

[Ex. No. 102]

YEAS—83

Aiken	Griffin	Morse
Allott	Gruening	Morton
Anderson	Harris	Moss
Bartlett	Hart	Murphy
Bayh	Hartke	Neuberger
Bennett	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Boggs	Hill	Pell
Burdick	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Ribicoff
Carlson	Javits	Robertson
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, Ga.
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smith
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Curtis	Long, La.	Symington
Dirksen	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominko	McCarthy	Thurmond
Douglas	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGee	Tydings
Ellender	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fong	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gore	Montoya	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Lausche	Prouty
Brewster	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Miller	Simpson
Dodd	Mundt	Smathers
Inouye	Muskie	Sparkman
Kuchel	Nelson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting have voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the action taken today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for 5 minutes for routine morning business.

#### FREEDOM HOUSE REPORT ON COMMUNIST CHINA AND SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, history books will record the year 1966 as a pivotal year in the thinking and discussion of U.S. relations with Communist China. For the first time since the Communist takeover of the mainland in 1949 and the Korean war, public officials, scholars, and private organizations are in a serious debate about our future relations with Communist China to the American public. Without the old fears, Americans are once again asking questions fundamental to our foreign policy.

Freedom House, founded as a memorial to Wendell Wilkie, a private organiza-

tion dedicated to an objective discussion of foreign policy and to the education of the American people, has made an important contribution to the advancement of the Communist China debate. Although I do not agree with all the statements in the Freedom House report, I find it on balance a solid and forward-looking document worthy of being called to the attention of my colleagues.

The Public Affairs Committee of Freedom House argues that the admission of Communist China to the U.N. should meet no objection from the United States provided "Peking signs a Korean peace treaty, renounces aggression and subversion abroad, and accepts Taiwan's independence and continued U.N. membership."

In regard to Vietnam, and here I have reservations as to the statement, Freedom House points out that the problems of that country are so vast and complex that any solution to them will take a long time to be fully settled.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Freedom House report entitled "Communist China and South Vietnam."

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

#### COMMUNIST CHINA AND SOUTH VIETNAM

This position paper on United States policy toward Communist China and South Vietnam has been prepared by the Public Affairs Committee of Freedom House. It summarizes a consensus reached at a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees of the organization.

#### PART I—U.S. POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Freedom House believes that the realities of the American attitude toward the admission of Communist China to the United Nations should be made clear in positive terms.

It should be recalled that the United States was not only amenable to the admission of Communist China to the U.N. in 1950 but was inclined to recognize the government in Peking until the situation was altered by the movement of the Communist armies across the Yalu River. At no time since have the Chinese Communists shown any disposition to abide by the usual standards of conduct expected of a responsible national state, nor have they applied for admission to the United Nations. Indeed, the major obstacles to mainland China's entering the U.N. have been the unacceptable conditions put forward by Peking itself. This basic fact has been obscured, however, by an outdated aspect of American policy. America's persistent and firm opposition to Peking's entry into the U.N. is no longer useful in the light of recent developments, handicapping our diplomacy by creating a false image of intransigence.

In any realistic appraisal of the situation today, certain facts are salient.

First, the Communist government is in effective control of the mainland of China. We may find the way that control is maintained highly offensive. We may deplore the way the Communist government has made use of its control of the Chinese mainland to menace and on occasion actually attack neighboring countries. But these reservations cannot obscure the fact that the people and resources of the Chinese mainland are firmly in the hands of Peking.

Second, it is equally beyond question that the Nationalist Chinese government is the effective ruler of the island of Taiwan with its twelve million people. Together, people and government form a sovereign state with

all the accompanying privileges and responsibilities, including, of course, membership in the United Nations and other international bodies. Any change in the government or status of Taiwan can be acceptable only if it originates in the clearly expressed will of its people. The United States, with close ties of friendship to both government and people, has a special responsibility in this area.

Finally, no realistic survey of East Asia can overlook the fact that, fifteen years after the Korean cease-fire, the war between the United Nations forces and those of Communist China and North Korea has never been officially ended. The settlement of this unfinished business by a Korean peace treaty signed by all participants is obviously an essential preliminary to any attempts to ease East Asian tensions.

These facts do not call for any change in the underlying bases of American policy in East Asia: support of the independence of the free nations of the region against totalitarian aggression, together with economic aid to enable them to solve their own problems. Changes of emphasis are needed, however, to enable the United States to carry out these policies more effectively. To this end, Freedom House believes that the signature by all participants to a final treaty of peace ending the Korean War is an essential move for easing East Asian tensions and must precede all others; that Communist China should renounce the use of subversion and force aimed at the overthrow of legitimate governments; that the independence and U.N. membership of the government on Taiwan are beyond challenge and must be preserved. Only the people of Taiwan can initiate changes in their status; that, if these reasonable pre-conditions are accepted by Communist China, the United States will interpose no objection to Peking's membership in the United Nations.

The diplomatic recognition of Communist China by the United States is a separate and distinct question. There have been many conversations between representatives of the United States and mainland China and these discussions are continuing today. Any decision whether the time has come for the formal recognition of the Communist regime by the United States might well be deferred until that government has assumed United Nations membership. Only then can we judge whether formal recognition can possibly result in a meaningful relationship between the United States and mainland China.

#### PART II—UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD SOUTH VIETNAM

Freedom House reaffirms its support of the United States policy on Southeast Asia. As President Johnson warned last year, no quick and easy outcome to the war in South Vietnam is in prospect. With as many political problems to be solved as there are military victories to be won, the difficulties that we all must face in South Vietnam should not be compounded by extravagant and imprudent demands upon our government. The call for American unconditional withdrawal from South Vietnam on the one extreme, and the call for the bombing of the large urban centers in North Vietnam on the other, are equally unwise.

To date both the American people and their President have demonstrated commendable patience and restraint. By limiting its air attacks on North Vietnam to specific military/economic targets, the United States has emphasized that we have no quarrel with the people of that unhappy country, who were the first victims of its Communist regime. We have placed equal emphasis on avoiding acts that might provoke an unsought confrontation between the United States and Communist China. These re-

June 21, 1966

protocol between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Mexico City on April 13, 1966, amending the agreement concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcast band signed at Mexico City on January 29, 1957. (Executive D, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[Ex. No. 101]

## YEAS—83

Aiken	Ellender	Long, Mo.
Allott	Ervin	Long, La.
Anderson	Fannin	Mansfield
Bartlett	Fong	McCarthy
Bayh	Fullbright	McClellan
Bennett	Gore	McGee
Bible	Griffin	McGovern
Boggs	Gruening	McIntyre
Burdick	Harris	Metcalf
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Mondale
Cannon	Hartke	Monroney
Carlson	Hayden	Montoya
Case	Hickenlooper	Morse
Church	Hill	Morton
Clark	Holland	Moss
Cooper	Hruska	Murphy
Cotton	Jackson	Neuberger
Curtis	Javits	Pastore
Dirksen	Jordan, N.C.	Pearson
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Douglas	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Eastland	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph

Ribicoff  
Robertson  
Russell, Ga.  
Saltonstall  
Scott  
Smith

Stennis  
Symington  
Talmadge  
Thurmond  
Tower  
Tydings

Williams, N.J.  
Williams, Del.  
Yarborough  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Ohio

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—17

Bass  
Brewster  
Byrd, W. Va.  
Dodd  
Inouye  
Kuchel

Lausche  
Magnuson  
Miller  
Mundt  
Muskie  
Nelson

Prouty  
Russell, S.C.  
Simpson  
Smathers  
Sparkman

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE H—RESOLUTION A.69(ES.II)  
ADOPTED ON 15 SEPTEMBER 1964

The ASSEMBLY,  
RECOGNIZING the need

(i) To increase the number of members on the Council,

(ii) To have all members of the Council elected by the Assembly,

(iii) To have equitable geographic representation of Member States on the Council, and

CONSEQUENTLY HAVING ADOPTED, at the second extraordinary session of the Assembly held in London on 10-15 September 1964, the amendments, the texts of which are contained in the Annex to this Resolution, to Articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization,

DECIDES to postpone consideration of the proposed amendment to Article 28 of the Convention on the Inter-Government Maritime Consultative Organization to the next session of the Assembly in 1965,

DETERMINES, in accordance with the provisions of Article 52 of the Convention, that each amendment adopted hereunder is of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it does not accept such amendment and which does not accept the amendment within a period of twelve months after the amendment comes into force shall, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention,

REQUESTS the Secretary-General of the Organization to effect the deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the adopted amendments in conformity with Article 53 of the Convention and to receive declarations and instruments of acceptance as provided for in Article 54, and

INVITES the Member Governments to accept each adopted amendment at the earliest possible date after receiving a copy thereof from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, by communicating an instrument of acceptance to the Secretary-General for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

## ANNEX

1. The existing text of Article 17 of the Convention is replaced by the following:

The Council shall be composed of eighteen members elected by the Assembly.

2. The existing text of Article 18 of the Convention is replaced by the following:

In electing the members of the Council, the Assembly shall observe the following principles:

(a) six shall be governments of States with the largest interest in providing international shipping services;

(b) six shall be governments of other States with the largest interest in international seaborne trade;

(c) six shall be governments of States not elected under (a) or (b) above, which have special interests in maritime transport or navigation and whose election to the Council will ensure the representation of all major geographic areas of the world.

Certified a true copy of Assembly Resolu-

tion A.69 (ES.II) of 15 September 1964 and of its Annex:

JEAN ROULLIER, *Secretary General of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization.*

22 September 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Executive H will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification of Executive H will now be read.

The resolution of ratification of Executive H was read, as follows:

*Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),* That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, which amendments were adopted on September 15, 1964, by the Assembly of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization at its second extraordinary session, held at London from September 10 to 15, 1964. (Executive H, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

straints are a basic element of American policy in Southeast Asia.

It is no less important that Americans be patient with the people of South Vietnam as they seek to form a government more broadly based on the popular will, a task of the greatest difficulty.

Democratic interplay of forces is not easily achieved even in nations with centuries of experience in popular government. South Vietnam must overcome a background of feudal despotisms, followed by a century of colonial status and a decade of civil war.

Under the best of circumstances, South Vietnam's progress toward effective self-government would be slow and faltering, marked by many set-backs and internal divisions. This pattern of events has occurred at some stage in the history of almost every self-governing nation in the world. The notable exceptions have been such countries as North Vietnam, where a fanatical minority seized power at the moment of independence and suppressed all opposition by terrorism.

But South Vietnam bears an added, and heavy, handicap—the massive Communist effort to conquer it by combined subversion and attack. Considerable portions of the country are under enemy occupation; in many others murderous terrorism cripples all local government and destroys public safety. Everywhere, disorder is fomented and every natural division exacerbated by the agents of subversion.

For Americans, the temptation to "pull out of the mess" is all too strong. Yet this is the counsel of despair. For, if the present situation is bad, the result of American abandonment of South Vietnam would be far worse—the extinction of the last hope of achieving a free, stable society for years, perhaps generations, to come. The South Vietnamese know this. Significantly, the various factions in South Vietnam, however divided among themselves on the formation of a government, are united in opposing Communist control. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that, despite unquestionable Communist attempts to infiltrate student and religious groups, no element or leader of any significance has sought the evacuation of American troops or the acceptance of Vietcong rule.

Holding meaningful elections in South Vietnam while simultaneously waging war against the Vietcong will be extremely difficult. Continued strife between various South Vietnamese factions makes the task infinitely harder. Nevertheless, the elections must take place—if necessary, province by province over a period of months.

The United States must make clear to all parties concerned that unless there is an effective government in Saigon American assistance by itself cannot help South Vietnam to become free and independent. But we must also bear in mind that hostile forces are using public agitation and demonstrations to undermine our position in Vietnam. We must not abandon our responsibilities under this provocation.

Not all the divisive factions are in Saigon. The appearance of division within the United States continues to block our best efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement. Those in positions of leadership—in the Congress as in the Administration, in the universities as in the community—bear a heavy responsibility for establishing a climate in which the hoped-for settlement can be achieved.

FREEDOM HOUSE, New York, June 1966.

#### MANKIND MOVES FORWARD—ADDRESS BY THOMAS PATRICK MELADY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on June 14, 1966, Dr. Thomas Patrick Melady, president of the Africa Service Institute and director of the Urban League of

New York, delivered an incisive commencement address at Manhattan College in New York.

The theme of his address was "The Barriers That Have Separated Man From Man." He notes that the barriers of time and distance have virtually disappeared, and that the barrier of colonialism is also rapidly vanishing as more and more nations emerge as independent states. He rightly called to our attention to a third barrier that not only stands but is growing higher—the separation of rich and poor states.

I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Melady's remarks inserted in the RECORD.

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

#### MANKIND MOVES FORWARD

(By Thomas Patrick Melady, Commencement Address at Manhattan College on Tuesday, June 14, 1966)<sup>1</sup>

Your Eminence, Your Excellency, the Secretary General of the United Nations, Reverend President, faculty and students, distinguished guests and friends.

There is much for us to be thankful for today, the sons who have received their degrees and their parents can rejoice that the well earned symbols have been obtained. Today is the Commencement of a new life.

All of us here—living in a city that is in many ways the capital of the world—can look with a feeling of rejoicing on the position of the human family in our world.

We stand on the threshold of an era which has ended most of the barriers that have separated man from man. The barriers of time and distance have almost vanished. Formerly we were separated by great distances. Since the guns of World War II became silent we have seen the shrinking of distances. How marvelous it is that instead of being geographically separated we now can live as next door neighbors to one another.

The same dynamic forces that are ending time and distance have also ended for the most part man's political domination of man. You and I, in the past few years, have seen the Afro-Asian peoples who were long dominated by outside forces emerge as independent states. With the exception of southern Africa, the peoples of color have the natural dignity of ruling themselves. Thus a main cause of alienation, another barrier separating man from man has been almost completely eliminated.

A third barrier that has separated one brother in the universal family from his other brother is the rich-poor silhouette. Here mankind has only begun to realize how much remains to be done.

When man was separated from man by time and distance and when one part of the world politically dominated the rest of the world, unity was impossible. Furthermore, these separations prevented man from at least being aware of the seriously inequitable situation in the world. The white North Atlantic members of the world community were affluent and becoming richer and the non-white part of the world was still cursed by poverty, illiteracy and disease and becom-

ing more afflicted by the unholy trio. The situation has not changed but the awareness of this gross gap in living standard has begun to stir both sides of the inequality.

When we contemplate the implication that the majority of the world's non-white peoples who are now politically free have awakened with a determination to obtain a decent standard of living we can indeed rejoice.

Yes, we know that some fear what is called the rising expectations of the world's poor. Instead of facing these changes with joy they prefer to talk about the decadence of modern civilization or even the approaching end of the world. And, of course, there are the cynics and the negative critics—those who can never build but only destroy.

It should be clear to us that this defeatism is unhealthy and impotent. Once it overtakes us, all potential to build is destroyed.

Yet we must face the challenge of world poverty openly and courageously. These are the facts; the per capita income in North America is \$2,200.00 with an average life span of 68 years. In black Africa the per capita income is less than \$100.00 with a life span of around 40 years. In Asia the per capita income is around \$106.00 with a life span of 51 years. The developed nations and the United Nations have all launched programs to help correct this inequity. But these programs have really only helped to enlighten the world about world poverty and misery.

We dare not rely only on our governments to do something about this. We now all live in the same city and the miserable of the world are our next door neighbors. Nothing of significance has been done to end the growing gap between the rich and the poor—made more horrible because it is the white and non-white. This is your responsibility and mine. The rising determination of the Afro-Asian peoples to end their life of misery must now be matched by our determination. Together we can push forward and thus end another serious source of alienation.

This opportunity clearly points out our destiny: to participate with enthusiasm in the forward movement of mankind. Our enthusiasm is justified as we have seen in our lifetime significant progress of mankind toward greater unity.

These vital forces for change have resulted in mankind becoming the ascending arrow. Our duty is to build the earth; to advance forward.

Teilhard de Chardin, the great philosopher who lived among us here in New York until 11 years ago, said "It is not the fear of perishing but the ambition to live" which throws man into this forward movement. Let us therefore do what is our destiny: the embracing of a conquering passion to sweep away the defeatism, the pessimism, the elements that still separate man, that still alienate man.

What method shall we follow? Here we can learn much from Vatican Council II.

Rooted in the stabilizing forces of God's presence, we should in our thinking on the problems of the world maintain an openness to all members of the universal family. This is no longer an age to rely on set formulas. Principles of life remain but programs of action must change.

This will require us to experiment in method. This may sometimes cause a little uneasiness and all experiments may not work.

But we must branch out quickly into all areas of human endeavor. The ascending arrow is moving so rapidly that we no longer have time for years of talk and planning as we must effect changes now. Some of the crucial areas that require our immediate attention are:

1. Urban life.
2. Problems of automation.
3. The insidious depersonalization of mankind caused by dealing with masses and large numbers.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Patrick Melady, Ph. D., of New York City, is President of the Africa Service Institute, author and professor. He is also a Director of the Urban League of New York, The Catholic Interracial Council and The John LaFarge Institute. Dr. Melady is the author of "Profiles of African Leaders," "White Man's Future in Black Africa," "Faces of Africa," "Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia" and "The Revolution of Color." He has served as the Pax Romana Representative to the United Nations since September, 1965.

There are two institutions whose recent emergence into world-wide leadership gives us cause for enthusiasm as we face tomorrow.

The resurgence given to Christendom by Vatican Council II and being given personal direction now by Pope Paul VI has rendered new power and strength to the Church. The treasurehouse of truth has been opened to the world and is uplifting mankind in a single tide toward his Creator.

Now that we are all living in the same city—mankind has created his own institution—the United Nations. This represents a new spirit to unify the vital human forces to push mankind forward. We all recall the 4th day of October, 1965, when Pope Paul VI visited the United Nations. He said then "we might call our message a ratification of this lofty institution. . . . The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace".

In the last few years, there has been a tendency by some to criticize effectiveness of a world body such as the United Nations. Some have attempted to cast a doubtful shadow on the ability of an assembly composed of nations so vastly different in ideology, wealth, culture and size. As expected, there will be many difficult moments, some failings, countless hours of exhausting discussion, yet, this great experiment requires endless energy and dedication, to translate more fully an ideal into reality. It is an experiment which must not fail. Mankind has significantly benefited from the currents moving forward and the United Nations is one of these currents.

The Church and the secular society have generated a rapid movement which is taking mankind forward to a new sunrise.

Our destiny is to embrace those forward movements and to assist them in approaching even more rapidly the noble goals given to us.

In our enthusiasm for these developments we cannot overlook the one great cloud on the horizon—racism. The hatred brought about when man denies that another man, because of the accident of his color, was created by God as his brother.

We must strike out and destroy the ugly sin of racism as it will eliminate all possibility of harmony in the human family. Every dream that we have spoken of will fade away if corrective action against this ugly doctrine is not taken soon. What can we do? Much has been said about the role of government. Let us discuss here the role of private institutions.

We must exert every effort to generate a favorable climate for men of all races to live as brothers. The need is so urgent and substantive aspects so vital that our private institutions must utilize every power at their command to enhance the dignity of the human family.

In this regard and because of the seriousness of the situation, we think especially of the various Christian churches. A good number of them—Catholic, Orthodox, Episcopalian and others, discourage their faithful from committing major infractions against the laws of God by refusing Communion to them until they have been freed from the immediate guilt of these sins by confessing them, promising amendment and doing penance.

In other words, in other areas of human behavior, these churches preach the positive aspects of the good life but warn their faithful that should they murder, commit adultery or steal, they have seriously offended God and must reconcile themselves with God before they can approach the Communion table.

It is, on the other hand, a known scandal that no such publicity is given to the grievous sins of racism. We fully understand why sins of racism are so serious. God made us all brothers in His likeness but the racist

sets himself above God and denies this. Furthermore, the racist sins against the greatest commandment of them all—charity.

The racist commits these sins and set himself above God when he refuses to sell his house, rent an apartment; when he refuses admission to his club or to give a job to his brother because of his color.

Certain Christian churches have found it effective to reinforce teaching on serious matters with a system of censure against serious transgressions of these teachings.

But when it comes to the grievous sins of racism where the sinner blasphemes God the Creator by denying that all men are created in His likeness, there is a reluctance to acknowledge this sin. As a result of this some non-white Christians are beginning to question the integrity of these institutions. And the Christian churches risk repudiation by the peoples of color unless these horrible sins that directly affect them are treated like other mortal offenses against God's dignity.

Racism is a serious sin and must be declared so and treated by the churches as they treat other serious offenses.

Activity on all fronts to eliminate the barriers and traditions that separate man from man is part of the mighty movement forward. An invitation has been extended to us: to embrace with passion the ascending arrow, to reject with equal passion the ugly offenses that separate man from man.

These are noble goals for us here in New York City which saw last October two powerful forces for progress—the Church and the United Nations—converge. And now we prepare to say goodbye to the Manhattan College campus. Some will return for the sentimental visit many times, others at least once and a few perhaps never. But let us all before this parting of the ways commit ourselves to the best of our abilities to mankind's forward march. The world you are going into will be of your making. Make of it what will be worthy of the ideals, and the inspiration of our Alma Mater, Manhattan College. This is our destiny!

#### OUR UGLY CITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the commencement address of Philip Johnson at Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts. Mr. Johnson is one of this country's leading architects and while his provocative statement talks of the growing environmental decay in our society, he has also set out some of the goals toward which we must work if ours is ever to rank with the great cultural societies of history.

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

#### OUR UGLY CITIES

(Commencement speech by Philip Johnson, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., June 5, 1966)

I have spent the winter designing (for my own amusement, I hasten to add) an Ideal City. It seemed to me pointless when I started and even now strikes me as the height of foolishness. No one will look at it. It will never be published, or if it is, there are very few who will read. Reading a plan is so, so difficult. And with absolute certainty, no one will build it.

The reason for telling you girls about my lonely troubles this afternoon is to point up for you the gap, in this cultural ambience of ours, between values I hold dear and the values that make our country run.

Here we live in the most affluent society the world has ever known. No one in the old days ever dreamt of universal literacy, to say nothing of universal toilets and

(heaven forbid) universal automobiles. It is clear we can have anything on this earth we want.

Yet, can we? Well, we cannot, or as I believe will not, make our environment a place of beauty, our cities works of art.

There can surely be no discussion whether we have ugliness around us or not. I never heard anyone tell me that Bridgeport was anything but an ugly city, or Waterbury, or Pawtucket, or Holyoke. And New York where I am at home, is it so handsome? Exciting, even breathtaking, but beautiful only in spots, only for a few blocks. Otherwise, for miles and miles in all directions ugliness, ugliness, ugliness.

And can there be any difference of opinion that it has been getting worse and worse? I do not think I am being distressingly old to point out that New York was handsomer a mere ten years ago, and argue further that it was handsomer even then than twenty, thirty, fifty years before that.

A few examples:

Item: The Brooklyn Bridge, one of the great bridges of the world, had not yet been ruined by a double deck.

Item: The Pennsylvania Station, which cost in today's dollars 600 million, still existed to give the commuter and newcomer a great gateway to a great city. That romantic, magnificent room is gone.

Item: Coenties Slip and other water inlets in lower Manhattan still gave us a romantic feeling of contact with our harbor. No more. The water is filled in, a super highway cuts off the water view.

Item: Park Avenue used gracefully to flow around the wedding cake delicacy of the Grand Central building. Pan Am settled that.

Item: Fifty-ninth Street, our other great axis now terminates in that cheapest of all cheapies, the Coliseum.

Item: The pile of needle-like 20's skyscrapers that we loved to look at from the harbor is gone, ruined by the new scale of Chase Manhattan Bank, and soon to be settled entirely by the Trade Center.

Item: Our last plaza at 59th Street and Fifth Avenue on Central Park is going now to a super cheapy, built ironically enough by our richest corporation, General Motors.

Item: We used to be able to see the water. After all, Manhattan is an island. We have finer water nearer at hand than Paris or London, yet you can see the Seine, you can see the Thames. In New York, no more. Elevated highways!

It is amusing to note that when the much maligned robber barons were building railroads into New York, they built them well, they put them underground. Must our generation then do less with the successors to the iron horse, the automobile? Why are our motor roads not underground? Only Grace Mansion, the residence of our Mayor, looks out over the water, the cars comfortably passing underground. It can be done, do we but will it. What Commodore Vanderbilt did for our city, we can do again—for ourselves.

Item: We used to have streets lined with brownstones, now we have areas dotted with cheap brick towers, all of which are built with lowest standards possible of ceiling heights, paper thin walls and execrable bricklaying. In other words, we used to have slums, today we have built but super slums.

Why? Why have we done this to our cities at the same time as we have done away with illness, illiteracy, hunger. At the same time as we have given every citizen a car, an education, elegant clothes, travel. Why does part of our culture advance and part decline so disastrously?

I must admit that at 60 I am getting a little bitter, so I dream up cities where I should like to live and, meanwhile, try to figure why, outside my dreams, the city decays.

example of how many architectural abominations can be combined in one building if you have the money.

A National Committee to Save the Nation's Capitol should be formed at once. It ought to shower petitions down upon Congress until that body is persuaded to relent. It ought to demand that which it has not received—adequate open hearings and a fair discussion of the requirements of the old building. It ought to compel Congress to examine the alternative to the demolition of the West Front—the reconstruction of the front as it stands, if it is in need to repair. It ought to hold Congress to the pledge given the Nation in 1958 by Speaker Sam Rayburn who then said while the East Front was being built: "We are not going to do anything with the west end." It ought to make it clear to Congress that it prefers a work of genius by Thornton, Latrobe and Bulfinch to anything that the designers and builders of the new House Office Building can bring forth.

Men who would lay their unhallowed hands on this sacred structure are indifferent to the glorious episodes of our past, ignorant of the architectural merit of one of the great buildings of the world and indifferent to every consideration of national pride and honor. This outrage must be stopped.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This morning the Post returned to the fray with a moving documentation of the basis for keeping this magnificent Capitol Building as it is.

The Post quotes the distinguished historian Allan Nevins, who has called the Capitol "the best-loved and revered building in America, the spirit of America in stone, the major symbol of the Nation."

Today's editorial concludes:

The wrecker's ball will soon do for the west front of the Capitol what the Nazi bombers did for the House of Commons. Is there no American of equal devotion to the temple of American democracy who can insist that when it is rebuilt, it will be kept as it was?

"Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial entitled "The Temple Profaned," published in the Washington Post of today, June 21, 1966.

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

#### THE TEMPLE PROFANED

"We have built no national temples but the Capitol," said Rufus Choate. Now that temple is to be profaned and the architectural genius of Thornton, Bulfinch, Latrobe, and Walter is to be buried under cafeterias and other conveniences.

Allan Nevins has described the Capitol as "the best-loved and most revered building in America." He has called it "the spirit of America in Stone." He has said it is "History—the Major Symbol of the Nation."

But the noble western front of the building with its handsome classic walls and its cascading staircases must give way to the convenience and comfort of Congressmen who need more room. Whether the exterior walls are or are not safe is a matter for competent engineers to decide. They have stood less than 200 years and sandstone structures of the kind elsewhere have lasted for hundreds of years. If they are unsafe, they can be rebuilt and replaced without alteration of the original design.

When bombs destroyed the British House of Commons in the 900-year-old palace of Westminster on the River Thames on May 10, 1941, the impulse of the whole British

nation was its restoration, not its modification. When he visited the vast ruin on Oct. 29, 1943, Winston Churchill gazed upon the wreckage and said: "There I learnt my craft, and there it is now, a heap of rubble. I am glad that it is in my power, when it is rebuilt, to keep it as it was."

The English people, led by Churchill, insisted that the House be restored, even though the reproduction can seat but 437 of the 627 members.

The wrecker's ball soon will do for the west front of the Capitol what the Nazi bombers did for the House of Commons. Is there no American of equal devotion to the temple of American democracy who can insist that when it is rebuilt, it will be kept as it was?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I simply wish to say that I join with the Senator from Wisconsin, and hope the entire Senate will give some thought to what is proposed with reference to the west front of the Capitol.

It is quite true, as the Senator has said, and as the editorial has also stated, he has quoted that the Capitol Building is a monument to the entire country. The question of efficiency and financing of new space is an effort which should be met by some method other than destroying this historic front.

#### SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SUPPLIES ESSENTIAL VITAMINS, MINERALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's proposal to slice the special milk program by 80 percent could have disastrous effects on the health of our Nation. If this legislation were enacted, the 18 million children receiving Federal help in purchasing school milk would shrink to 3 million children. The remaining 15 million, including millions of children who come from low-income families, would have to pay the full cost of any milk they consumed in school or day camp.

Obviously, many millions of these children simply would stop drinking milk. This could have a substantial impact on the dietary habits and future health of these young people.

Let us take a look at what has contributed to the health of our Nation in the past. In 1940 one could walk down the streets of any major American city and see the bowed legs of children suffering from rickets. This is no longer true. This disease has been eliminated, in large part through the ready availability of Vitamin D fortified milk.

Pellagra is another disease that was highly prevalent not too many years ago. The usual cycle followed was pellagra, hospitalization, and treatment with vitamins and diet, return to home followed by the old diet, followed by pellagra and hospitalization again. Once more the

ready availability of milk, with its protein quality and content of tryptophan, spelled the end for this serious dietary disease in most sectors of our population.

The Food and Nutrition Board of the American Academy of Sciences has stated that:

Milk and milk products . . . contribute approximately 24 per cent of the protein, 76 per cent of the calcium, and 47 per cent of the riboflavin in the national diet.

These are among the facts and figures which explain the outcry from Congress and the people alike over plans to cut the school milk program. Such a move would be taken at the expense of the health of future generations of Americans.

#### WHY NOT FACE THE TRUTH ABOUT VIETNAM?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, newspaper headlines reveal that at his last press conference President Johnson indicated that he would "raise the cost of aggression at its source" by intensified use of airpower.

This is a threat of further escalation. It is an indication that the daily bombing will be carried further North.

On many previous occasions, the President has said, "We seek no wider war." Yet it is steadily widening.

The administration's answer invariably is that we have to escalate because our adversaries escalate.

This is precisely the gloomy outlook so clearly spelled out in the Mansfield report after his return in company with four other Senators—MUSKIE and INOUE, Democrats; AIKEN and BOGGS, Republicans—from an intensive study on the ground in southeast Asia. They made it clear that it was an open-end war and that each side would escalate to meet the other's escalation.

To what end? Further deaths of fine young Americans, whose number killed in combat already has passed 4,000, with over 20,000 wounded, many crippled for life, countless thousands of North and South Vietnamese killed, many of them noncombatants, women and children. The undeclared war is costing close to \$2 billion a month and so the great domestic programs, so brilliantly enacted in the 1st session of the 89th Congress under President Johnson's masterful leadership, are going down the drain.

And yet the facts, so consistently ignored and even denied by the administration, disclose the total lack of justification of our present and our continuing actions in southeast Asia.

These facts must be repeated to offset the completely misleading propaganda which continues to emanate from the White House, the Pentagon, and the State Department.

Item: We were not asked by a friendly government in South Vietnam to help it repel aggression.

We asked ourselves in.

June 21, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13139

modeling of the terraces might be eliminated.

The third alternative, which so far as we know is the plan that is now being followed, has already been described. It is the least desirable of the three and should join the file of never-carried-out plans for the Capitol. Such proposals have a history that dates back to the original competition held in the spring of 1792. The brief invitation to submit drawings brought forth a variety of responses, none of which was totally satisfactory to the Commissioners or to the President.

The submissions included a very respectable and conservative Georgian design by Samuel McIntire; a charmingly naive proposal by Philip Hart that in detail is vaguely reminiscent of Independence Hall; an adaptation of Palladio's Villa Rotunda submitted by Samuel Dobie; a strange mélange of medieval and Georgian detail on a building that surrounded a square open courtyard by James Diamond of Maryland; and a fairly sophisticated design, to judge by later drawings which have survived, by Stephen (Etienne Sulpice) Hallet, a French emigre who was then residing in Philadelphia.

Thornton's winning design, which was submitted after the close of the competition (setting a precedent for confusion in federal architectural competitions persisting to the present time), was a far simpler, more monumental conception than any of the previous designs. It was one that more clearly reflected the desires of Washington and Jefferson for a Capitol that would somehow express the strength and virtues of the infant republic.

Thornton never had clear sailing in the execution of his design. He declined to supervise its construction; he lacked the technical experience to carry through the work on a major public building in a day when the architect was obliged to provide truly "comprehensive services." The short-tempered doctor thereupon had a succession of difficulties with Hallet, who was retained as supervising architect, and George Hadfield who later succeeded to the job. Both had sought to alter his design, and the even-tempered James Hoban assumed the responsibility for construction from the year 1798, until the appointment of Benjamin Latrobe in March 1803.

Latrobe brought to the position an already established reputation as an architect of great talent and skill. He was much respected by President Jefferson and managed to impose his own ideas upon the interior design and in plans for the central portion of the building which were carried out, after his retirement in 1817, by Charles Bulfinch who completed the original building in 1829.

Robert Mills, who was Architect of Public Buildings at the time, proposed several forms of extension to the Capitol in the year 1850. Mills' designs deserve special mention for it is hard to believe that they were not the genesis of Walter's final designs for the wings and dome. The few sketches of Mills that have survived are much more like the Capitol as we see it today than were Walter's first competition drawings of the same period, for Mills had already seized upon the idea of a great dome, modeled in scale and form after that of St. Peter's, to be constructed over the foundations of the rotunda.

He evidently was intrigued by the idea of developing the expanded building in the form of a cross, the enlarged dome to act as a dominant focal point at the center, but he also prepared drawings of an extension of wings to the sides attached with an ingenious arrangement of interior courts to prevent blanking the windows of the older building. Mills' plans were not accepted by the Senate, which insisted that a competition be held, and in 1851 President Millard Fillmore appointed Thomas U. Walter as Architect of the Capitol. Mills at that time was already

70 and died four years later, in March 1855. Walter was 47 and destined to work on the Capitol for the next 14 years.

The list of designs for "the Capitol that never was" continued to the turn of the century, and the more familiar proposals of Carrere & Hastings for expansion of the building in the year 1905 by the survival of two plans for monstrous enlargements submitted by Thomas Walter in 1874, nine years after his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

Walter had apparently never completely given up an infatuation with his earliest competition studies, which extended a vast interior gallery eastward from the rotunda, and the years he had spent since leaving Washington, working on Philadelphia's City Hall, might have clouded the esthetic judgment of any man. The ubiquitous Washington firm of Smithmeyer & Pelz submitted a grotesque scheme in 1881 that would have left nothing of the original central portion of the building but the rotunda and dome, which they planned to embellish with eight additional domed turrets.

Admittedly the present proposal for the extension of the West Front is more modest than some that have been discarded in the past, but it has neither the merit of sensitive historic preservation nor the merit of bold architectural concepts. It falls to the inevitable level of an unhappy compromise, for it fails to recognize that time has changed what can and cannot be done to this one building that symbolizes the aspirations and growth of the country from the time of its founding through the age of confidence and material prosperity which characterized the last decades of the 19th century.

If the old stones of the Capitol are crumbling let them be restored, or replaced if need be, but let us refrain from padding its bones with layers of rooms until it becomes a shapeless mass signifying nothing but its own bulk. Congress deserves a mid-20th century answer to its space needs, not a misguided mid-19th century alteration to a venerable building deserving of respectful preservation.

## STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The Institute believes that the Capitol of the United States is a vitally important symbol of our nation's government. As such, it should be preserved. If reconstruction is structurally necessary, it should be carried out in strict accordance with the present design. If the Capitol continues to expand, it will rapidly lose all resemblance to the original building. The AIA believes that it should be a permanent policy of the Congress that the exterior of the Capitol is to remain unchanged. Today, the West Front contains the last remaining external vestiges of the Capitol as it was originally designed and built. It is the only important link with the beginnings of the building. If the West Front of the Capitol is extended, we will have buried the last of those walls that date from the early years of the Republic, and will have obscured a part of our history that can never be restored.—Oct. 13, 1965.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who incidentally is chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin on this

issue, and I urge very strongly that before any money is appropriated to initiate this \$34 or \$35 million project, which will add some 4.5 to 5 acres to the capitol area, the most careful and searching engineering study be made to find out if this is the only way that the west front can be made stable and guaranteed against further deterioration.

I personally am convinced that engineers can tell us that we can brace and underpin the west front, preserving the grace of the old Capitol, without doing damage to the historic building, and still provide for the continued use, for another 100 years, of this great edifice.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for yielding, and for his cooperation in helping preserve this shrine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his remarks.

## WEST FRONT PROPOSAL A NATIONAL OUTRAGE — A TEMPLE PROFANED

Mr. President, in one of the most emphatic and powerful editorials I have read in a long, long time the Washington Post Sunday ripped into the proposal to extend the west front of the Capitol.

The Post calls for a National Committee To Save the Nation's Capitol to shower petitions down upon the Congress to persuade this body to relent, to demand the kind of full open hearings on this proposal—which have not been held—with adequate advance notice and with representatives of the American Institute of Architects and other competent and critical bodies invited to appear.

The editorial concludes:

Men who would lay their unhallowed hands on this sacred structure are indifferent to the glorious episodes of our past, ignorant of the architectural merit of one of the great buildings of the world and indifferent to every consideration of national pride and honor. This outrage must be stopped.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "A National Outrage," published in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 19, 1966.

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

## A NATIONAL OUTRAGE

If the people of the United States mean to save their historic Capitol, so filled with reminders of great events in the Nation's life, they must swiftly make it clear to Congress that they do not wish this national monument submitted to the hammer and bull of the demolition crews about to descend upon it.

Under the guidance of J. George Stewart (by act of Congress and not by grace of any academic benediction) the Architect of the Capitol, Congress is about to commit on the Capitol an act of vandalism without precedent in this country's life. The British in 1814 greatly damaged the Capitol. The remodeling of the East Front destroyed a facade before which the great ceremonies of the Nation took place. But the destruction and rebuilding of the West Front exceeds even these disasters. A structure fashioned by genius and executed by artists is to be remodeled by a man presumptuous enough to believe he can do better. And his presumption is the more offensive because the best that he can do stands just across the Capitol grounds where the new House Office Building presents to the world a staggering

Item: It is not true a solemn commitment was made by three Presidents to do what we are doing.

President Eisenhower merely proffered economic aid and that conditioned on reforms and performance which were never carried out either by the Diem regime or by the eight subsequent self-imposed regimes.

Item: President Kennedy, accepting the bad advice of Secretary McNamara, escalated the number of advisers from the 600 in South Vietnam, as part of the military mission established by President Eisenhower, to a total of 20,000. But he sent no troops to combat. No American lives were lost in combat during the administrations of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

Item: Regrettably, after a campaign in which President Johnson led the American people to believe he would achieve a peaceable solution in southeast Asia, he sent our troops into combat. No previous President—neither Eisenhower nor Kennedy—had done that.

The more recent official justifications that article 4 of the SEATO Treaty warrants our military actions are also groundless.

The article provides that in the event of alleged aggression, all the signatories will consult, and by unanimous agreement resolve on a course of action, which must be in accord with each nation's constitutional processes.

We never asked the signatories—Great Britain, France, Pakistan, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines—to consult. Had we done so, there would have been no unanimous decision, since both France and Pakistan are opposed to our course. Finally, action in accord with our constitutional processes would have required a declaration of war by the Congress. We have not had it.

It seems clear that each subsequent escalation has been expected to bring "victory." What are the realities?

Item: President Johnson accepted and acted on the same kind of bad advice that led President Kennedy into the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Item: Each time the advice to President Johnson was proffered as the solution to his dilemma and would bring the adversary to his knees.

"Bomb North Vietnam. That will do it." We bombed for 16 months. It has not done it.

"Send in the Marines. That will do it." It has not.

"Send in more ground troops. That will do it." There are 360,000 there now, plus the fleet offshore with 70,000 aboard and 40,000 in Thailand.

It has not done it.

"Send in more troops. Raise the number to 400,000." It is being done.

We will bomb further north, the President now warns Hanoi, perpetuating the myth that North Vietnam is the aggressor.

In the course of all this, United States has violated:

First. United Nations Charter, articles 1, 2, 33, and 37.

Second. The SEATO Treaty, article 1.

Third. The unilateral commitment by Walter Bedel Smith to support the Geneva Agreements.

Fourth. The aforementioned pledges to send in no additional troop or war material into Vietnam.

The regrettable and depressing fact in all this is that it is the United States which is the aggressor in southeast Asia.

The United States, sending its forces halfway around the world, injected itself into a civil war. All those present at the time of our invasion were Vietnamese—South Vietnamese fighting a corrupt and oppressive government, thus revolting against the denial of promised elections, aided later by infiltrators from North Vietnam.

The continued support by the United States of corrupt, self-imposed, and malodorous regimes reveals the folly of our whole performance.

The original premises justifying our military involvement, although false, have now been shown to be completely fanciful. We are not supporting freedom or saving a brave and gallant people. We are supporting a corrupt, self-imposing dictatorship.

Last year, 1965, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army.

And yet we are drafting our boys and sending them to southeast Asia to fight and die for this cause which has so little support from the people we are presumably aiding.

The great myth is that Hanoi is the villain. True, the North Vietnamese are aiding the Vietcong but their aid came after our own violation of our agreement—our support of Diem's refusal to abide by the Geneva Agreements and hold elections.

In all American history, of which we have had so much reason to be proud, the United States has not committed so tragic an error. The consequences can only be disastrous.

The administration's allegations that we are willing to negotiate with any government avoids and evades the fact that the adversary is not a government but the National Liberation Front or Vietcong, with which President Johnson has consistently refused to negotiate. Until that is done, it is nonsense to assert that we have exhausted every effort to achieve peace.

Likewise, we have not carried the issue before the Security Council, as we are required to do by the United Nations Charter.

Why have we not done this? Because, obviously, the free discussion that would take place in the United Nations would reveal the unpleasant truth, which is, that the United States is the aggressor.

Is there a way out? Yes. Lay the issue before the United Nations. Stop the bombing. Agree to negotiate with the National Liberation Front. Ask for a cease fire. Promise to hold Vietnam-wide elections, supervised by the United Nations, not merely in South Vietnam but in all Vietnam as promised in the Geneva accord. Agree to abide by the

results, and pledge a phased withdrawal of our troops once peace is established. It might not work. But why not try it? We have not tried it. Until we do, until we make these proposals clearly, emphatically, unmistakably, we cannot continue to allege that we have tried to secure peace—that objective which every passing day more and more Americans fervently seek.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again the Senator from Alaska has made a statement on what I consider to be our illegal and immoral course of action in South Vietnam and North Vietnam, with which statement I am in complete agreement.

I associate myself with his remarks.

#### THE BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some days ago I sent the Washington Post a letter to the editor in which I set forth certain facts in regard to the participation of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] in the legislative record on a bank merger bill in the Senate.

In the letter I pointed out the position that the Senator from Virginia had taken with respect to three cases in this country. One case involved action on the part of the U.S. Justice Department with respect to action that it is proceeding to litigate in connection with a bank in Lexington, Ky.

I think in fairness to the Senator from Virginia that I owed it to the record to write the letter that I wrote the Washington Post.

Last Sunday an abbreviated form of the letter was published in the Washington Post. But its abbreviation is fair neither to the contents of the letter that I sent the Washington Post nor, in my judgment, to the record of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full letter that I wrote the Washington Post, as well as the abbreviated letter which the Washington Post published and attributed to me, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1966]

ROBERTSON PRAISED

[Letters to the Editor Version]

My attention has been called to several news stories which have appeared in your columns over last weekend and to an editorial which appeared on June 14 concerning Senator ROBERTSON and his interest in banks and banking, particularly in the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 and the relation of that law to the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company of New York City.

In the news articles and editorial, it is suggested that the principal significance of the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 was the relief of three banks from antitrust prosecution and that the gratitude of bankers to Senator ROBERTSON is based primarily on the special relief provided for three banks against which antitrust cases were pending at the time the Act was passed.

The Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 restored the congressional intent to give primary importance to the public interest, which had been developed in the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

The new standards and procedures for bank mergers written into the 1966 Bank Merger Act were in turn written into the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments, and this action was sustained last week by a roll call vote of 64 to 16—a clear expression of congressional intent on the relation between banking and the antitrust laws.

While I have not always agreed with all the provisions of the banking bills which Senator ROBERTSON has proposed and carried through to enactment, I think it is quite clear that the legislation he has sponsored in the field of banking has been of broad public interest and importance.

WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator From Oregon.

WASHINGTON.

[Letter to the editor, Washington Post,  
actual copy]

JUNE 15, 1966.

THE EDITOR,  
The Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to several news stories which have appeared in your columns over the weekend and to an editorial which appeared on June 14 concerning Senator ROBERTSON and his interest in banks and banking, particularly in the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 and the relation of that law to the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company of New York City. In the news articles and editorial, it is suggested that the principal significance of the Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 was the relief of three banks from antitrust prosecution and that the gratitude of bankers to Senator ROBERTSON is based primarily on the special relief provided for three banks against which antitrust cases were pending at the time the Act was passed.

I do not think this is an accurate or fair presentation. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee for two years, 1955 to 1957, I was deeply involved in two major pieces of legislation Senator ROBERTSON handled in 1956 and 1957—the Bank Holding Company Act, which was enacted in 1956, and the Financial Institutions bill, which was considered by the Committee in 1956 and passed the Senate in 1957 and which, though it did not become law as such, contained most of the amendments to banking laws which have been enacted since that time.

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 was a major piece of regulatory legislation designed to prevent undue extension of bank concentration through the holding company device and to separate banking from unrelated businesses. It contained two broad open-end exemptions to which I objected at the time and which I am glad to say Senator ROBERTSON has now closed in the current Bank Holding Company Act Amendments, which the Senate passed on June 7 and which are now pending in the House: the first for long-term trusts and charitable institutions applying to the Alfred I. duPont Trust Fund, the second for regulated investment companies and their affiliates applying to the Financial General Corporation.

Another major bill which Senator ROBERTSON brought into being was the Bank Merger Act of 1960, based on a provision in his Financial Institutions bill of 1957 and a 1956 Fulbright bill, all of which were founded on the understanding that the antitrust laws either did not apply to bank mergers or at least did not provide effective control. For example, it was universally understood by all responsible officials, including leading members of the House and the Senate and representatives of the Justice Department, that Section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to bank mergers.

In recent decisions, the Supreme Court applied the strict rule of the Clayton Act that competitive factors were the sole and controlling factors to be considered in bank merger cases, nullifying the congressional intent spelled out in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 that the public interest—the public convenience and necessity—should be the final controlling consideration in bank merger cases.

When the Justice Department's efforts to break up the merged banks at Lexington, Kentucky, and New York made clear the losses and damages which would inevitably result from their attempts to "demerge" these banks, Senator ROBERTSON introduced a bill to exempt all bank mergers from the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act. This bill was amended, and, as it eventually became law this year, it terminated, as far as the Clayton Act and Section 1 of the Sherman Act are concerned, the three pending cases involving mergers consummated before the Philadelphia decision—the Manufacturers Hanover case, the Lexington, Kentucky, case and the Continental Illinois case. The three cases involving mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision, when the new law had been laid down by the Supreme Court, were not exempted but were to be handled under the new standards written into the 1966 Bank Merger Act Amendments, like all subsequent mergers.

Unfortunately the Department of Justice is attempting to continue the proceedings started under the antimonopoly provisions of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, contrary to the intent of the Congress and the representations of the Department of Justice.

The Bank Merger Act Amendments of 1966 restored the congressional intent to give primary importance to the public interest, which had been developed in the Bank Merger Act of 1960. After the passage of the 1960 Act, President Johnson, then Majority Leader, made the following comment:

"Again, I want to express my congratulations to Senator ROBERTSON and Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator Capehart and the other members of the Banking and Currency Committee for the persistence and the thoroughness and the statesmanship which they have displayed in carrying this matter through to a satisfactory conclusion."

The new standards and procedures for bank mergers written into the 1966 Bank Merger Act were in turn written into the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments, and this action was sustained last week by a roll call vote of 64 to 16—a clear expression of congressional intent on the relation between banking and the antitrust laws. And after the passage of the bill Senator MANSFIELD, the Majority Leader, commented that Senator ROBERTSON "once again has served this body with the unparalleled distinction and wisdom which has characterized his many years of public service."

While I have not always agreed with all the provisions of the banking bills which Senator ROBERTSON has proposed and carried through to enactment, I think it is quite clear that the legislation he has sponsored in the field of banking has been of broad public interest and importance.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

#### IRRESPONSIBLE USE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURANCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.

President, it appears that a group of irresponsible promoters and builders have devised a unique method of using the FHA insurance to finance their speculative construction of multifamily units throughout the country.

These speculative promoters are giving little or not attention to the prospective success of the projects, their primary interest being in the quick profits reaped from inflated markups of previously undeveloped land, a generous allowance of builder's fees to their own construction firms, and architect's fees on a percentage basis which oftentimes are in excess of the actual payments.

To make this scheme more profitable, cheap land located in marginal or isolated areas is purchased and then unloaded on the Government through generous appraisals of the lots on the basis of being a developed area.

The result is that many of these projects, particularly the multifamily units, are going broke as fast as they are being completed—oftentimes even before construction is completed. The promoter, having collected his quick profits through a markup of the land, builder's fees, et cetera, now abandons the project in many instances without paying the subcontractors and suppliers. The result is that scores of small subcontractors and suppliers are going broke, since FHA assumes no responsibility and apparently has no concern as to whether or not they are paid.

The blanket mortgage protects the Government—as far as it can be protected—in cases of 110-percent mortgages as the payments are made to sponsors in accordance with progress on construction projects, without regard as to whether or not the supplier and subcontractors are being paid.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. CURTIS. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for bringing before the Senate a situation that certainly merits attention. Information has come to me bearing out what the Senator has said. Some scandals and some wrongdoing have occurred in this area, and they merit an investigation as soon as the calendars of the appropriate committees permit.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware a question. Is it not quite likely that the evil procedure that promotes or presents an opportunity for wrongdoing is the fact that individuals can go into building projects without any of their own money being involved?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. Another instance, as I have pointed out, is that a promoter can start half a dozen projects simultaneously, each under a different corporate name. If one project succeeds he keeps the one that succeeds; and if the other five go broke he turns them back to the Government.

There is no requirement for the endorsement by the promoter or the builder of the various projects. That is a correction in procedure that should be adopted. Surely, they should have to

cy—now apparent in our economy—of freezing out all but a few giants from vital sectors of American industry.

It seems to me that much further exploration is needed of the competitive effects of this bill. Certainly no Senator wants unwittingly to encourage monopolization in American industry.

**OUR DILEMMA IN ASIA—ADDRESS  
BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER 3D**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3d delivered a speech to the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry in New York. His analysis of "Our Dilemma in Asia" is one of the best I have seen. I particularly call the attention of my colleagues to his comments about our "overpresence" in Asia, and his strong and persuasive argument for multinational channels for the administration of aid.

It is one of the finest statements I have seen on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement in the RECORD.

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

**OUR DILEMMA IN ASIA**

(By Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3d before the Far East-America Council at a luncheon meeting in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, May 17, 1966)

It is a pleasure to meet again with members and guests of the Far East-America Council. I am also glad to have this opportunity to talk with you about United States policies in Asia, and particularly about a dilemma which Americans and Asians together have only recently begun to recognize and cope with.

This dilemma, expressed simply, is that the overwhelming American involvement in Asia today, which is so necessary to Asian security and economic development, could in the long run become self-defeating. It is not that we have used our power arrogantly. It is rather that the relative weight of our involvement—compared with what Asians have so far been able to do by themselves—constitutes an American "overpresence" which often depresses Asian initiative, disrupts Asian traditions, and irritates Asian sensitivities.

We are expending billions of dollars annually—and the lives of our young men—in order to contain Communist expansionism and promote the growth of viable economies and free societies that can live at peace with each other and with the rest of the world. Yet, unless this sense of American "overpresence" is corrected by fresh Asian and American initiatives, it may engender so much misunderstanding and antagonism that it jeopardizes the high purposes which engaged us in Asia's problems in the first place.

We have assumed far-reaching responsibilities and risks in Asia because we were asked to and because there was no one else to do so. As William P. Bundy, our able Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs has pointed out, "today there cannot be an effective deterrent military force, and thus a balance of power around China's frontiers without major and direct military contributions by the United States." Similarly, the United States is so far the only nation both able and willing to provide the substantial share of Asia's needs in economic aid.

This necessity for heavy American participation is, I believe, widely understood in Asia. What is more difficult for Asians to

understand and accept are some of the side effects of our participation. In South Vietnam, for example, the presence of so many Americans—while vital to the preservation of the country—has contributed to inflation, has had a corrosive social effect, and has aroused a good deal of resentment. In India, where American food and other assistance—including military aid—are welcomed, the proposed India-America Foundation was instantly attacked in Parliament and the press as a possible threat to the integrity of Indian education—or even a cover for the CIA. In Japan, whose economy prospers in trade with the United States, legislative debates and the press echo widespread fears that the country may be dragged into a major Asian war through its security ties to the United States.

The problem, in other words, is the overpowering impact of America on Asians. Our presence supports their self-preservation, but it bothers their self-respect. It is an imbalanced relationship of receiver and donor, of protegee and protector. It is a lopsided relationship that breeds suspicion and resentment among ancient, proud and sensitive peoples, most of whom have just emerged from centuries of colonial rule and are struggling to establish their own national identities.

The answer to this dilemma lies, I believe, in policies—both Asian and American—which will help strengthen Asian initiative and responsibility, in national development efforts and in regional cooperation on common problems.

We must all understand that the expenditure of American lives and dollars cannot guarantee peace, stability and economic progress in Vietnam or anywhere else in Asia. The American military shield can hold the line while the Vietnamese and other free Asians evolve their own stable political institutions, and assume greater responsibility for their own security. Foreign aid from the United States and other capital-exporting countries is fuel, not the vehicle, for improving Asian societies. The fundamental creative tasks can only be performed by Asians themselves, mobilizing their own human and material resources to develop their economies and satisfy popular aspirations for a better life.

Furthermore, this growth process can be speeded by the pooling of scarce resources throughout Asia, the sharing of skills and experience, the practical division of labor among complementary economies, and the opening up of wider regional markets.

A regional approach to development offers the promise of more rapid and more efficient growth. It is also our best hope for redressing the imbalance and overdependency which now characterize American relations with most free Asian nations. There are, I believe, now approaches that both Americans and Asians can take to mobilize Asian resources more efficiently, to promote greater Asian cooperation and solidarity and, in the long run, to create an effective Asian counterweight to the American "overpresence."

Let us look at the Asian side of the situation first.

There are encouraging signs of initiative and cooperation emerging in Asia which, if fully appreciated and intelligently supported, could begin to balance and improve our relations with our Asian friends.

On the political front, the treaty of normalization between Japan and the Republic of Korea is an extremely significant development. This treaty, which came into effect last December, after 14 years of difficult negotiations, established normal relations between Japan and its former colony for the first time in 55 years. It also provided for a 20-year program of \$800 million public and private Japanese investment in modernizing Korea's agriculture, diversifying its industry, creating a modern transportation system,

and expanding Korean exports. As a result of this political accommodation and economic cooperation, Korea will become a better customer for Japanese exports, a more important supplier to Japan, and correspondingly less dependent on American aid. Thus, 16 years of American "overpresence" in Korea are now being alleviated by closer Korean-Japanese cooperation.

I was in Seoul when the treaty negotiations were nearing completion, and I saw the hostile demonstrations when Japanese Foreign Minister Shiina arrived. The demonstrations, however, could not frustrate the statesmanship on both sides which successfully resolved a bitter, seemingly intractable problem. In contrast, when Japan's first ambassador arrived in Seoul to present his credentials, he was received with public as well as official respect.

Perhaps the Japan-Korea achievement will suggest to other nations in Asia and elsewhere that they have far more to gain in the long run by resolving than by perpetuating their disputes. I earnestly hope that similar creative statesmanship will eventually lead to the peaceful resolution of other conflicts, such as that between India and Pakistan.

We can also take encouragement from some recent events in Southeast Asia. Malaysia and the Philippines are moving rapidly toward the restoration of normal relations. These two countries, together with Thailand, have recently revitalized the cultural and educational Association of Southeast Asia—whose initials ASA stand for "hope" in the Thai and Malay languages. At a working-party session in Bangkok two and a half weeks ago, these three governments earmarked for "priority implementation" numerous cooperative projects in economic, technical and cultural fields. Indonesia, a fourth important nation in that area, has taken several cautious steps this last month toward more normal relations with its near neighbors.

In the economic field, the emerging pattern of Asian cooperation is even more pronounced.

The establishment of the Asian Development Bank, in my judgment, may well be a historic step comparable to the founding of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation in the Marshall Plan era. The Bank is the product of Asian initiative—not a response to an American proposal. It was conceived and developed by Asian leadership through the United Nations Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE). In fact, the United States withheld support until it became clear that the Asians were going to establish the Bank by themselves.

The Bank is a genuine Asian institution—supported by a majority of Asian capital; directed and staffed primarily by Asians; and structured to encourage the adoption of regional, rather than purely national, priorities in the planning, scheduling and financing of development activities.

For the first time in history, all interested Asian governments have their own mechanism, with substantial pooled capital of \$1 billion, to attack their common economic problems. The Bank's charter is flexible. It allows for the creation of various forms and levels of consultative and planning bodies, including someday perhaps a high-level coordination group to evaluate country requests for external funds and to determine in which countries and which sectors foreign public investment can be most efficiently used.

Such a regional approach could, for example, further the coherent development of national and regional transportation and communications systems, which would be a major contribution to the economic development of the entire area.

The establishment of the Bank has also stimulated a fresh momentum toward other

forms of Asian consultation and cooperation. A succession of Asian conferences has been going on since last December. First there was the education ministers meeting in Manila, then the Ministerial Conference for Economic Development of Southeast Asia in Tokyo in April. This was followed by the Asian and Pacific regional conference in Bangkok, which in turn has prepared the way for a 10-nation ministerial economic conference in Seoul next month.

The Tokyo meeting was the first significant non-European economic conference, since World War II, where the United States was not a participant, and where the main objective of the participants was not to obtain more American aid. In fact, one of the principal objectives of the participants was to obtain more Japanese aid. The Tokyo meeting was also significant because all the Southeast Asian countries except Burma responded to Japan's economic initiative.

The Japanese Government announced to the Conference that it would raise the level of its aid to the developing countries to one percent of its national income—to some \$870 million a year, or a three-fold increase—and that a significant portion of this aid would be channeled to Southeast Asia. A Japanese 3-year credit of \$20 million a year has already been proposed for Thailand, and a \$6-7 million credit for Cambodia.

The Conference agreed that there are considerable areas in economic development where cooperation among Southeast Asian countries is possible, and these opportunities will be examined in greater detail when the ministers reconvene in Manila next year. The importance of agriculture was emphasized, especially the urgent need to increase food production, and steps were taken toward a conference on agricultural development. Special attention was given to the promotion of fisheries, and it was proposed that with the cooperation of Japan a marine fisheries and development center should be established in Southeast Asia.

Attention was also given to the role of private enterprise in promoting industrialization, and the need therefore to improve the investment climate in Southeast Asian countries. In this connection, the ministers also agreed to study the establishment of a Southeast Asian economic promotion and development center.

I do not mean to exaggerate the progress that has been attained in the settlement of old political disputes and the development of new forms of cooperation among Asian nations. I do want to point out that the attitudes for greater Asian cohesion are emerging, and that the framework for more effective regional cooperation is gradually being erected. Asians are demonstrating their readiness to assume greater joint responsibility for Asian development.

Continuing progress in this direction depends fundamentally on strengthened Asian initiative and cooperation. But it will also be affected by what the United States does or does not do, in coming months and years, to recognize and encourage these developments.

The principal challenge and opportunity facing the United States, in my judgment, is to adapt our policies and our aid strategy more closely to the emerging pattern of Asian cooperation. This means redirecting and managing our aid in ways that will encourage—not inhibit—greater Asian initiative and self-help; that will accelerate—not impede—Asian moves toward regional cooperation. There are three ways I would like to suggest in which the United States can do this. We have already made some impressive starts but we need to do much more, much faster.

First, the United States should give top priority to development projects of the greatest regional utility. We should use our aid selectively to promote the planning and

carrying out of major projects that promise the greatest benefits to the peoples and nations of the area—and these will be mostly, although not exclusively, multinational projects. This means assigning first call in the disposition of American aid, and the most favorable terms, to those projects that can make the most significant contribution to overall regional development.

I am thinking, for example, of multipurpose projects of multinational value such as the Mekong Valley and Indus River developments, and a possible Ganges-Brahmaputra project—where the benefits of flood control, irrigation and electric power can provide a major, and perhaps decisive, stimulus to economic development of important regions.

I am thinking also of education, where scarce research and training resources could be pooled to create a few adequately staffed institutions of higher learning, postgraduate studies, and technical studies to serve specialists from all of Asia. The benefits, in terms of more efficient research, as well as more effective sharing of knowledge, can be substantial. An especially important need is for agricultural research, experimentation and training in the development and use of hardy seeds and strains suitable for various Asian soils and climates. The International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines is one example of the multinational benefits that can be achieved through this cross-fertilization of ideas and technology.

Long-term and far-reaching commitments such as these, which place a premium on regional utility, will encourage greater cooperation in planning and carrying out multinational development projects. Thus this approach can also lessen the side effects of the American presence.

Second, the United States should encourage and support much higher levels of mutual assistance among Asian countries. We should encourage a greater flow of capital, through grants, loans and credit, among Asian countries. We should also foster greater sharing of Asian technical skills and experience by proposing and helping to finance the local training and broader regional exchange of specialists in agriculture, industry, health, education, commerce and civil administration.

The Asian Development Bank is now 65 percent Asian-financed. Japan plans to triple its annual foreign aid outlay. Asian nations are contributing to regional development consortia and to their own Point Four programs, in Asia and elsewhere in the developing world, and should be encouraged to do more.

There are also many forms of technical assistance that Asian countries can exchange with each other to better effect than Western technical assistance. Some of these are Asian-developed technologies in labor-intensive agriculture, in fisheries, construction and other fields. Others are Asian adaptations of Western technology, such as the tractor for wet rice farming that is being developed in Thailand, and will be more suitable for Southeast Asian rice culture than any Western or even Japanese tractor. This technological sharing among Asians should be broadened, partly because Asian peoples have more in common with each other in environmental conditions and cultural experience than they do with the West, and partly because Asians are best-equipped to determine how to take advantage of available Western technologies, and how to adapt these technologies to special Asian conditions.

Third, the United States should adopt a declared national policy of phasing economic aid to Asia into multilateral channels as rapidly as possible. We should reverse our present emphasis on bilateral aid, with the objective of achieving the highest possible proportion of multilateralism in our foreign aid mix, at the same time recognizing there will

always be sound reasons for significant bilateral projects.

The United States has shown increasing willingness, in recent years, to work through multilateral institutions such as the UN Development Program, the Pakistan and India consortia, the Mekong project, and the Asian Development Bank. But we need to accelerate this process by making full use of the administrative machinery and the Special Funds provision of the Asian Development Bank, encouraging Asian planners to set priorities, to establish standards of performance, and to accept joint responsibility for administering and auditing the projects.

A primarily multilateral aid emphasis—which has been advocated by Eugene Black, Senator FULBRIGHT, George Woods and others—is the best, and perhaps the only satisfactory, way to implement the regional-utility approach to Asian development and to raise the level of mutual assistance among Asian countries. These are basically multinational activities, and they require multilateral machinery.

This three-point aid strategy offers a way out of our dilemma. By pursuing it we will, I am convinced, be taking an important step in redressing the imbalance which is the cause of the American "overpresence" in Asia today.

This strategy can insure that Asian leaders and experts will have a greater voice and larger stake in managing regional development for common benefit.

Further, this strategy will facilitate Asian mobilization of Asian resources, and speed the modernization of the region.

Faster economic progress and closer political cooperation could, in turn, gradually alleviate the serious security problems in Asia. For the development of viable economies and stable and responsive political institutions, within an effective framework of regional cooperation, is in the long run the best insurance against Communist subversion and aggression.

Whether this rate of progress is actually achieved depends on the scale as well as the efficiency of the effort. As President Perkins of Cornell pointed out, in a recent article on "Challenge and Response in Foreign Aid:"

"A cardinal principle of statecraft holds that a nation's response to a problem should be on the same scale as the problem itself."

Both Americans and Asians need to think and act on a scale that is commensurate with Asia's problems and needs. Unless the Asians do, our aid efforts will be relatively ineffective. Unless we do, the Asians will lack the tools to maximize their efforts.

This kind of all-out approach would have unlimited possibilities for Asia. It might well require higher levels of American aid in the future. And it certainly would require greater Asian initiative and self-help now.

If both Asians and Americans accept this challenge, it is possible that most of Asia, with its great human and material resources, could be standing on its own feet in another generation, or by the end of this century. Our aim is not to dominate Asian development patterns, or to make Asia dependent upon us. Our aim is to help nourish Asian growth and freedom, and to encourage our Asian friends to take charge of their own destiny, in equal partnership with the rest of the world.

#### "MEET THE PRESS" WITH SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last month our colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH, completed a study mission to Europe on behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During his trip, Senator CHURCH interviewed government