets had hit. Walking through the building, Ruyle finally came upon a room off the main corridor where Molina Urefia sat dejected in a stuffed armchair. He was surrounded by a number of rebels, some in uniform and some in civilian clothes. At first the Acting President refused to consider giving up the fight, but his companions persuaded him to give it some thought. Ruyle left him and drove back to the embassy.

An hour later Molina Urefia and 18 rebel officers arrived at the white stucco, one-story embassy. This time the group included Lt. Col. Francisco Caamaño Deñó, one of the top rebel leaders and a 32-year-old graduate of a Florida high school and of U.S. Marine Corps schools. Again Tap Bennett was asked to mediate, and again he refused—but there are two contradictory versions of what happened. Colonel Caamaño insists that the ambassador told the group that "this is the time to surrender and not to negotiate." This, the colonel said later, was an insult to the rebel's honor.

Bennett denies that he either demanded a surrender or intended to insult anyone. However, Colonel Caamaño's—and most other rebels'—personal abhorrence of the ambassador is associated with this incident. But on one point both sides agree: When the conference finally broke up, Colonel Caamaño turned to Tap Bennett, just before leaving his office, and said, "We shall go on fighting." (The ambassador did not report this remark in his cable to the State Department that night, nor had there been any mention of Caamaño in embassy messages during the first 4 days of the rebellion.)

The rebels left the embassy one by one, some hanging back as if they were reluctant to leave. Finally Molina Urefia decided that his side had lost and drove to the Colombian Embassy to request asylum. As far as the U.S. Embassy was concerned, the pro-Bosch rebellion had collapsed. An army battalion from out of town, uncommitted to either side until then, entered the city from the west and marched on the palace. In the east, General Wessin's tanks were smashing their way into Santo Domingo over the Duarte Bridge against heavy resistance. The U.S. Navy evacuation of the first 1,175 Americans had been safely completed. There had been an early incident at the Hotel Embajador, where evacuees had congregated, when rebels lined terrified people up against a wall in the lobby and fired a submachinegun burst overhead. But nobody was hurt. In Washington, administration officials expressed relief that the revolt had collapsed.

But to everybody's surprise—the embassy's second major surprise in 5 days—the rebels not only did not give up but they found a second breath. Colonel Caamaño, whose promise to fight had been ignored by Tap Bennett the evening before, took command of the rebellion and eventually mustered perhaps 3,000 supporters—although he later claimed to command 10,000 armed rebels. Caamaño became the rebel leader almost by accident, after many of his fellow plotters had vanished into diplomatic asylum. A somewhat paunchy man of unpredictable mood, he has none of the magnetism of a typical revolutionary leader such as, say, Fidel Castro. If he has any political, economic, or social ideas, beyond his proclaimed support for democracy, he has failed to make them clear. He alternates between rages, when he swears to die alongside his men to preserve their honor, and a kind of gay insouciance that he displayed recently at an improbable crepes suzette luncheon at one of his hideouts. He could scarcely be regarded as anything more than a transitional leader.

By Wednesday morning, in any case, Caamaño's rebels had barricaded themselves into an area of narrow streets and ancient houses in old Santo Domingo. They placed machineguns on the roofs and posted snipers at windows. Molotov cocktails were stored in houses, many of which became small fortresses. Captured tanks and trucks, with the painted word Pueblo [People] fanned out into the city.

Now both the Wessin command and the United States had to respond to a renewed rebel threat. The Embassy decided that intervention was necessary, but a legalism had to be satisfied: Someone had to request U.S. military help. Accordingly in mid-morning a three-man junta was established at San Isidro with Embassy guidance. Because General Wessin was so objectionable to many Dominicans, an unknown air force officer, Col. Pedro Bartolomé Benoit, was named head of the junta.

Colonel Benoit immediately appealed to Tap Bennett for help. At 1:48 p.m., on Wednesday the Ambassador cabled Washington that the junta's communications problem—the lack of radio equipment—was critical. He cabled that the military was facing leftist forces and raised a question about the effect on the morale of the air force and the others if the United States denied them aid.

Shortly after lunch Colonel Benoit radioed the Ambassador from San Isidro that the recently formed junta could no longer assure order in Santo Domingo or protect foreign lives. He asked for U.S. intervention. Tap Bennett passed this request to Washington, then drafted another message which explained that he regretted that the United States might have to impose a military solution to a political problem. While leftist

propaganda could be expected to characterize the revolt as a fight between the military and the people, Bennett said, the issue really was between those who wanted a Castro-type solution and those who opposed it. He went on to make clear that while he did not want to overdramatize the situation, he believed that if the United States denied the requested communications equipment and if the opposition to those he called leftists lost heart, the United States might be required in the near future to stage a Marine landing. What, he asked, did Washington prefer?

Messages whipped frantically between Washington and Santo Domingo that afternoon, and the State Department replied that the United States would not intervene militarily unless the outcome was in doubt—but that the walkie-talkies were being got ready.

At that point the administration was nearing the decision to land a contingent of marines whose mission would be the protection of the continuing evacuation of Americans. About 2 p.m. a group of Marine Corps "pathfinders" came ashore at the sugar port of Haina, 7 miles west of the capital, to survey the beach for an amphibious landing.

At this point the United States identified three men among the Rebel leadership as having possible Communist ties. None of them were the visible top leaders. The identification was sent by the CIA from Santo Domingo Wednesday morning, and Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., retired, who had been sworn in as CIA Director at 12:30 p.m. that same day, brought this information to President Johnson.

Shortly before 5 p.m., Santo Domingo time, Tap Bennett received from Colonel Benoit a written note confirming the earlier radioed request for "a temporary intervention." Bennett telephoned the White House and talked to the President. Then he sent his "emergent" message, the highest-priority communication in the U.S. Government, recommending that the junta intervention request be honored. Within minutes the first helicopters took off from the deck of the Boxer to ferry marines to the Hotel Embajador.

The "limited intervention" had begun. For the first time since 1916, U.S. troops had set foot in the Dominican Republic. In his televised announcement that night, President Johnson emphasized that the marines had gone ashore in Santo Domingo to assist in the evacuation of Americans and other foreigners. Nothing was said of a feared Communist takeover or of U.S. help to the junta forces.

While the original landing by the marines on April 28 brought no more than 500 U.S. troops to Santo Domingo, the administration almost immediately moved toward a major buildup. By the end of the first week, there were 5,000 marines and paratroopers ashore. During the May Day weekend, the forces were more than doubled to 12,000. At the end of the second week, on May 8, the peak was reached with 22,000 U.S. troops in the Dominican Republic and 8,000 sailors manning 40 ships offshore. The U.S. military spokesmen were never entirely precise about the need for such a large force. But State Department officials, briefing newsmen in Santo Domingo, gradually escalated the nature of the U.S. purpose in the Dominican Republic from the initially declared evacuation mission to one of assisting Dominicans "to find a democratic solution to their political problems."

When the landings began on Wednesday, however, the first marine contingent soon secured its perimeters. At 7:30 p.m., after a marine platoon had been driven over to the Embassy, Bennett sent a telegram marked for Under Secretary Mann. Snipers had been firing at the Embassy building from across the street, and the marines shot seven of

July 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190008-1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18135

them. Tap Bennett's cable told Mann that U.S. lives were in danger and conveyed an oral message from Colonel Benoit that the situation was deteriorating rapidly. He cabled his hope for an urgent reply to his official request for assistance to the Wessin forces.

Thirty minutes later the Ambassador sent off yet another telegram to Washington. It said that the junta forces were incapable of resisting and added Bennett's recommendation that serious thought be given to armed intervention to restore order, beyond the mere protection of lives. If the loyalist efforts failed, he said, power would go to groups whose aims were identical with those of the Communist Party. The United States might have to intervene in force to prevent another Cuba.

In Washington, a stunned Council of the Organization of American States was informed of the U.S. landing. The Latin American ambassadors were told that the marines went ashore to protect lives of foreign residents and that the administration had had no time to consult beforehand with other governments. Several ambassadors protested that the U.S. action violated the OAS Charter, which bans unilateral intervention. But, again, they were assured that the United States desired only a cease-fire.

But in Santo Domingo events were proceeding on a somewhat different basis. News-men preparing to land behind the marines from the Navy's amphibious task force happened to turn on their transistor radios and, quite accidentally, tuned in radio exchanges between Tap Bennett and Colonel Benoit, chief of the newly formed junta.

One message, at 9:25 on Thursday morning said: "This is Shade Tree 1 [the Embassy's radio call]. The Ambassador to Colonel Benoit. Do you need more? Believe that with determination your plans will succeed."

Another message from Tap Bennett: "Could you open Punta Caucedo [the international airport] for air traffic to bring in food and medicine? Uniformed marines can operate there if civilians are not there."

Another exchange between the Embassy and an American voice at San Isidro Air Force Base spoke of need for batteries, communications equipment, and rations for the Wessin troops.

A message from San Isidro reported that "a significant morale boost is evident here since the arrival of rations." Then, San Isidro informed Shade Tree 1 that "I've got a message that the suppression attack is being initiated at 0845 local." A message from the Embassy asked Colonel Benoit whether he had enough supplies against "the Castro forces facing you." The message then was changed to say "rebel forces" instead of "Castro forces."

Aboard the *Boxer* the task force commander, Capt. James A. Dare, dispelled any doubts about why the marines had landed in Santo Domingo. Briefing newsmen, he said that American forces would remain there long enough "to keep this a non-Communist government." But the official story at the Santo Domingo Embassy and in Washington continued to be that the troops had gone ashore to provide safety during the evacuation.

That Thursday evening Tap Bennett briefed the group of newsmen who had come ashore from the *Boxer*. He told them that there was evidence of Communist domination in the rebel movement, then distributed typewritten copies of a list of 54 Communists or Communist sympathizers who, Bennett said, were active in the rebel leadership.

Simultaneously the Embassy cabled Washington the text of a rebel leaflet that called for a fight "to death" against the Wessin forces. It was signed by eight rebel leaders,

beginning with Colonel Caamaño. The Embassy message, signed by Bennett, said that two of the signers might have Communist connections but that no information was available about the others. In Washington, State Department officials began hinting to newsmen, on the strength of the Bennett telegram, that seven or eight of the top rebel leaders might be Communist-oriented.

Bennett also told newsmen that night of rebel atrocities—of several heads paraded on pikes, of mass executions, and of how Colonel Caamaño personally had machinegunned Colonel Calderón, the aide-de-camp to President Reid Cabral. The reporters had no reason to doubt Bennett's accounts, which were also being cabled to Washington.

But it subsequently developed that none of these reports was accurate. Nobody could be found in the rebel zone—where reporters went but Embassy officials did not—to confirm the stories of executions or of heads on pikes. Colonel Calderón emerged a few days later at a hospital with a slight neck wound received at the palace during the first day of the revolution. A newsmen had a beer with him later on.

As days passed it became evident that, deliberately or because of faulty information, the Embassy was passing out inaccurate reports. One evening an official State Department spokesman announced that the Embassy had received the intelligence that Colonel Caamaño had met with five Communist leaders the night before and promised them cabinet posts if the revolution succeeded. If it failed, Caamaño was supposed to have said, he would negotiate safe conduct out of the country for them. The spokesman did not have the names of the leaders, and several days later he acknowledged that the Embassy was not at all sure of this information.

At his staff meetings, Bennett referred to the rebels as "that Communist scum" or "that bunch downtown." Requests from Dominican professional groups—businessmen, lawyers, doctors, and engineers—for contacts with the Embassy to explain their contention that the "constitutional" revolution was not Communist, were not granted. When a reporter asked Bennett if he did not fear that this policy of isolating the rebels might push them into Communist hands, he replied, "They are already in Communist hands."

This was also the quickly reached conclusion of John Bartlow Martin, the former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic during the Bosch regime whom President Johnson sent to Santo Domingo to establish contact with the rebels and to take a fresh look at the situation. Martin, who had the reputation of being a liberal and had many friends in Bosch's P.R.D., spent an afternoon conferring at the Caamaño command post and immediately announced at a news conference that the revolution had been taken over by Communists. He said flatly that all "democratic elements have been destroyed." But neither Martin nor the Embassy is known to have made any effort to encourage democrats against the Communists. For 10 days there were no further contacts between the United States and the rebels. The Embassy clearly demonstrated partiality for the forces of the junta—which it began to call "the Government of National Reconstruction."

To head this "government," the Embassy picked Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, one of two survivors of the group that killed Trujillo. To assist General Imbert, the United States made available \$750,000 on May 9 to pay the salaries of public employees in areas not under rebel control. No similar offer was made to Colonel Caamaño.

Santo Domingo was a city governed by confusion. While the United States was still

proclaiming "strict neutrality," technicians from the U.S. Information Agency and the CIA jammed the rebel radio station. Newsmen and television cameramen recorded truckloads of Imbert troops passing freely through American checkpoints en route to battle the rebels.

On the rebel side, Colonel Caamaño's announcers vilified Ambassador Bennett in the worst imaginable terms. Snipers, who according to Caamaño were not under his control, fired nightly at American positions, often causing casualties. Amid all the confusion, an Organization of American States team negotiated a shaky truce on May 5.

The Johnson administration determined that a new approach might be needed to bring matters to a settlement, and that the reporting and the recommendations from Bennett and Martin were no longer adequate. In the same way that Martin had been sent in because of doubts about Tap Bennett's reporting, McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, was dispatched to reinforce Martin. With him came the State Department's two top Latin experts, Mann and Vaughn.

Just before the Bundy mission's arrival, Imbert aircraft broke the OAS-arranged truce. Guns blazing, they made strafing runs on rebel-held Radio Santo Domingo. In making their approach, the planes roared over the Embassy, spraying bullets into adjoining streets. Tap Bennett and many of his aids dived under their desks, the Ambassador shouting, "I shall protest this."

For reasons never explained, Bundy's presence in Santo Domingo was kept secret for 12 hours while officials denied that he and other high-ranking envoys were there. Newsmen were now barred from the Embassy building, largely because the small, green-shuttered structure was so full of generals and top-level "special guests" that it was almost impossible to move about inside or find privacy for confidential conversations.

Bundy's mission was to negotiate a compromise constitutional government. Selected to head it was Antonio Guzmán, the former agriculture minister under Dr. Bosch and the man reportedly received so coolly by Second Secretary Brelsky on that first Sunday of the revolution. Guzmán's name was suggested by Bosch, whom Bundy had stopped off to consult in San Juan. He was basically acceptable to the United States and to the Caamaño command. The only remaining problem was to win General Imbert's agreement to resign in favor of the compromise candidate.

It was not a small problem. When Under Secretary Mann suggested to Imbert that he resign, Imbert flatly refused. He told the Americans that since the United States had helped him to become the head of the junta, he now intended to keep the post. To do otherwise, he said, would be "to turn everything over to the Communists." General Imbert told reporters, "I won't be played for a sucker." One reporter described the situation by writing, "General Imbert is the U.S. puppet who is pulling his own strings."

It was at this time that Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, commander of U.S. military forces, had to order half of the marine howitzers—which had until now been aimed at the rebel stronghold downtown—turned around to face Imbert's troop emplacements. Some of Palmer's troops appeared to be confused about their mission, and some wondered where the enemy was.

During the Guzmán-Bundy negotiation and while the OAS-arranged truce was still in effect, the Imbert forces mounted another offensive against the rebels, this time in the northern section of Santo Domingo. Imbert's tanks and artillery made a full-scale

assault that cost hundreds of Dominican lives, mainly of women and children.

The rebels could not counter Imbert's attack in the north because the U.S.-controlled security corridor, bisecting the city from east to west, kept them hemmed in downtown. At one stage the United States prepared to open another corridor, running north from the rebel area, to halt the Imbert advance. But this idea, advocated by Bundy, was vetoed in Washington. At the embassy, Under Secretary Mann said that he hoped Castro would recognize the Caamaño regime and prove once and for all that the rebels were Communist-oriented.

Then "the Guzmán formula"—for which Bundy had worked for 10 days with all the prestige of his White House post—collapsed on orders from Washington. The FBI had intercepted a telephone conversation between Dr. Bosch and a friend. The conversation reportedly included a statement that if the Guzmán regime were installed there could be a new government in 5 days. About this time the State Department sent a memorandum to the White House recalling that in 1933 the United States had been accused of imposing a government on Cuba and that the Johnson administration should beware of opening itself to such a charge.

The breakdown of the Bundy-Guzmán negotiation marked, for many of those on the rebel side, the end of hopes for a "constitutional" regime. The Imbert regime was allowed to go on consolidating its position in the governmentless country, while another OAS commission, the second inter-American group to try mediation, arrived in Santo Domingo to seek a settlement.

On the day before his return to Washington, 5 weeks after the United States found it had a tiger by the tail, Bundy arranged to meet with Colonel Caamaño and his associates. It was to be their first encounter, for the rebel chief had canceled an appointment a week earlier when one of his top aides was killed by gunfire, apparently shot by U.S. troops manning the security corridor. The meeting place was to be the Musée Conservatoire, a modern white building on a seaside boulevard in the no man's land between the marine and rebel lines. Arriving there at 3:45 p.m., Bundy and his associates found the building locked, but assumed that Colonel Caamaño's men had made arrangements to have the conservatory opened. It turned out, however, that Colonel Caamaño had made a like assumption. After unsuccessfully trying to find an open door or window, one of the rebels produced a knife and pried loose some window panes. Chairs were brought into position and the two delegations climbed in through the window.

The meeting lasted 4 hours, with Bundy using his fluent Spanish in the conference. Near the end of the session, violent gunfire broke out not far from the conservatory. Swearing in anger, Colonel Caamaño rushed to telephone his forces to stop firing. Bundy hurried for a phone to contact U.S. commanders. But there was no telephone in the building.

It might be said that the missing telephone symbolized the entire Dominican tragedy, where there was a general breakdown in communications between Americans and Dominicans attempting to end the civil war without further loss of life, and where no formula seemed to offer a peaceful solution. It may be that there was no alternative to the U.S. intervention in Santo Domingo, but the 5 weeks I spent there at the height of the crisis failed to convince me that there was a real risk of "another Cuba." As exiled President Juan Bosch, sitting out his country's agony in Puerto Rico, observed sadly, "Perhaps the United States should have taken a chance with Dominican democracy."

THE VISION LETTER

(The weekly analysis of Latin American affairs)

The Dominican crisis hangs like a dark cloud over the upcoming second special Inter-American Conference of Foreign Ministers, scheduled for Rio on August 4. The longer the Caribbean deadlock endures, the more prejudicial it becomes. The U.S. unilateral intervention, the subsequent creation of an Inter-American Peace Force and the de facto OAS trusteeship have raised fundamental questions which completely overshadow the agenda, mostly pegged to reorganizational and economic matters.

Lacking a consensus on the OAS role in the Dominican Republic, some members tried to postpone the meeting. However, Brazil, with important elections around the corner, pressed for holding the meeting on schedule and received key support from Argentina and Chile. Now, rumors of postponement, which seem unfounded at the moment, are on the wing again.

Washington had hoped that Rio would be a forum to discuss the setting up of a permanent inter-American police force to deal with Communist flareups, and President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and OAS Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker all talked it up. But the kickback has been so strong that the idea has been quietly put aside, for the moment at least.

As a sign of Latin American discontent over the Dominican affair, Secretary General José A. Mora came under some sharp questioning from OAS ambassadors last week at a closed-door briefing he defended himself well, but still he was under the gun for such picaresque consideration as unfurling an inter-American flag in Santo Domingo without authorization. Chilean President Eduardo Frei gave a foretaste of the kind of talk which may be heard in Rio when he stated in Paris this week: "We want an inter-American system without hegemony."

To avoid polemics, some nations would like to make the Rio conference as short as possible. Such questions as an inter-American force would be thrown into some future conference called to amend the OAS Charter. Events in the Dominican Republic have been no help. Loose ends keep appearing after the mediators reportedly have bagged a solution. The whole involvement has stretched the OAS to the limit, and Secretariat officials find themselves deeply immersed in a myriad of unfamiliar tasks in Santo Domingo. Technically speaking, the OAS may have two conferences on the fire simultaneously next August. In addition to the Rio conference, the tenth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers, convoked to handle the Dominican explosion, is in force until the crisis is solved.

MIDWESTERN STATES REFUSE TO BACK ROTTEN BOROUGH AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the indications are growing every day that the rotten borough amendment is losing ground not only in the Senate but in the country. One after another columnists, editorial writers, and other leaders of public opinion are recognizing the grave dangers which the rotten borough amendment poses to our democratic system. Perhaps the most significant indication that the rotten borough amendment is losing support throughout the country is the fact that the Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments refused to adopt a resolution

calling for the passage of Senator DIRKSEN's proposed amendment.

According to a report in the Washington Post of July 22, the Dirksen amendment failed for lack of a majority in the 12-member Council of State Governments just as it failed for lack of a majority in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Washington Post reports that 6 of the 12 Midwestern States favored the resolution calling on Congress to approve the rotten borough amendment. But six States refused to lend their consent to this resolution. Three of these six—Indiana, Iowa, and Michigan—voted against the resolution. Three others—Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois—abstained. I find it highly significant that the minority leader's own State should fail to endorse his proposed constitutional amendment and that his proposal should fail to carry in the heartland of this great country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be inserted in the Record at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1965]
MIDWESTERN STATES FAIL TO ASK APPORTIONING AMENDMENT

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—A resolution asking Congress to submit a Constitutional amendment allowing one house of State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population failed by one vote yesterday at the closing session of a conference of 12 midwestern States.

Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio and North and South Dakota voted for the resolution which needed a majority of the 12 States to carry. Indiana, Iowa, and Michigan voted no, and Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin abstained.

The delegates to the Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments voted 7 to 2 with three abstentions against a proposal to commend the U.S. Supreme Court for its one-man, one-vote rule or reapportionment.

A PARATROOPER IN VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, one of the thousands of young Americans who are defending the interests of the free world in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam is a 22-year-old paratrooper from my home city of Phoenix, Ariz.—Pfc. Jerry P. Linsner.

That this young soldier knows very well why he is fighting in that far-away Asian nation is demonstrated by a letter to the editor which he wrote to the Arizona Republic newspaper in Phoenix. The thoughts which he so eloquently expressed in that letter are like a clear fresh breeze compared to some of the juvenile demonstrations and protests by students of his age on campuses throughout the country.

In the belief that this dedicated young serviceman's letter deserves wider circulation as a forceful answer to advocates of appeasement, I ask permission to have it printed in the body of the Record.

the part of the House, to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5401) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGEE
VIETNAM IN PERSPECTIVE—WHY WE ARE THERE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday President Lyndon Johnson went to the American people to describe again the critical nature of the crisis in southeast Asia and what its dimensions require of us. He made clear two fundamental points that must be understood everywhere and by everyone. The first is that, in adversity or in success, we do not intend to abandon Vietnam to the aggressors—that we are there to stay whatever the price may be; and second that we stand ready at all times to talk to anyone in the hopes of negotiating a peaceful settlement. That these basic concepts of our policy in that troubled part of the world may become more costly, more risky, and more troubled he left no doubt. But it was a candid appraisal which no American could misread, nor from which no American would dare retreat. President Johnson made it abundantly clear, moreover, that we intend to prosecute the struggle in Vietnam within the context of stopping aggression and protecting smaller nations from their enemies outside without, on our part, resorting to general war.

The response to the President's message has been heartwarming and, in fact, very strong. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following my remarks the editorial comment appearing in this morning's Washington Post applauding the President's statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the lead editorial in today's Washington Daily News entitled "Everything That Is Necessary." The editorial commends the President for his courage and the forthrightness of his statement.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the lead editorial published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star captioned "No Surrender—No Retreat."

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McGEE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of a newspaper advertisement published by Freedom House entitled "The Silent Center Must Speak Up."

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, no one in his right mind wants war or looks upon it with a light heart—least of all the kind of dirty, ugly, brutal tactics which are an intrinsic part of guerrilla combat. Whether it be as bloody and cruel as the jungles or rice paddies of Vietnam command or a nice "clean" little crisis like Berlin or Cuba where the nerves of the giants on the political chessboard of power politics were tested by air power alone, the central issue remains the same—that of the willingness of those with power but bent upon peace to use that power in behalf of peace. History has thrust us into this role. We did not seek it. We do not want it. But the tides of change in our time have swept us up with these alternatives and these requirements. We have no choice save one. That is to forfeit both the responsibility and the opportunity for reshaping the balance of power of the new 20th century world to governments and philosophies and forces hostile to the basic principles of peace and human freedom.

The fact of American military and political power in the wake of World War II no one can deny. But the price of that power, with those attendant risks and sacrifices, would be avoided or evaded by some of our people at the present time, if they had their way. We—and we hope they—are learning, however, that the price of peace is not a cheap one and that peace does not just "happen." Both World War I and II should have taught that peace has to be waged as vigorously as we wage war. This means the willingness to risk the use of the tools of war in order to achieve the goals of peace.

It is in pursuit of this harsh fact of international life that the United States went to Vietnam in the first place. How we got there and why we must stay are better viewed and understood from the perspective of what has preceded our policy there.

For a few brief moments then, Mr. President, I would like to recast the foreign policy of the United States since World War II in the setting of stress and pressure and threat which required it and to spell out some of the conditions which shape it. For it can be seen that, against the backdrop of the cold war years, our policy in Vietnam is but another logical and necessary commitment within the same framework of national interest and international responsibility as were Iran, Greece, Berlin, Korea, and—in one sense—even Cuba.

Ever since the end of the Second World War the United States has followed two general lines of foreign policy at one and the same time. There is nothing inconsistent in this. Indeed, we could not avoid it, for we faced a world with a split personality.

On the one hand, the world has been made one by the discoveries of scientists and the inventions of technicians.

The old barriers of space and time which once cut off nations one from the other had been wiped out. The industrial revolution and the agricultural revolution and the power revolution and the revolutions in communications and

transport together have given us the means to conquer the environment and to raise standards of living to levels of decency throughout the planet—to liberalize and to humanize life for all mankind.

Plainly the way to deal with this world of new opportunity—of progress and color and excitement—was the way of international cooperation.

Our Nation rose splendidly to the challenge of the world of opportunity. We did well in matching scientific invention with social invention. We invented the Marshall plan. We invented the point four program. We launched the AID program and the Alliance for Progress and food for peace and atoms for peace and the Peace Corps, to cite a few examples.

We have shared our resources and our technology and our know-how. We have cooperated with all who would cooperate with us.

And we have organized for permanent cooperation in this world of opportunity in one way after another. We are members in good standing of every useful international organization in the world. We send delegations to almost every international conference—and there are half a thousand of them every year. We participate in cooperative regional organizations wherever it is appropriate for us to do so. We take part in the World Bank and the International Development Agency and the Inter-American Bank and have offered to do the same in the Asian Development Bank.

We have lent more support and provided more leadership in the United Nations than has any other member. And not just in the Security Council. Not just in the General Assembly. As the whole family of United Nations agencies has come into being and then gone into operation, the United States has been in the forefront of the initiators, the contributors and the leading supporters of these agencies in which the nations share their resources and talents cooperatively to help make good the opportunities opened up by science and technology.

I could go on and on with examples. Taken together they comprise the first line of our postwar foreign policy. We have done all this partly out of compassion and partly out of enlightened self-interest; for the cooperative path is the path to peace and order, to progress and justice, in a world made one by science.

But alas, Mr. President, these actions—this preferred course of our leaders and our people—could not be the whole of our foreign policy. For there was another aspect of the world which had to be dealt with too—another face to world affairs. This was the face of danger, of threat, of force, of violence, and of war.

This face of the world was not designed by us; it was designed by others. By the very nature of our society we could only react to it. But to defend our society—and our kind of society elsewhere—and the very hope of our kind of society anywhere—we were obligated to react to it. And we did. Taken together our reactions to force and the

July 29, 1965

threat of force make up the second general line of our postwar foreign policy.

When our offer to turn over to the United Nations full control of the dangerous aspects of atomic energy was rejected by the Soviet Union—in one of the most tragic decisions in history—we had no choice but to build up an arsenal of nuclear weapons.

And when it became indisputably evident that our wartime Russian ally was more imperialist than the czars, we organized to defend ourselves and our friends—and indeed all who were prepared to resist aggression to preserve their national independence.

That policy was laid down for all the world to see in this very Chamber on March 12, 1947, by President Harry S. Truman. It is well worthwhile to recall here today the key passage of that historic proposal which came to be known as the Truman doctrine. The President pointed out that the survival of Greece was threatened by terrorists led by Communists—that Greece must have our assistance—that there was no other place to turn except the United States—that the future of Turkey as an independent state likewise was threatened. And then the President enunciated the policy he was recommending to the Congress and the people in these words:

I am fully aware of the broad implications involved. * * * We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. * * *

Mr. President, I would remind Senators that when President Truman spoke the Greek Army was in no shape to put up much of a fight. The terrorists controlled most of the countryside and government forces had retreated to a shrunken area around the capital. Lines of communications were broken. Refugees from burnt-out villages were shuffling into Athens. Foreign exchange was exhausted. Prices were out of control. And a deep sense of panic infected the people.

That doctrine, laid down in this Chamber in 1947, has been in force ever since. It was tested first in Greece and Turkey. Then it was tested in Berlin. Then it was tested in Korea.

To support that doctrine has cost our Nation dearly in time and effort—yes, in treasure and in lives. But it worked. Not since Korea—15 years ago—has any nation marched its armies across another nation's frontiers.

The Truman doctrine in action taught the world that the United States meant exactly what President Harry Truman said—that we were in fact prepared “to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.”

Moreover, it taught the former masters of the Soviet Union that armed aggression simply does not work because it will not be allowed to work. That was an important—perhaps essential—lesson in the search for world peace.

But unfortunately mainland China is still in the hands of men who believe—as Mao Tse-tung has said again and again—that “all political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.” And his disciples have turned to a new form of aggression which they offer to the world behind a false face called “wars of national liberation.”

These are, of course, neither liberating nor national. They are aggressions undisguised by the fact that they begin without bugles or banners, that their agents may dress not in uniforms but in the work clothes of peasants, that they strike not at dawn but after sunset, that their tactics are not those of conventional armed forces but of nonconventional guerrilla bands.

Mr. President, the organization, training and equipping of murderers and marauders, the clandestine infiltration of such bands across international frontiers, the arts of guerrilla warfare practiced in the name of “national liberation”—this is merely the most modern form of aggression, of conquest, and of empire.

And the greatest threat to the peace of the world today lies in this insidious doctrine of wars of national liberation, this clandestine form of international aggression which is facing its climatic test in Vietnam today.

If it succeeds in Vietnam, it will be taken as proof that it can succeed elsewhere.

If it succeeds in Vietnam, it will be taken as hard evidence that militant violence is a better way to promote communism than competitive coexistence.

But if it fails in Vietnam, the policy of promoting “wars of national liberation” will be dealt a body-blow everywhere. So let us be very, very clear what may be well at stake here and now.

The world is still dangerously overstocked with atomic weapons and the threat of spreading atomic power has by no means receded. Yet it is my view that when the great atomic powers stood on the edge of that awful abyss in the Caribbean in the autumn of 1962, a tacit agreement against nuclear war took silent hold in the capitals of the nuclear powers. We have reason to hope that nuclear weapons, by their very destructiveness, have outlawed their use.

And when old-fashioned aggression with conventional arms was at last stopped dead in its tracks along the 38th parallel in Korea, one and all could see that there was no mileage left in that kind of attack against a neighboring state.

Now clandestine aggression is on trial in Vietnam. If that, too, can be shown to be futile, is it too much to hope that the day of the aggressor will be over for all time? I would not expect the sudden reform of Mao Tse-tung or Fidel Castro and some of their followers. But the evidence would be in. Armed aggression—nuclear, conventional or guerrilla—does not belong in the second half of the 20th century. There is nothing to be gained—nothing in it for anybody.

So Vietnam could well be the last chapter in the long, long story of mili-

tary conquest. The stakes could be just that high.

In any event, Mr. President, the fact that Vietnam is halfway around the world is no better reason for not standing against aggression there today than it was in Korea a decade and a half ago.

The fact that aggression in Vietnam is dressed up in the false doctrine of “wars of national liberation” does not make the Truman doctrine any less relevant than it was in 1947.

We stand in Vietnam now for the same reason we stood in Greece and Turkey. That reason is right. It is just. It is moral. And if we have the endurance—which I know we have—it will turn out as it has turned out in the past—successfully.

And let us not be deluded by Communist propaganda, or by statements made in other capitals for domestic political purposes, or by uninformed pleas from people who are genuinely frightened, that we stand exposed and isolated in Vietnam. For we are not alone in that far land.

Outside of Communist China and North Vietnam, there is hardly a nation in this world which in truth wants the United States to withdraw its support of the Republic of Vietnam. Outside of those places, there is hardly a responsible leader who does not privately hope that aggression will be stopped in Vietnam.

And more than 30 nations, in one way or another, are providing some kind of help to the Republic of Vietnam in its hour of agony. Some have provided money and relief and school supplies; some are training young Vietnamese in their own countries; some are offering technical assistance in such fields as agriculture, forestry, dairy practices, and engineering. Others have sent nurses and medical and surgical teams and mobile military hospitals. Several have sent psychological warfare experts. Military units are on the scene from Australia, New Zealand, Korea, and Thailand in addition to U.S. forces from the United States.

Whatever may be said by hostile or irresponsible critics, the world knows well what we want and do not want in Vietnam. It has been said by President Eisenhower and by President Kennedy and by President Johnson in turn. It has been said by others, including the late Adlai Stevenson. More than a year ago, on May 21, 1964, Mr. Stevenson told the Security Council of the United Nations:

The United States has no, repeat, no, national military objective anywhere in southeast Asia. U.S. policy for southeast Asia is very simple. It is the restoration of peace so that the peoples of that area can go about their own independent business in whatever associations they may freely choose for themselves without interference from the outside.

Later in the same address, Governor Stevenson stated—as others had before and have since—what is needed to bring peace to Vietnam:

There is a very easy way to restore order in southeast Asia. There is a very simple, safe way to bring about the end of U.S. military aid to the Republic of Vietnam.

Let all states in that area make and abide by the simple decision to leave their neighbors alone.

When their neighbors decide to leave them alone—as they must—there will be no fighting in southeast Asia. * * * Any time that decision can be put in enforceable terms, my Government will be only too happy to put down the burden that we have been sharing with those determined to preserve their independence. Until such assurances are forthcoming, we shall stand for the independence of free peoples in southeast Asia as we have elsewhere.

So we are not yet finished with the task faced up to by Harry Truman in 1947. We are still obliged to pursue that second general line of foreign policy which is helping others to stand against those who would impose totalitarian regimes upon them from across their borders. This has been a heavy burden and at times a lonely and thankless task.

Yet I shudder to think of what this world would look like today if the United States had not stood firm in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin and Korea, as we are standing firm in Vietnam today.

Mr. President, we have worked hard these past two decades to make the point that armed aggression no longer pays. When that point is made once again in Vietnam, it should be made once and for all.

And until it is—until the aggressor regains enough of his senses to leave the battlefield for the conference table—I shall support without reservation every effort that is needed to finish the job for good.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

THE VIETNAM POLICY

In typically Johnsonian fashion, the President supplemented his announcement of intensified American participation in the Vietnamese war with an escalation of his peace efforts. Draft calls are to be doubled in the months ahead, and there will be a rapid buildup of American fighting men in the besieged southeast Asian country. But the aim of protecting freedom and independence from Communist aggression without resort to general war remains the same.

The President made another graceful appeal to the United Nations to exert whatever influence it can to halt the aggression in Vietnam. At the same time he offered to discuss Hanoi's proposals along with our own and those of any other interested nation that may care to sit down at a conference table. His sincere desire to substitute the conference table for the battlefield took away any suggestion of belligerence that might otherwise have been read into the announcement of expanding military operations.

The gist of what the President had to say is that the United States places such a high value on peace that it is willing to fight for it. The spread of Asian communism by terror and slaughter is the antithesis of both peace and freedom. The United States has attempted to provide a shield against this menace. It is now called upon to demonstrate that this shield is not an illusion.

We do not see how President Johnson could have explained the necessity of the U.S. course in Vietnam more effectively than he did:

"If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise of protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would impair the security of the United States itself.

"We just cannot now dishonor our word

or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam."

The President's reference to "Asian communism" doubtless holds special significance. His exclusion of the Russians from his comments was an indirect appeal for Moscow's understanding of why we must do what we are doing. The Soviet Union shares at least some of the alarm in the West over the openly belligerent and recklessly aggressive course of Communist China and the Hanoi government. President Johnson seemed to be saying to Moscow that the United States is doing everything possible to avoid a general war and that the two major nuclear powers have a common interest in not allowing this Asian Communist brushfire to get out of hand for want of a rational confrontation at a conference table.

Within the United States, we surmise that the response to the President's speech will be overwhelmingly favorable. Despite the innate hatred of war, most of the people are aware of the kind of world we live in. They appear to be reconciled to a hard struggle in a faraway land because of the close relation it has to the preservation of our own freedom. Many of those who are committed to the general policy, however, retain some concern over the way it is being carried out.

One would hope that much of the discussion in the White House conferences of the last week has been given to effective employment of the additional manpower and equipment that are flowing to Vietnam. It is not enough merely to build up larger forces and the volume of supplies. With the extension of military might in Vietnam, there will be increasing need for wise decisions and sound strategy. This perceptive statement on the part of the President also greatly strengthens confidence that he will be as firm in pushing for a rational settlement as he has been in trying to teach the Communists that peace cannot be bought with terror and aggression.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Daily News, July 29, 1965]

EVERYTHING THAT IS NECESSARY

At his televised press conference yesterday, President Johnson was about as clear as anyone could be about why we are in Vietnam and what we propose to do about it.

We are there, in short, because we have to be. Our national security is at stake. If we have learned anything in our frustrating and costly experience with communism the last 20 years, it is that nonresistance is the quickest way to our own downfall.

And what we are going to do about Communist terrorism and aggression in Vietnam is everything that is necessary. This may be a lot. To start, the President is doubling the draft and immediately adding 50,000 troops to our forces in Vietnam.

These are the choices forced upon us.

Every retreat from Communist attack has resulted in defeat, in more peoples losing their freedom. Every evidence of weakness merely has served to egg on the Communists.

The President spoke of commitments of three Presidents to defend Vietnam. But even more essential is our national interest—for if we should quit Vietnam we retreat a long step toward subjugation of our own freedoms to Communist domination.

All that we have built in this country, and all that we hope to build, would be jeopardized. We are fighting, even though in a distant land, for our own security.

Mr. Johnson said he had asked the commander in Vietnam what he needs to meet the situation, and that these needs will be met.

The only question here is whether enough is to be done now.

For many months we have hoped the drag-

ging war in Vietnam would lead to a negotiation table. That hope has been grounded.

There are risks in whatever we do. But the risks if we do not stop the Vietcong are far greater, in terms of our own safety, than the risks in using our power (all of it, if necessary) to force a decision in South Vietnam.

It is, as the President said, agonizing. But that's the way it is. We didn't make the situation. But it is up to us, primarily, to settle it, as completely and as rapidly as possible.

It is war, and let every American see it as such.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Evening Star, July 29, 1965]

NO SURRENDER—NO RETREAT

The President's report to the Nation on Vietnam was perhaps his best performance since taking office.

He was careful to explain—again—why we are fighting in Vietnam. It boils down to this: First we have made a commitment there which we will not dishonor. Second, to let Vietnam go would merely whet the appetite of the aggressors. If we do not see this fight through, we will surely have to fight later under even less favorable conditions at some other place.

Mr. Johnson also—again—held forth the olive branch. He said he would welcome any effective intervention by the United Nations. He repeated his readiness to go to the conference table at any time. Our goal, he stressed, is a free election, internationally supervised, "in the south, or throughout all Vietnam." In short, our record in this respect is as clear as clear can be—for anyone who wants to read it.

Some disappointment has been expressed because the military buildup announced by Mr. Johnson stopped short of what, in one view, is needed. An additional 50,000 American troops will be sent immediately to South Vietnam. But the buildup will not stop at that level. "Additional forces will be needed later," the President said, "and they will be sent." He is not now calling up the Reserves, although the implication is plain that this, too, will be done if and when needed. The monthly draft call is to be raised at once from 15,000 to 35,000—presumably in preparation for the time when more units will be shipped to the battle scene. Taken together, these measures are a significant enlargement of the effort that we are making and will make.

Everything will depend upon the reaction of the other side. The President sought to allay apprehensions by saying that "nothing we have in mind should arouse any distrust or provoke any violence" by the Soviet Union. The only immediate response has been a Moscow radio broadcast, in French, which was monitored in London. It said that the United States is taking a "colossal risk" in boosting its strength in Vietnam.

The President, however, had already given the appropriate answer: "We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences no one can foresee. Nor will we bluster or bully or flout our power. But we will not surrender. And we will not retreat."

Well said.

EXHIBIT 4

THE SILENT CENTER MUST SPEAK UP

"I hope that others who feel as you do may be willing to join in this expression." (From President Johnson's letter to Freedom House.)

The defense of our Government's efforts in South Vietnam should not be left solely to the President or to officials of the administration. The critics of the President have had the field to themselves. This monolog is a disservice to the American people. The great majority of our people have been

July 29, 1965

silent too long; their voices must now be heard.

The distorted picture of American public opinion given by the critics has undoubtedly affected the decisions of the Communist rulers in Hanoi and Peiping. Few of these rules have ever visited Western countries; they do not realize that the strength of the small ad hoc groups calling for American withdrawal from Vietnam is grossly exaggerated. This misunderstanding has impeded the administration's effort to achieve a durable peace. The notion that the American people are gravely divided against their leaders has helped to create the illusion that in the end the United States would capitulate to the aggressor.

It is not surprising that a recent full-page advertisement, signed by several hundred artists and seeking to persuade the country to abandon the defense of South Vietnam, included the names of avowed Communists—men whose articles have appeared in the Communist Worker and whose books are official Communist publications. But more noteworthy is the long list of those others who are not Communists and have nevertheless added their signatures; believing they are striking a blow for peace, they have allowed themselves to become parties to an insidious propaganda campaign.

One of the many things the advertisement forgot to mention is that both Peiping and Moscow have rejected all appeals for negotiations by our President, by United Nations Secretary General U Thant, by the mediation committee of the 17 nonaligned Afro-Asian nations, and others.

We believe most Americans know that if aggression against South Vietnam—disguised as a war of liberation—is not successfully resisted, more aggression and perhaps even larger scale war will follow. That is the lesson of Ethiopia. That is the lesson of Munich.

We believe that at this moment of peril and challenge the American people would like to see their real views proclaimed in a forthright declaration of national unity. This is why Freedom House offers the following credo of support for our national purpose in Vietnam:

1. Our withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances cannot be sustained on moral grounds. Such a decision would be morally indefensible. Having freely accepted responsibility as a world power and a champion of freedom, the United States would dishonor that role by defaulting on its promises and commitments. Such default would not only abandon men, women, and children to cruel reprisals; it would seriously undermine the credibility of our commitments to other nations.

2. The decision to halt Communist aggression—whether in Vietnam, Laos, or the Congo—is clearly in the interest of the United States and the other nations of the free world.

3. We welcome the recognition of a common interest which has prompted Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea to take an active part in the present struggle. We hope other allies will join in the defense of the free world areas threatened by Communist "wars of national liberation."

4. The United States is not embarked on a military crusade against Communist nations. Our record in dealing with the Iron Curtain nations of Europe and living peaceably with their Communist-controlled societies is our credential.

5. It is equally important to recognize that our military effort is only part of the substantial U.S. program to enlarge the economic, social, and political future of the Vietnamese people.

6. We regret the world is still racked by force rather than run by reason. But we also see no hope for reason until the force of lawlessness is checked. Our troops and arms

are not mere engines of destruction; they are instruments of prevention. We mean to use them as judiciously as possible. But we do mean to use them effectively.

There is nothing new in what we confront today, either in the challenge from the aggressor or in the timid voices that would yield. Nor is there any blinking the fact that the necessary responses are both difficult and dangerous. The very nature of the great challenges we as a nation must face requires not only wise decisions but prompt and effective action. We believe the present policy of the United States meets these tests and deserves the wholehearted support of the American people.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1771. An act to establish a 5-day workweek for postmasters, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6022. An act to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; and

H.R. 6875. An act to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary medical benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I feel compelled at this time to question a statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] on the floor of the Senate on September 15, 1964, during the last days of the 88th Congress, concerning the effects of the Supreme Court ruling on reapportionment.

It is quite possible that in the last few hectic moments of discussion prior to the vote on the so-called Javits-Humphrey-McCarthy modified amendment on reapportionment during that session, the implications contained in the short speech by my distinguished colleague were not fully grasped nor understood.

I believe that it is highly imperative that the statement be challenged in order to have the record set straight. This is especially so in the light of the new move to push through the constitutional amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator of Illinois, an amendment designed to continue malapportionment in our various State legislatures.

If Senators recall, my colleague stated that "the logical extension of the Supreme Court's decision would be an amendment to the U.S. Constitution or a Supreme Court decision requiring re-

apportionment of the U.S. Senate on the basis of population in spite of the prohibition that no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate under article V."

Drawing upon rather questionable logic and upon even more questionable constitutional interpretation, my colleague was led to remark that ultimately small States such as Hawaii would be deprived of representation in the U.S. Senate. By the Senator's own logic and interpretation, the list could conceivably have included some score or more of the other smaller States of the Union.

I most respectfully feel that the statement by the senior Senator from Hawaii is a rather misleading one.

First, even a superficial reading of the reapportionment cases decided by the Supreme Court would show that it specifically excluded the theory of representation underlying the U.S. Senate from the principle of one-man, one-vote as applied to State legislatures. There is no question in the Court's mind that the Senate of the United States would always have two Senators representing each State of the Union, regardless of size or population. The point made by the Court is that this Federal form of representation cannot be extended to State legislatures which often over-represent rural areas and under-represent metropolitan areas.

For example, the city of Honolulu, containing more than 80 percent of the State of Hawaii's population, is very much underrepresented in the Hawaii State Legislature. The decision would, in effect, redress that imbalance.

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, in delivering the opinion of the majority in Reynolds against Sims, June 15, 1964, stated:

Much has been written since our decision in *Baker v. Carr* about the applicability of the so-called Federal analogy to State legislative apportionment arrangements. After considering the matter, the Court below concluded that no conceivable analogy could be drawn between the Federal scheme and the apportionment of seats in the Alabama Legislature under the proposed constitutional amendment. We agree with the District Court, and find the Federal analogy inapposite and irrelevant to State legislative districting schemes. Attempted reliance on the Federal analogy appears often to be little more than an after-the-fact rationalization offered in defense of maladjusted State apportionment arrangements. And the Founding Fathers clearly had no intention of establishing a pattern or model for the apportionment of seats in State legislatures when the system of representation in the Federal Congress was adopted. . . . The system of representation in the two Houses of the Federal Congress is one ingrained in our Constitution, as part of the law of the land. It is one conceived out of compromise and concession indispensable to the establishment of our Federal Republic. Arising from unique historical circumstances, it is based on the consideration that in establishing our type of federalism a group of formerly independent States bound themselves together under one National Government.

That is what the Supreme Court said. How can we possibly infer from this that the Court may ultimately require reapportionment of the U.S. Senate on the basis of population?

Wisconsin is a real one, but I am convinced that it can be solved, especially if it is a choice between increasing capacity and letting millions starve.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I am pleased to yield to the outstanding expert on Food For Peace in this country, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his overly generous words.

The Senator from Minnesota has delivered the finest statement I have heard on challenge of world hunger and what our response to that challenge ought to be.

The Senator has described in moving terms the world food gap. I regard it as the most important single problem in the world today. I use those words advisedly. If we cannot figure out some way to deal with the problem that faces half of all the people on this globe today—and that is the problem of adequate food, either too little food or the wrong kind of food—we are in for very serious times.

Human hunger, human misery and disease, all of which are interconnected, are at the bottom of a good many of the tensions, instability, and explosive situations that exist all over the world.

The Senator from Minnesota is addressing himself to an absolutely crucial problem. It is crucial from a moral standpoint. It is crucial from a political standpoint. It is crucial from an economic standpoint.

The Senator has also described in effective terms the rough outline of what ought to be our response to that problem, which is to harness the bountiful productive capacity in this country—capacity that we have been trying to idle at great expense to our taxpayers—and put that bounty to work in the cause of health and peace all over the world.

I fully appreciate, as does the Senator from Minnesota, that until we find a more effective way of using this food overseas, we must have some kind of control program at home to keep the surpluses from destroying our agricultural economy.

The time has come, however, particularly if we look at the dwindling food reserves in this country, to do what the Senator from Minnesota recommends today, and that is to take an imaginative and careful look at the possibility of using our ability to produce to take care of the needs of hungry people overseas.

Today I was talking with one of the world's leading nutritionists, Dr. Zabrel. He told me that there are now 3 million children who will die before the end of this year because of malnutrition or outright hunger; and that rate has continued annually for some time.

It may be that the cause of death is not listed as hunger. It may be that a child will be said to have died from chickenpox, influenza, or any one of the diseases that take the lives of children all over the world, but the reason children die from those diseases—diseases youngsters in this country would throw off—is that they are so undernourished and poorly fed that they have no resistance.

If today the American people were told that 3 million children were about to die because of some dramatic catastrophe, perhaps an earthquake or famine or flood, they would respond quickly.

We would do everything we could. We would have our globemasters flying food to them. We would make our military forces available to help distribute it. We would bring ships out of the mothball fleet and do whatever we could to make that food available.

But we do not see the silent death occurring all over the world. Millions of men, women, and children drag out their lives undernourished and underfed, dying premature deaths, not being able to make a contribution to society because of the lack of energy that stems from bad diet. It is to that question that we must address ourselves as a nation that has been blessed and can produce food beyond our own needs.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for helping to open up this subject on the floor of the Senate. This is really the kind of war we ought to fight. We can win a war against hunger. It is the kind of war the United States is better equipped to fight than any country in world history.

The challenge is greater to meet than in the past.

I welcome the opportunity to join the Senator from Minnesota in the magnificent effort he has made in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MONDALE. I am highly grateful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his comments. He is universally regarded as the Nation's leader in this great fight. He was the first Food for Peace Director, receiving one of the first appointments made by the late President Kennedy, and thus he was responsible for shaping much of today's program. Incidentally, he incorporated many new and creative ideas in the use of food to help children, to help build roads and schools by using food for wages, and to expand and encourage the participation of private charitable and religious organizations in food distribution. Our Nation will forever be indebted to him for his contributions, and also for the literature that he has written. This literature has helped more than that from the pen of any other man to develop this Nation's understanding of the great problem which we confront in facing what can only be described as a hunger explosion.

The point that the Senator from South Dakota has made about seeing for the first time this silent hunger, as he so aptly described it, is the very core of the problem. If we have a neighbor down the street who is starving, everyone responds. If people in American society are starving, and we see it, we respond without question. It is what a decent person does without question. If there is a disaster overseas—an earthquake, a tornado—time and time again our Nation has responded without question to make available any resources we have to help those people in their hour of need. What is different with this silent hunger; this hunger that takes the lives of at least 10,000 people a day? It

is silent; it is unseen; it is unknown. And it is not only death that we must prevent; we must relieve bodies and minds from malnutrition, not merely in the thousands, but in the millions.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator knows that one of the unfortunate, permanent aspects of malnutrition is that when a youngster lives out the period of life after weaning until he is perhaps 5 or 6 years old, with a bad diet, a diet lacking in protein, minerals, and vitamins, there is nothing that can be done in later life to correct the permanent damage that has been done to the physical and emotional life of the child. That youngster will be warped for the rest of his life. The most critical period is from the age of 1, after the child has been weaned, until he is 6 or 7 years old.

One of the reasons why it is critical is that the child at that age is not old enough to fight for his share of the food that is available. There is a mistaken notion in many underdeveloped countries that the father ought to have the major share of the food because he is working in the field and is doing the physical labor. The mother will carefully set aside the largest portion of food for the father.

Actually, it is the little child that suffers the greatest damage; it is the child, more than adults, that requires the most food and requires a balanced diet. So what we are talking about here is perhaps most acutely the problem of children.

The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct in saying that if the American people had their way about solving this problem, they would perhaps be ahead of Congress. The American people are generous, moral people. What they need is more aggressive leadership from Congress and more aggressive leadership from our policymakers downtown. They will quickly respond to the kind of program that will harness our abundance in the cause of peace and freedom.

I feel certain that the Senator's distinguished predecessor, who is now the Vice President of the United States, and who in many respects is the father of the food-for-peace program, a man who stood on the floor of the Senate 10, 12, and 15 years ago, talking about the possibility of greater use of our food abundance overseas, would be proud to hear the junior Senator from Minnesota, his successor, speak out as he has done today.

Mr. MONDALE. I deeply appreciate the Senator's kind comment. I cannot imagine a program in which more interests of Americans converge than this. It is not merely our moral responsibility, which, in my opinion, ought to be enough. But we stand as the richest Nation in the world, the major surplus-food-producing nation in the world, with incredible unused agricultural productive power and surpluses being held at Government expense, while thousands of people starve and millions have stunted physical and mental growth because of malnutrition. I do not believe we can live in that kind of world and respond in that way without being hated, just as our neighbor would hate

18174

us if we did not help him when he was starving.

Second, at a time when we are in a titanic struggle with the forces of communism and other forces of dictatorship for the minds of men, surely we must know that it is hunger, illiteracy, disease, and poverty together which are our main enemies. It is the desperate acts of frustrated people who reach out for fanatical leaders that are our major problems. The use of American food in an enlightened, creative manner, and in the fullest sense, can help to destroy the very basis of our major enemy.

Third, if we would use our best agricultural productive power to help to meet the needs of the people of the world for food, we would give to our agricultural economy the lift it desperately needs.

Any Senator who represents a farm population cannot help being struck by the fact that farm people are fine, hard-working Americans, investing their lives in their chosen profession, while receiving less than almost any other group for all they have contributed to the rest of American society. That is not fair.

In addition, by using the surpluses to help nations to get on their feet, to build strong, viable economies and, hopefully, democracies, we have already demonstrated that we can create new markets for industry and for farm products, as we have already done in Japan, Taiwan, Italy, Spain, and elsewhere.

Thus, by helping them, in the long run, we will create markets that will strengthen our economy.

Finally, I do not believe any nation, any strong Christian society such as ours, can forever ignore its moral responsibilities and remain fat in a starving world. We cannot fail to respond to the growing voice of humanity crying out for enough food to survive and get started.

For all these reasons, I believe the time has come for our Nation to open its eyes and to take the steps necessary to be the kind of compassionate, humane Nation that I believe we can and must be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

PEARSON IS MISTAKEN ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, what I am about to do is not a pleasant task. It is probably not a wise task for anyone engaged in politics.

Two of the outstanding columnists and the most widely read and respected columnists in the country are Walter Lippmann and Drew Pearson.

Drew Pearson supplies something that is very badly needed. He is a muckraker. He does an excellent job. He exposes scandals and situations involving weakness, inefficiency, incompetency, and dishonesty in our Government. He is a columnist who is widely read in my State.

I regard him as a man of great integrity and ability, as a man of compassion, and a fine human being.

Like everyone else, Drew Pearson can be mistaken. It seems to me that in his column of Tuesday, July 27, he was very much in error in what he had to say. What he had to say can have a most unfortunate effect, I believe, on the attitude of our people toward the war in Vietnam.

I believe that he must be answered.

Pearson made a series of statements about the situation in Saigon. I was deeply concerned about those statements.

I have sought, through my staff, to discuss the matter with members of the executive branch and the various departments to find out what the facts are, or what our most competent and knowledgeable people understand them to be.

One of the assertions made by Drew Pearson was as follows:

The South Vietnamese Army is suffering from such wholesale desertions that it is risky to arm it. The arms go over to the Vietcong.

There is no evidence that the desertion rate is up. It has been fairly constant for years and is related generally to such factors as low pay or no pay, poor commanders, difficulty of fighting, and unpleasant conditions.

In the southeast Asian context, the desertion rate is not abnormally high. The Vietcong desertion rates, on the other hand, may very well be higher. However, this is very difficult to judge or to measure.

The better index of the Vietnamese fortitude is casualties suffered by South Vietnamese armed forces: 26,000 have been killed in action in the past 4 years, and 51,000 have been wounded.

In relation to population, this is 10 times the rate of loss the United States of America suffered in Korea, and it is substantially above our total losses in World War II.

The South Vietnamese have fought and endured for a long time. Pessimistic out-of-context emphasis on a problem like desertion gives a misleading impression.

The second assertion in Pearson's column of July 27, 1965, is:

The Saigon Government, always corrupt, always ineffective, might just as well be scrapped.

This undocumented assertion does not reflect the views of our mission in Saigon, or of policymakers in Washington. Ky himself is not known to be personally corrupt, nor was his predecessor, Dr. Quat. Certainly no one here or there believes that the present government "ought to be scrapped."

The third assertion by Drew Pearson is as follows:

American popularity once reasonably high, has nose-dived. It is now on a par with the anti-French feeling during the long civil war in French Indo-China.

Mr. President, that is nonsense. There is no evidence to support this view. All signs, except Communist propaganda, point in the opposite direction. Americans live as individuals or in small groups of two, three, or four all over Vietnam, working on AID projects, schools, in-

formation programs, and so forth, or, as military advisers. We would know quickly enough if they were no longer welcome. Quite the opposite is the case. Villagers and the local population are at pains to help and care for Americans.

The Americans are, of course, targets for the Vietcong terrorists, but the relatively low number of successful attacks against U.S. civilians proves that this Vietcong tactic does not have widespread popular support.

Americans are working and fighting with the South Vietnamese for a cause defined and supported by them—not, like the French, against the Vietnamese to maintain a fading colonial empire.

The fourth charge made by Drew Pearson was:

Sixty percent of South Vietnam is now in the hands of the Vietcong, with many villages still supposedly loyal to the government probably actually disloyal.

Mr. President, that is a misleading statistic. The Communists have varying degrees of control of substantial parts of the Vietnam land area, including much of the mountainous and less populous areas. Their control is largely negative in character. They can disrupt and harass efforts by the South Vietnamese Government to exercise governing power in such areas. They can cut roads and bomb bridges. However, their control is not positive in the sense that they could not build bridges, repair roads, or carry on the normal processes of government unless the South Vietnamese Government permitted them to do so.

The Vietcong do not have a single city or province capital.

The strength of the Vietcong, such as it is, is among the peasants and rural population, a group that, in southeast Asia, as elsewhere, even in the rural United States, is traditionally mistrustful of Central Government authority.

Communists have exposed this trust, but have not shown that they, in turn, would have the positive support of the peasants if they sought to rule.

When they try, and try to collect taxes, for example, the peasants quickly turn against them. The South Vietnamese Government has the support of virtually all the more educated people, and this is not to be written off lightly. All the major groups in South Vietnam: Catholics, Buddhists, sects, labor unions, political parties like Dai Viet—oppose the Communists. They may have their differences about the kind and complexion of government they want in Saigon, and their inability to unite behind a strong one is one of the chronic problems of South Vietnam. But this does not mean they prefer the Communist alternative.

The last assertion by Drew Pearson is that the policy of bombing North Vietnam has been a complete failure. Military supplies have continued to come down from the north.

This is not the view of Pentagon experts and others who have studied the situation. Carefully pinpoint bombing has taken out a large portion of North Vietnam's logistical and military capability, especially as it relates to the war

July 29, 1965

in the south. There is very reason to think this has made it significantly more difficult for Hanoi to supply and support the Vietcong. The shrillness of North Vietnam and Peiping propaganda—including protestations that it has not affected their will to fight—should not be taken at face value, any more than should their charges that we bomb hospitals and civilian facilities—which we have not done. North Vietnam is a tightly organized totalitarian society, with leadership concentrated in a few hands at the top. Those few, such as seasoned Communists as General Giap, Le Duan, the party theoretician, and, of course, Ho Chi Minh himself, would be unlikely to tip their hand except for a purpose. And they are under no meaningful public or popular pressure at home, since they so totally control the means of communication and personal expression. Pearson seems to have made the elementary mistake of taking Communist propaganda at its word. If North Vietnam really was not bothered by the bombing they would not devote so much of their diplomatic and propaganda effort to branding us as villains precisely because we bomb, and to trying to have pressure brought on us by other countries to make us stop.

There is one other point mentioned by Drew Pearson. He states:

The above facts show the contrast between war in Vietnam and war in Korea. In the Korean war, the United States was supported by a strong patriotic civilian population that gave full cooperation. We also had the advantage of a Korean army, much of it well trained and willing to fight. There was no problem of an enemy constantly disappearing into the jungle.

Pearson's memory in this respect is short. With all due respect to the vallant Koreans, things were not all that rosy then, either. The enemy was often hard to find, the South Koreans sometimes got tired of fighting, the ROK Army was not well trained or prepared when the war started—that was one reason North Korea invaded when they did—and to this day it is necessary for two U.S. divisions to stay there to protect Korean security and independence against further or renewed Communist encroachment. Even the origins of that war were not thought to be all that clear at the time. Has Pearson forgotten the extensive Communist effort to make it appear South Korea started the war? This is a point the Communists, by the way, have never conceded. And the charges of germ warfare against us that were so widely believed among the neutral countries? Also, granted this was a splendid example of collective security under the U.N., let us not blind ourselves in retrospect by forgetting that this too was largely a U.S. effort in terms of numbers of forces and size of military commitment.

At a time when so many of us are supporting the President in his efforts to persuade the United Nations to come into the South Vietnam situation, we should recognize that getting the U.N. involved will not be the end of our South Vietnam fighting and dying. It required a long time after the U.N. came

into Korea to end that situation. It will be a help, but of limited military help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the appropriate part of the article by Drew Pearson entitled, "Bad News From Saigon" to which I have made reference printed at this point in the Record.

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

BAD NEWS FROM SAIGON

Here is some of the distressing news from Saigon that has caused the series of White House huddles over future policy.

The South Vietnamese army is suffering from such wholesale desertions that it is risky to arm it. The arms go over to the Vietcong.

The Saigon Government, always corrupt, always ineffective, might just as well be scrapped.

American popularity, once reasonably high, has nosedived. It is now on a par with the anti-French feeling during the long civil war in French Indochina.

Sixty percent of South Vietnam is now in the hands of the Vietcong, with many villages still supposedly loyal to the Government probably actually disloyal.

The policy of bombing North Vietnam has been a complete failure. Military supplies have continued to come down from the north.

The above facts show the contrast between war in Vietnam and war in Korea. In the Korean war, the United States was supported by a strong patriotic civilian population that gave full cooperation. We also had the advantage of a Korean army, much of it well trained and willing to fight. There was no problem of an enemy constantly disappearing into the jungle.

LIPPMANN ERRORS ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, as for Walter Lippmann's criticisms, Mr. Lippmann's charges are less specific, and more generalized, but I think I can discuss them a little more briefly.

Mr. Lippmann states that no Asia or NATO nation supports us in the effort to help South Vietnam in its fight against Communist aggression. Is this the case? The answer is emphatically, "No."

Great Britain has stated its support and has a police advisory team in Vietnam. Her prior commitments in Malaysia against similar aggression precludes her doing more. She is a member of NATO. Italy, a NATO member, supports us in Vietnam. It has sent a surgical team there. West Germany, a vital NATO link, supports us. It has extended economic aid.

The Government of Japan supports this stand against Communist imperialism and has given considerable economic aid to South Vietnam. Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand support our action and have sent assistance as have Australia and New Zealand.

Lippmann then goes on to say no vital American interest is involved in the defense of Vietnam. It is not the same, he says, as when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain or when Japan threatened the whole Pacific. Mr. Lippmann ignores the fact that if the Western Powers had stood firm in such places

as the Rhineland, Munich, and Manchuria, Hitler would not have stood in sight of Britain's conquest, nor would Japan have threatened their own western coast. But, unfortunately, there were people then who said that those places were not vital. People in authority listened to these councils and we paid a terrible price. Fortunately, Mr. Lippmann's views do not command a similar following today.

South Vietnam does not want to accept Communist domination. Ten years ago this country asked us to help them avoid this fate. We said yes to this plea; now Mr. Lippmann says it was a mistake. He forgets that a lot of other countries from Japan to France have made the same request and received the same reply. These countries are now watching Vietnam to see just how much that reply was worth. The world is too small for us to make second class commitments.

This does not mean as Lippmann suggests, that we are "policeman for mankind." It does mean that we should honor our commitments to assist a small country to resist aggression. It also may mean that in some cases we will carry a substantial part of the burden of resisting such aggression, though I am confident we will continue to have the support of those everywhere who believe in peace and honest self-determination.

Vietnam is not a decisive test, says Mr. Lippmann. Again, people said this about Czechoslovakia and Manchuria.

Korea did not stop the defeat in Indochina, says Mr. Lippmann. Korea did convince the Communist world that conventional aggression was too risky. That is why they advocate now the type of aggression that won for them in Indochina in 1954. They must be made to realize that this type of aggression is also too risky. I fail to see how abandoning South Vietnam to the Communists of North Vietnam can do anything but encourage Communist regimes in North Vietnam, China, and Cuba in their belief that subversive aggression is profitable.

I agree with Mr. Lippmann that these so-called revolutionary wars are difficult to deal with. I agree that it would be nice if we could cure the vulnerabilities that the Communists exploit rather than have to use military force to counter the aggression that takes advantage of these vulnerabilities. But to build a strong, viable state takes time. When the Communists do not give the victim enough time, and resort to military aggression and subversion, then we will respond. This was the case in Greece and in Malaya. I cannot agree that we can leave to the Communists all those countries that suffer from the vulnerabilities of underdevelopment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article of July 27 by Mr. Lippmann to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

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

July 29, 1965

18176

ASIAN WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are about to pit Americans against Asians on the continent of Asia. Except for the diminishing and disintegrating South Vietnamese army, we have only token or verbal support from any Asian country. No great Asian power, Japan, India, or Pakistan, is allied with us. None of our European allies is contributing anything beyond scattered verbal support. We have no mandate from the United Nations as we had in Korea, none from NATO, none from the nations of this hemisphere.

The situation in which we find ourselves is unprecedented, and the best the administration has been able to achieve by way of approval and support from our own people is a reluctant and depressed acquiescence. For there has been no proof, not even a real attempt to prove, that the security of the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was, for example, when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain and the capture of the British fleet, or when Japan with a great navy threatened to command the whole Pacific Ocean including Hawaii and the coast of California.

Nations fight well when they are defending themselves, when, that is to say, they have a vital interest. It is the lack of an American vital interest which explains the current mood of depression and anxiety, which explains why our intervention in southeast Asia has for 10 years been so gingerly, so furtive, so inadequate.

There are in truth two main reasons why we are becoming ever more deeply involved in Vietnam. The first, much the more powerful of the two, is a proud refusal to admit a mistake, to admit the failure of an attempt, begun 10 years ago, to make South Vietnam a pro-American and anti-Chinese state. More than anything else we are fighting to avoid admitting a failure—to put it bluntly, we are fighting to save face.

There is a second reason which weighs heavily with many conscientious people. It is a respectable reason. As stated by the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday:

"We're in Vietnam at the express invitation of the Vietnamese Government; we're fighting there for the Vietnamese people. But we're fighting also for the millions of people in the other threatened lands beyond, people who haven't the power to defend

themselves from the Chinese colossus, and whose lives, safety, and freedom depend on the strong arm of the policeman—which only we can provide."

My own view is that the conception of ourselves as the solitary policeman of mankind is a dangerous form of self-delusion. The United States is quite unable to police the world, and it is dangerous to profess and pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. How many more Dominican Republics can the United States police in this hemisphere? How many Vietnams can the United States defend in Asia?

The believers in America as the world policeman get around these practical difficulties by making an assumption—that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens elsewhere in Asia, that what happens in the Dominican Republic will determine what happens all over Latin America. This notion of the decisive test is a fallacy. The Korean war, in which we successfully defended South Korea, did not determine the outcome in Indochina. What we have done in the Dominican Republic will not protect any other Latin American country from the threat of revolution.

Revolutionary wars are indeed dangerous to order and it is baffling to know how to deal with them. But we may be sure that the phenomenon of revolutionary wars, which is latent in all of the underdeveloped regions of the world, cannot be dealt with by American military intervention whenever disorder threatens to overwhelm the constituted authority. On the contrary, it is more like that in making Vietnam the test of our ability to protect Asia, we shall in fact provide revolutionary China with just the enemy it needs in order to focus popular hatred against us—a white, rich, capitalistic great power. We are allowing ourselves to be cast in the role of the enemy of the miserable and unhappy masses of the emerging nations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29, 1965:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Wood B. Kyle Norman J. Anderson
 Joseph O. Butcher Keith B. McCutcheon

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 29, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hiram R. Cancio, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 8 years.

Edmund A. Nix, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for a term expiring July 15, 1968.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to the office indicated:

Dr. Mary I. Bunting, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for term expiring May 10, 1970.

Harvey Picker, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for term expiring May 10, 1970.

assaults that cost hundreds of Dominican lives, mainly of women and children.

The rebels could not counter Imbert's attack in the north because the U.S.-controlled security corridor, bisecting the city from east to west, kept them hemmed in downtown. At one stage the United States prepared to open another corridor, running north from the rebel area, to halt the Imbert advance. But this idea, advocated by Bundy, was vetoed in Washington. At the embassy, Under Secretary Mann said that he hoped Castro would recognize the Caamaño regime and prove once and for all that the rebels were Communist-oriented.

Then "the Gusmán formula"—for which Bundy had worked for 10 days with all the prestige of his White House post—collapsed on orders from Washington. The FBI had intercepted a telephone conversation between Dr. Bosch and a friend. The conversation reportedly included a statement that if the Gusmán regime were installed there could be a new government in 5 days. About this time the State Department sent a memorandum to the White House recalling that in 1933 the United States had been accused of imposing a government on Cuba and that the Johnson administration should beware of opening itself to such a charge.

The breakdown of the Bundy-Gusmán negotiation marked, for many of those on the rebel side, the end of hopes for a "constitutional" regime. The Imbert regime was allowed to go on consolidating its position in the governmentless country, while another OAS commission, the second inter-American group to try mediation, arrived in Santo Domingo to seek a settlement.

On the day before his return to Washington, 5 weeks after the United States found it had a tiger by the tail, Bundy arranged to meet with Colonel Caamaño and his associates. It was to be their first encounter, for the rebel chief had canceled an appointment a week earlier when one of his top aides was killed by gunfire, apparently shot by U.S. troops manning the security corridor. The meeting place was to be the Museo Conservatorio, a modern white building on a seaside boulevard in the no man's land between the marine and rebel lines. Arriving there at 2:45 p.m., Bundy and his associates found the building locked, but assumed that Colonel Caamaño's men had made arrangements to have the conservatory opened. It turned out, however, that Colonel Caamaño had made a like assumption. After unsuccessfully trying to find an open door or window, one of the rebels produced a knife and pried loose some window panes. Chairs were brought into position and the two delegations climbed in through the window.

The meeting lasted 4 hours, with Bundy using his fluent Spanish in the conference. Near the end of the session, violent gunfire broke out not far from the conservatory. Swearing in anger, Colonel Caamaño rushed to telephone his forces to stop firing. Bundy scurried for a phone to contact U.S. commanders. But there was no telephone in the building.

It might be said that the missing telephone symbolized the entire Dominican tragedy, where there was a general breakdown in communications between Americans and Dominicans attempting to end the civil war without further loss of life, and where no formula seemed to offer a peaceful solution. It may be that there was no alternative to the U.S. intervention in Santo Domingo, but the 5 weeks I spent there at the height of the crisis failed to convince me that there was a real risk of "another Cuba." As called President Juan Bosch, sitting out his country's agony in Puerto Rico, observed sadly, "Perhaps the United States should have taken a chance with Dominican democracy."

THE VISTON LETTER

(The weekly analysis of Latin American affairs)

The Dominican crisis hangs like a dark cloud over the upcoming second special Inter-American Conference of Foreign Ministers, scheduled for Rio on August 4. The longer the Caribbean deadlock endures, the more prejudicial it becomes. The U.S. unilateral intervention, the subsequent creation of an Inter-American Peace Force and the de facto OAS trusteeship have raised fundamental questions which completely overshadow the agenda, mostly pegged to reorganizational and economic matters.

Lacking a consensus on the OAS role in the Dominican Republic, some members tried to postpone the meeting. However, Brazil, with important elections around the corner, pressed for holding the meeting on schedule and received key support from Argentina and Chile. Now, rumors of postponement, which seem unfounded at the moment, are on the wing again.

Washington had hoped that Rio would be a forum to discuss the setting up of a permanent inter-American police force to deal with Communist takeovers, and President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and OAS Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker all talked it up. But the kickback has been so strong that the idea has been quietly put aside, for the moment at least.

As a sign of Latin American discontent over the Dominican affair, Secretary General José A. More came under some sharp questioning from OAS ambassadors last week at a closed-door briefing he defended himself well, but still he was under the gun for such picaresque consideration as unfurling an inter-American flag in Santo Domingo without authorization. Chilean President Eduardo Frei gave a foretaste of the kind of talk which may be heard in Rio when he stated in Paris this week: "We want an inter-American system without hegemony."

To avoid polemics, some nations would like to make the Rio conference as short as possible. Such questions as an inter-American force would be thrown into some future conference called to amend the OAS Charter. Events in the Dominican Republic have been no help. Loose ends keep appearing after the mediators reportedly have bagged a solution. The whole involvement has stretched the OAS to the limit, and Secretariat officials find themselves deeply impaired in a myriad of unfamiliar tasks in Santo Domingo. Technically speaking, the OAS may have two conferences on the fire simultaneously next August. In addition to the Rio conference, the tenth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers, convoked to handle the Dominican explosion, is in force until the crisis is solved.

MIDWESTERN STATES REFUSE TO BACK ROTTEN BOROUGH AMENDMENT

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the indications are growing every day that the rotten borough amendment is losing ground not only in the Senate but in the country. One after another columnists, editorial writers, and other leaders of public opinion are recognizing the grave dangers which the rotten borough amendment poses to our democratic system. Perhaps the most significant indication that the rotten borough amendment is losing support throughout the country is the fact that the Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments refused to adopt a resolution

calling for the passage of Senator DIRKSEN's proposed amendment.

According to a report in the Washington Post of July 22, the Dirksen amendment failed for lack of a majority in the 12-member Council of State Governments just as it failed for lack of a majority in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Washington Post reports that 6 of the 12 Midwestern States favored the resolution calling on Congress to approve the rotten borough amendment. But six States refused to lend their consent to this resolution. Three of these six—Indiana, Iowa, and Michigan—voted against the resolution. Three others—Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois—abstained. I find it highly significant that the minority leader's own State should fail to endorse his proposed constitutional amendment and that his proposal should fail to carry in the heartland of this great country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be inserted in the Record at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1965]
MIDWESTERN STATES FAIL TO ASK APPORTIONING AMENDMENT

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—A resolution asking Congress to submit a Constitutional amendment allowing one house of State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population failed by one vote yesterday at the closing session of a conference of 12 midwestern States.

Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio and North and South Dakota voted for the resolution which needed a majority of the 12 States to carry. Indiana, Iowa, and Michigan voted no, and Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin abstained.

The delegates to the Midwestern Conference of the Council of State Governments voted 7 to 2 with three abstentions against a proposal to commend the U.S. Supreme Court for its one-man, one-vote rule or reapportionment.

A PARATROOPER IN VIETNAM

MR. FANNIN. Mr. President, one of the thousands of young Americans who are defending the interests of the free world in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam is a 22-year-old paratrooper from my home city of Phoenix, Ariz.—Pfc. Jerry P. Linsner.

That this young soldier knows very well why he is fighting in that far-away Asian nation is demonstrated by a letter to the editor which he wrote to the Arizona Republic newspaper in Phoenix. The thoughts which he so eloquently expressed in that letter are like a clear fresh breeze compared to some of the juvenile demonstrations and protests by students of his age on campuses throughout the country.

In the belief that this dedicated young serviceman's letter deserves wider circulation as a forceful answer to advocates of appeasement, I ask permission to have it printed in the body of the Record.

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

[From the Arizona Republic, July 15, 1965]
A PARATROOPER IN VIETNAM PENS LETTER TO STUDENTS

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

I am a 22-year-old paratrooper now serving with the 173d Airborne Brigade (Separate). My home address is 2412 North 37th Way, in Phoenix. I am writing this letter from the perimeter defense position around Bien Hoa Airbase, South Vietnam, and its questioning aspects are directed at a select few who are helping to fight this war on the home front.

I must say though, that I am a little confused as to which side is being supported, and whose cause upheld by some of our young and upcoming "intellectual soldiers" whose bases of operations are located at several of our institutions of higher learning.

One of our most precious possessions is the freedom to challenge the policies of our Government, and keep those policies within the limits of our society's national feelings. This freedom was borne to us from our Nation's birth through the careful actions and watchful minds of dedicated leaders and protected by the blood of thousands.

It now seems evident that this freedom can be, and is being, undermined and abused in an ignorant display of rash actions, which do nothing but confuse the public and place a doubt in the minds of countries on the verge of communism as to the soundness of America's promise to defend them against Communist aggression.

The un-American aspects of these demonstrations, which are carried out by those who might occupy positions of leadership and responsibility in the near future, carry the traits of a possible dupe by an outside force.

You would think that the countless broken Communist treaties, lies and anti-American attacks, and the stark nakedness of public Communist announcements, which state openly and coldly their intentions to crush us, would awaken minds and open eyes.

From the Lao Dong Party in Hanoi, the Communist cry that the fighting in the south is a matter for the South Vietnamese, has been heard all over the world. Seized Vietcong caches of Communist-supplied arms and ammunition, the extremely elaborate military and political machine aimed at conquering South Vietnam, and the high proportion of northern trained officers, enlisted men, specialists, and secret agents, reveal the Communist line to be a giant mockery. It is a useless attempt to hide the fact that Hanoi is behind the continuing campaign of aggression aimed at conquering South Vietnam. There exists in South Vietnam a large scale, carefully directed, and Communist-supported program of armed attack on a sovereign state and a free people.

Obviously, some students are so entangled in their efforts to reform our international policies that they fail to see the danger. Assured by social and intellectual freedoms, they strike out viciously and defiantly at our National Government. Not only do they lack diplomacy, they infringe upon the rights and freedoms of other citizens, and either do not care or have no conception of the ill effects our Nation suffers in the world spotlight.

I only hope that when the demonstrations finally terminate, these students will add to their store of knowledge a recognition of the truth along with a valuable bit of experience.

Students should use their freedoms, take advantage of their rights, pry, disapprove, and question our Government's actions and make them conform to the will of the people. But before they pass judgment, they should take another look at our country's foundations, what we have fought and died for in the past, and what we stand for today. They should

open their eyes and see who is trying to take this away from us.

I have watched America's youth swelter on the decks and in the holds of troop ships and LST's. I have watched them rise from muddy pup tents, to construct through long, laborious days as clean and healthy a place to live as is possible in this environment. I've watched their bodies burn and tan under a merciless sun as they dug bunkers and mortar shelters. And at night they keep a vigilant watch in these same positions.

They have dropped in convulsions from the heat, and died from Communist steel. They are fighting a dirty and nasty war, and they board helicopters willingly to hunt out an elusive enemy in their own territory.

There is one thing I haven't slightest doubts about, Mr. Student, and that is these men's determination to stop communism here, on their own back doorstep. They know the score and this realization shows in their mental and physical willingness to fight.

However, when I turn my eyes homeward, I see something ugly, and I don't like it. Where is the moral support enjoyed by other men in wars past won? Where is determination to stop communism? Don't sell us down the river, Mr. Student, you might regret it.

Pfc. JERRY P. LINSNER,
APO, San Francisco, Calif.

THE VAN ALLEN SIMPLIFIED SCORING SYSTEM IN TENNIS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently in Newport, R.I., a lawn tennis tournament was conducted under VASSS the Van Allen simplified scoring system. This tennis tournament, which had in it such world famous professions as Rod Laver, Ken Rosewall, Pancho Gonzales, and Butch Bucholtz, was an experiment that may well pave the way to making tennis an even more generally enjoyed, watched, and participated-in sport than is presently the case.

The VASSS system basically calls for scoring on a point system somewhat like table tennis with the first person to reach 31 points winning the set. By previous stipulation a set can be decided by 21 points or 41 points or any variable of 5 plus 1, the unknown being divisible by 2.

The VASSS system provides that the server shall stand 3 feet behind the baseline, thus eliminating the advantage of the big server who normally would rush the net in order to put away the defensive return on the first volley. Rather, there is substituted the longer rally which requires more emphasis on strategy, experience, and precision as the players seek to maneuver each other out of place so that one of them can get in position for a winning shot. This longer rally also, I believe, provides the spectator with a great deal more enjoyment.

An additional advantage of the VASSS system is that it provides for the possibility of handicaps, like golf. This means that an exciting game can be played between two players of very different ability. For example, one would start out with a 10-point advantage over the other; but the winner of the set would be the first one who reached 31 points. This could make tennis far more enjoyable and would end the necessity of trying to find people of almost equal ability with whom to play as is now so often the case.

Finally, the frank relationship in this professional tournament of the points to money added to the excitement of the audience. In fact, on the scoring board where the points were listed, the scoring board also multiplied the points by 5, preceded by a dollar sign, to indicate the amount of dollars that had so far been won by each of the participants.

The success of this tournament is shown by the number of people that it drew both in the day and at night. In fact, another trailblazing result was the introduction of outdoor tournament night tennis playing.

All told, I am glad to rise and commend James Van Allen, president of the Newport Casino, for his efforts in creating a new scoring system and I hope paving the way for a further popularization of tennis. I am particularly happy to congratulate him on his election to membership in the National Tennis Hall of Fame. James Van Allen has always been an activist and a doer and is particularly qualified in the world of sports, having for many years been the court tennis champion of America.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REAPPORTION STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in recent weeks a number of editorials opposing the Dirksen amendment have come to my attention. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thoroughly Bad Legislation" from the Washington Afro-American of July 20, 1965, and an editorial entitled "Wait a While" from the Toledo Times.

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

[From the Washington Afro-American,
July 20, 1965]

THOROUGHLY BAD LEGISLATION

No matter how ardently its reactionary proponents try to dress it up, the so-called Dirksen amendment would still be bad legislation.

For one thing it rests on the erroneous premise that people who live in rural districts must be presumed to be more intelligent, more patriotic, and overall better citizens than those who dwell in the cities.

It is on this faulty foundation, not supported by fact, that Senator DIRKSEN, the Illinois Republican, is asking Congress to overturn last year's Supreme Court decision that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the democratic principle of one man, one vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN's proposal calls for one branch of the legislature to be apportioned on land area, cows, chickens, or other factors than people. It is an arrow aimed directly at the 70 percent of the Nation's population living in the cities.

It is unabashedly designed to allow the 30-percent minority of county dwellers to perpetuate the rotten borough system of frustrating the legislative aspirations and needs of the urban majority.

As much as they argue for its passage, backers of the amendment cannot justify it as being in the democratic tradition. It is patently discriminatory and does wholesale violence to majority rule.

Moreover, as Maryland's Senator TYDINGS has so aptly pointed out, it would "carve out

July 29, 1965

an exception to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment."

Thus it would lower the safeguards of this constitutional bulwark on which a majority of Supreme Court decisions outlawing racial discrimination rests.

More directly, it would permit hard-core Southern States, faced with a growing colored electorate under the newly enacted voting rights bill, to water down their voting strength under the Dirksen formula of counting factors other than people in allotting legislative seats.

It is not difficult to envision States like Alabama and Mississippi enacting apportionment legislation brazenly designed to again disfranchise citizens on the basis of land-ownership, wealth, education, or race.

There is nothing in the Dirksen amendment, once enacted, that would prevent such action, which no doubt explains why all of the old Confederate States are so enchanted with the scheme.

Thus our stake in the impending Senate battle over the Dirksen amendment is even more vital than that of other citizens.

For if it is jammed through, we stand to lose not only our political strength in the major northern cities, but in the Southern States as well.

That is why it is so important for you to keep reminding your Senators that a vote for the Dirksen amendment is a vote against you and yours and one which you will not soon forget.

[From the Toledo Times, July 14, 1965]

WAIT A WHILE

The Dirksen amendment over which the U.S. Senate soon will be fighting a battle royal is a watered down, spruced up version of the same name proposal that Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN first introduced last year to nullify the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling on State legislatures.

As approved by a Senate subcommittee the proposal still would allow one house of a legislature to be apportioned on factors other than population. But it no longer would bar Federal courts from hearing suits challenging apportionment plans. And it would require a vote of approval at least every 10 years by the people of a State which used nonpopulation factors for one of its legislative houses.

The changes have brought the proposed amendment considerably more support than it originally commanded. Its passage is still uncertain, but the vote is bound to be close, since even such liberal spokesmen as Senators JAVITS of New York and KUCHEL of California are now endorsing it.

Part of this widespread sympathy for the amendment—which we are tempted to share—arises from recognition that fair representation in a legislative body does not always come solely from numbers. This is most easily seen in States like California, Illinois, New York, and others where the bulk of population is massed in one or two great metropolitan centers. The Court's ruling, strictly interpreted, could create a tyranny of majority in which vast areas of a State had no voice in legislative affairs at all.

What restrains us from wholehearted support of the Dirksen amendment is the evidence—and there is plenty—that most of its supporters are not really interested in fair solutions to apportionment problems. They want simply to salvage the old status quo of entrenched rural power that drove the Supreme Court reluctantly to get into the political thicket it had long avoided.

It should not be forgotten—though the Courts' critics never mention it—that the tribunal invaded this field only because those in control of the States' apportionment machinery refused to do anything about the gross imbalances that had developed. Many of the same people who now leap to the de-

fense of the States' own laws and constitutions showed no such high regard for them when reapportionment provisions were being violated decade after decade to protect vested political interests.

So the Supreme Court has, in effect, restored to the States the right to devise systems of legislative representation which are fair now and can be kept so in the future. Of course it is not easy, especially for those with freakish distributions of population. But they should at least be given the chance before an amendment is added to the U.S. Constitution which might only perpetuate abominations on the representative form of government.

If experience shows the difficult problems of apportionment cannot always be worked out on the basis of population alone, that will be the time to consider a basic constitutional change.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER'S ANNOUNCEMENT REMOVING HIMSELF AS A CANDIDATE FOR THE REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION IN 1968

MR. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Clearing the Air," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 27, 1965, dealing with Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's announcement removing himself as a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1968; also an article entitled "GOP and 1968," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Washington Post of July 28, 1965, praising Rockefeller's decision.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 27, 1965]

CLEARING THE AIR

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's announcement removing himself as a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1968 clears the political air and should prove helpful to the Republican Party.

Until he made his statement on a "Face the Nation" program on Sunday, there had been doubts as to the Governor's political plans, and whether he intended to run for another term in Albany preliminary to taking a future stab at the presidential nomination which had eluded him twice before.

His statement in Minneapolis, where he has been attending the Annual Governors' Conference, was straightforward and unequivocal. He will definitely seek a third term as Governor. He will not be a candidate for President.

The Governor could have delayed his announcement for many months. By making his position clear now, he will give the Republicans that much more time to pull their party together, in the hopes of avoiding a repetition of the 1964 disaster.

Rockefeller served his party well by trying manfully to head off the nomination of Barry Goldwater. He might very well have obtained the nomination himself if it had not been for the unfortunate lapse of judgment in the timing of his remarriage. Coming just as the presidential campaign was about to get underway, that event severely damaged his political chances, especially among women voters.

From then on, his drive for the nomination was an uphill and, as it proved, a losing struggle. While other moderate Republican leaders did nothing to stop the Goldwater surge except to lament it, Rockefeller and

fought it out in the grueling heat of the primaries.

It is possible that certain of the Republican leaders hoped that Rockefeller and Goldwater would knock each other off in the pre-convention battles, opening the door to their own nomination as compromise candidates. The result in California dispelled that illusion, and the New York Governor found another act of courage called of him when he faced the roaring radicals of the Goldwater galleries in the convention, and made his appeal for a decent platform on civil rights.

Governor Rockefeller has fought hard and well to keep the Republican Party where it belongs, and where it must stand if it is not to disintegrate, out of the hands of the extremists. He has made mistakes of political judgment, but not of the heart. He has never been short of that quality called courage.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1965]
GOP AND 1968—ROCKEFELLER'S DECISION
PRAISED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

MINNEAPOLIS.—Three consequences flow from Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's action removing himself—now and forever—as a presidential candidate:

1. It make it nearly certain that the 1968 Republican nominee will be a political moderate.

2. It virtually rules out the danger that the remaining rivals for the GOP nomination will again get into such a lacerating contest that the moderated forces within the party would end up helplessly divided—as they were in 1964.

3. Barring the emergence of another Wendell Willkie who is less visible today than Mars, it narrow the probable choice to Gov. George Romney of Michigan, Gov. William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania, and perhaps former Vice President Richard M. Nixon. Each is qualified personally and politically. Any of them could get it. One of them almost certainly will.

The potential candidates of the two furthest apart wings of the party have both taken themselves out of the running. Barry M. Goldwater has said he would not seek re-nomination. Now Rockefeller follows suit. These decisions in themselves shift the eyes of the party to its political center.

It is no accident that Rockefeller chose the Governors' conference here in Minneapolis as the occasion to make his political announcement. He picked it deliberately and, thereby, underlined the powerful role the GOP Governors have played in the past and can again play in deciding the party's presidential nominee.

All the most influential Republican Governors are in the moderate-to-liberal wing. They include Volpe of Massachusetts, Chafee of Rhode Island, Rhodes of Ohio, Hatfield of Oregon, Smylie of Idaho, as well as Rockefeller, Scranton, and Romney. And, significantly, they take in most of the populous States.

This is a lot of political power at the center of the party. These Governors have probably learned enough from their pre-convention experience of 1964 to realize that they cannot influence the presidential nomination at the last minute, that their power as leaders must be concerted—or dissipated. With both Goldwater and Rockefeller removing themselves, the prospect is that the long-exercised power of the Governors will not be dissipated, that most of it will be mobilized behind a candidate who will reflect the moderate consensus.

Rockefeller gave a good reason for taking himself out of the picture earlier than was necessary.

"I think," he said, "that in order to pull the party back together, to unite it, to make