

10658

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20, 1965

of this occasion will live forever in my mind and heart.

I am deeply grateful for the honor you do me today. It will serve as an inspiration and as a source of strength to me. It will be a challenge to me in the tasks that lie ahead.

May I say that I am greatly impressed by the work and activities which I have been privileged to observe during our tour this afternoon. It is tremendously gratifying and encouraging to see such a dedicated staff supported by such devoted public-spirited citizens, making visible progress in the training and rehabilitation of the unfortunate children under your loving care.

The work you have done here at Partridge has helped make the people of this Nation more aware of the problems of the mentally retarded and has provided a valuable example of how to cope with these problems. Your work and selfless devotion have been a challenge to those of us in Congress who share the cause of mental retardation with you and have inspired us in our own continuing efforts in behalf of assistance to States and communities to combat mental retardation and to encourage expansion in teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children.

As you know, in 1963 we enacted the Mental Rehabilitation Facilities Construction Act. That Act authorized construction of assistance for research centers to combat mental retardation, university-affiliated centers for the mentally retarded, and facilities for the care of the mentally retarded.

The scope of your Federal Government activities in the mentally retarded field is evidenced by the fact that during the present fiscal year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will expend \$25 million for mental retardation programs. Half of this for research, demonstration, professional training, services, and instruction, and half for income maintenance of mentally retarded persons. In contrast, 10 years ago the total amount spent for mental retardation programs was \$22 million. For the next fiscal year, the President has asked Congress to appropriate \$280 million for these purposes. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate handling this request, I believe I can assure you that the appropriation will be made and will be made in a timely manner.

To all of us who are so deeply concerned with mental retardation, to you here at Partridge who have done so much to help combat it, it is indeed distressing to realize that by 1970 there will be an anticipated 8 1/2 million mentally retarded persons in the United States. It is even more distressing to face the realization that in three out of four mentally retarded cases we do not know the cause of the problem.

Yes, we have made a good start; we have made progress, and yet, from the figures I have just cited, we see how much more there is to be done. Now great the challenge is for the future.

I am glad to tell you here today that I have confidence we will pass legislation, which I have been privileged to introduce, to greatly expand the facilities of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Vested with the responsibility for the progress of this fine school, you will be interested to know that this bill authorizes grants to pay part of the costs of constructing rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops, as well as grants to help pay for the initial operating costs. It will provide training grants, including stipends for trainees in workshops, project grants for the improvement of sheltered workshops, and technical assistance to workshops.

With the assistance of a National Policy and Performance Council created under the bill, the States will be helped to expand and extend their vocational rehabilitation programs, and their research and development work.

More important, the legislation provides that vocational rehabilitation evaluation services may extend to a maximum period of 18 months during which the employment potential of any affected individual may be determined. Under present law, these services cannot be furnished a disabled person unless it is first determined that the service will actually prepare him to fill a paying job. As we know, particularly for the mentally retarded, this requirement works a hardship; the new liberalization will permit more persons to be prepared for productive lives.

Here at Partridge, you are giving hope and comfort to disabled children. You are giving them the help without which they would be forever denied their just measure of life's potential.

I congratulate you and again salute you on your great work and on the humanitarian spirit that inspires it. As I stand here with you today, I cannot but be reminded of the words of the biblical philosopher who declared: "One cannot get closer to God than by bringing help to one's fellow man."

With profound gratitude to you for the honor that you do me with this appointment for the wonderful work that you have done, I say to you that in the confidence of knowledge, in the strength of integrity, in the tenderness of sympathy, in the fellowship of humility, and in the love of God we shall go forward together. The battle for our mentally retarded children who do much need our help. For the man who said to me, "Father, the little children to come into the Kingdom of Heaven."

## REASONS FOR U.S. ACTIONS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. BASS (Mo.). President, the newspapers of the Nation have done an exceptional job of reporting and commenting on the reasons for U.S. actions in the Dominican Republic crisis.

The Nation's editors have almost unanimously supported President Johnson's policies and moves in that troubled island country.

In the final analysis, the two basic factors underlying the President's actions were to protect American lives and subsequently to thwart communism in its effort to control the Dominican Government.

As the May 4 editorial in the Nashville Tennessean pointed out:

President Johnson moved courageously in the face of certain criticism and widespread misunderstanding to prevent an apparent Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic and guarantee that nation a chance to form a democratic government.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch in a May 8 editorial noted that President Johnson's decisive response to the Communists certainly slowed the Red subversion in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record these two editorials and also an editorial published in the Cheyenne, Wyo., Eagle of May 7.

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

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 4, 1965.]

PRESIDENT'S FIRM ACTION POINTS THE WAY FOR OAS

The administration has properly laid emphasis upon the role that needs to be played by the Organization of American States in dealing with the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

The President acted firmly Sunday in doing what was necessary in the face of mounting intelligence reports that Communists were taking over the Dominican revolution. He made it unmistakably clear that the hemisphere will not under any condition permit another Cuba, and that there was no time to lose in ordering American forces to the island to prevent a takeover and protect foreign nationals.

But then the President appealed to other Latin American nations—and particularly the members of the OAS—to join with this country in performing what is essentially a hemispheric duty. He repeatedly stressed the fact that citizens of 30 foreign countries in the Dominican Republic were enjoying protection of American troops and hinted strongly that it was the duty of these other countries—as well as that of the United States—to participate in the keeping of order.

Mr. Johnson certainly was aware of the criticism he risked by undertaking this emergency action, and the criticism was not long in coming. The action was attacked by Cuba, Communist China, and—in the United Nations—by the Soviet bloc. While criticism from these nations was to be expected, the reaction of other Latin American nations undoubtedly is the thing that is uppermost in the President's mind.

For the most part, the reaction of other members of the OAS has been encouraging. There has been criticism from some Latin American countries, but this is likely to be mitigated as the danger posed by the Dominican situation is fully disclosed.

Mr. Johnson took special pains Sunday night to explain that this country's only interest in the Dominican Republic—or anywhere else in Latin America—is its determination to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime and to provide the afflicted nations with the opportunity to create their own democratic governments.

This means that the citizens of weak and poverty-stricken Latin American nations must be protected not only from Communist invaders but also from corrupt and distasteful internal regimes that deprive the people of their rights and the resources of their countries. To do this requires the effort of all Latin America.

It would be all but impossible for the United States to attempt to police all of the potential trouble areas in Latin America alone. For one thing, this would be strategically unwise, permitting the Communists to scatter our forces while they increased the pressure in Southeast Asia or some other place. Too, it would create resentments that would only intensify the unrest.

President Johnson moved courageously in the face of certain criticism and widespread misunderstanding to prevent an apparent Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic and guarantee that nation a chance to form a democratic government.

How will the Dominican future turn out depends to a large extent upon the people themselves and upon the cooperative spirit of the rest of Latin America. The President acted in an emergency and he acted in the interest of all the hemisphere. But it is time for the Organization of American States to recognize that protection of the hemisphere is everybody's business, and get on with the planning for such emergencies in the future. It appears that there may be quite a few of them.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 5, 1965.]

## LATIN AMERICA MAY LEAVE IT

The "domino theory" that has been applied to southeast Asia might well have become operative for Latin America, if the United States had stood idly by, and let the Communists take over the Dominican Republic. Once the Reds found that we would not move forcefully to stop them, they would

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10659

have stepped up their drive to seize the governments of such countries as Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala.

Special cadres from these and several other Latin American countries are reported to have been in Cuba for training in guerrilla warfare and subversion at the very moment when the disorders broke out last week in Santo Domingo.

An attempt by Communists to assassinate President Leonel, of Venezuela, was thwarted last month. An Italian who was said to be trying to smuggle in \$330,000 from Soviet Russia to finance the assassination and revolt, was arrested. An extensive Red conspiracy was uncovered.

Guerrillas in Colombia have been carrying out kidnappings every few days—apparently with a view to raising money to finance the revolution there. One is reminded of the bank robberies that Josef Stalin and the other early Bolsheviks carried through in Czarist Russia for a similar purpose.

As for Guatemala, the United States was largely instrumental in 1954 in ousting the Arbenz regime, which had been collaborating closely with Moscow. For the past decade, there has been undercover agitation in Guatemala by Communist-led elements, and these same elements have been trying to expand their beachhead.

These and all other Communist revolutionaries in Latin America may well have been slowed down by President Johnson's swift action in recent days to prevent Reds trained in Havana, Moscow, or Peking from grabbing the Dominican Republic.

At the same time, it could be that Mr. Johnson has pleased a great many Latin Americans and increased respect for the United States in the Caribbean and below the Rio Grande.

After the Bay of Pigs fiasco, many Central and South American leaders were much dismayed. They wanted to see Washington move forcefully to block the Communist takeover in Cuba, and we muffed the chance.

Hence today, despite the cries that are being heard in certain quarters concerning our unilateral intervention, and our so-called imperialism, it may well be that the overall effect in Latin America of our forceful action has been good.

Even Walter Lippmann, who has been arguing that we should pull out of Vietnam, is strongly in favor of what President Johnson has done in the Caribbean. We have moved, he says, to assert our rightful authority within our sphere of influence. And that, he declares, is exactly what we should have done. He is right.

[From the Wyoming Eagle, May 7, 1965]

## IMPORTANT STEPS

The crisis in the Dominican Republic is by no means ended.

Indeed, the crisis will not be ended until the citizens of the revolt-torn Caribbean island, through self-determination, have re-established a firm government—a non-Communist government.

But several important steps in the right direction already have been accomplished.

The first was when President Johnson acted promptly and decisively to prevent a communist takeover in the Dominican Republic.

Recognizing that what had begun as a popular revolution, dedicated to democracy and social justice, had been taken over "by a band of Communist conspirators," the President sent American troops to the island to protect U.S. citizens and to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere.

The next step was the establishment of a cease-fire and "firm truce."

Another very important step was taken early yesterday when the Organization of American States (OAS) voted to send an Inter-American peacekeeping force to police the Dominican Republic.

The OAS voted 14 to 5, with Venezuela ab-

staining, to approve a U.S.-sponsored resolution calling on member governments to provide army, navy, air force or national police troops for the new force.

Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Peru voted against the peace force resolution. And Mexico's Ambassador said he did not believe his government would be able to spare troops for the force.

On the other side of the picture, tiny Costa Rica, which boasts it has no army, immediately offered to place its 3,500-man national police force at the disposal of the OAS.

U.S. Ambassador, Ellsworth Bunker said he was gratified by the vote, which was exactly the two-thirds majority needed. And he indicated that the Inter-American force might become a permanent part of the OAS peace-keeping machinery.

Under the resolution, the OAS will be in complete control of the peacekeeping force, which will be directed by a unified command with power to determine when it is no longer needed in the Dominican Republic.

It is to be hoped that all the nations, including those which voted against the resolution, will participate in the peacekeeping force in the interest of hemispheric harmony and security, now and in the future.

In the meantime, it seems to us that President Johnson has given new meaning and new life to the doctrine laid down by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823.

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 183, but excluding Nos. 188 and 189.

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

The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, as requested.

# REPRINT OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGING ENTITLED "FRAUDS AND DECEPTION AFFECTING THE ELDERLY; INVESTIGATIONS, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS"

The resolution (S. Res. 92) to permit reprint of the Committee on Aging report entitled "Frauds and Deception Affecting the Elderly; Investigations, Findings, and Recommendations," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed, for the use of the Special Committee on Aging, six thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly; Investigations, Findings, and Recommendations, 1964", a report by the Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly.

# REPRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "PROPOSED FEDERAL PROMOTION OF 'SHARED TIME' EDUCATION (A DIGEST OF RELEVANT LITERATURE AND SUMMARY OF PRO AND CON ARGUMENTS)"

The resolution (S. Res. 98) to print as a Senate document the proposed committee print entitled "Proposed Federal Promotion of 'Shared Time' Education (a Digest of Relevant Literature and

Summary of Pro and Con Arguments)" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the committee print entitled "Proposed Federal Promotion of 'Shared Time' Education (a Digest of Relevant Literature and Summary of Pro and Con Arguments)", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the request of Senator WAYNE MORSE and issued by the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session; and that there be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

# REPRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STUDENT ASSISTANCE HANDBOOK (GUIDE TO FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL)"

The resolution (S. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document the committee print entitled "Student Assistance Handbook (Guide to Financial Assistance for Education Beyond High School)" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the committee print entitled "Student Assistance Handbook (Guide to Financial Assistance for Education Beyond High School)", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and issued by the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress, second session; and that there be printed four thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

# ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 101) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, \$35,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

# PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO CARRIE WALTON

The resolution (S. Res. 108) to pay a gratuity to Carrie Walton was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carrie Walton, widow of Barrister L. H. Walton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the time he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

# PRINTING OF POCKET-SIZED EDITION OF "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 383) authorizing the printing of a pocket-sized

10660

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20, 1965

edition of "The Constitution of the United States of America" as a House document, and for other purposes, was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PATIENCE FOR PEACE DRAMATIZED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the recently ended lull in the bombing of military installations in North Vietnam has demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt President Johnson's willingness to travel more than halfway down the road toward negotiations to end the fighting in that war-ravaged corner of southeast Asia.

The temporary discontinuance of the bombing raids represented further evidence of American restraint in the face of provocative Communist aggression. While the 6-day lull was undoubtedly a considerable sacrifice on the part of our military operations there—particularly in view of the fact that the monsoons will soon close down our air operations—it was ordered by the administration to give every chance for a beginning of negotiations to end the fighting.

The failure of the Communists to respond to our invitation places the burden of guilt for the continuation of the fighting squarely on the shoulders of the regimes in Hanoi and Peiping.

This point is clearly and concisely made in the lead editorial of the New York Times for May 20, 1965.

Another important point on the Vietnam situation was scored in an article written by John Chamberlain and published in this morning's Washington Post. Mr. Chamberlain reports that Rajmohan Gandhi, the grandson of Mahatma Gandhi, believes that the presence of American forces in Vietnam "lengthens freedom's duration in India" and in the other southeast Asian countries.

Gandhi's support of President Johnson and our military posture in Vietnam is significant evidence that all Asiatic intellectuals are not opposed to our policy. In his weekly magazine, *Himmat*, Gandhi pointed out with cold realism the need to fight the determined Communist program of forcing communism on the countries of southeast Asia.

Gandhi obviously realizes that passive resistance—employed by his grandfather to free India from Great Britain—works only against a nation that is fundamentally humane. The tactics of passive resistance—peaceful marches, demonstrations, and walks to the sea—are futile against the ruthless and terroristic militancy of Red China.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial and the Washington Post article be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1965]

#### SUPPORT FROM INDIA

(By John Chamberlain)

We are constantly being told that there is a "world opinion" to which we must defer in foreign policy moves. But the former State Department official who, in a scoffing reply to a well-known commentator, remarked that the vast majority in Asia don't even know where Vietnam is was probably pretty close to the truth. In any event, there is no single opinion, no consensus, even among literates in Asia about the action of the United States in South Vietnam.

The Indian intellectuals are supposedly against what we are doing—or, at least, so we are asked to judge from the words of Nehru's successor, Prime Minister Shastri. Both Nehru and Shastri can be truly represented as the heirs of Mahatma Gandhi. But they are not the only heirs.

For Rajmohan Gandhi, the grandson of India's revered liberator, has come forward with a new interpretation of his grandfather's doctrines that differs somewhat from the Nehru-Shastri variety. In his own weekly magazine, *Himmat*, young Gandhi has chosen, in the name of peace and his own Indian version of the Western idea of "moral rearmament," to support what Lyndon Johnson has been doing in Vietnam.

Since the Moral Re-Armament movement in the West was identified in the 1930's with pacifism, Rajmohan Gandhi may appear to be a walking contradiction. But the young man makes a good deal of basic sense. He argues that there are two colliding realities in southeast Asia. The first reality is that Hanoi and Peking regimes will, "short of inviting serious damage upon themselves," adopt every means to force communism on South Vietnam. The second reality is, that by fighting to prevent the communization of South Vietnam, "America is stemming communism in Asia as a whole."

Like his grandfather, young Gandhi doesn't believe you can conquer ideas with bullets. But he is realist enough to know that passive resistance only works against an enemy who is himself fundamentally humane. Fighting the British, a nation with a long Christian and parliamentary tradition, by sit-down tactics and marches to the sea as Mahatma Gandhi did, is one thing. But fighting Communists by such tactics only invites disaster.

Knowing the difference between enemies, Rajmohan Gandhi says that "whether or not we like the American manner of fighting in Vietnam, and whether or not we believe that the Vietnamese people want the American military presence, this presence lengthens freedom's duration in India. We need to be grateful, therefore, for the American soldier who leaves family and comfort and roughs it out in Vietnam at considerable risk. Should the Americans decide to pull out of Vietnam, a pro-Communist or fully Communist government will soon be installed in Saigon.

"Laos will then speedily succumb, and Thailand will be in a precarious state. If Thailand goes Communist, what remains of Burma's freedom will disappear and Rangoon's status will quite likely be reduced to that of a provincial capital of China. Malaysia will be unable then to stay outside of Peiping's control. China's grip on India will become tighter and stronger and will not fail, in fact, to crush us."

Going beyond his realpolitik, however, young Gandhi picks up the main thread of his grandfather's thinking. The "third reality" in South Vietnam, he says, is that "communism is strong \* \* \* and will not vanish if military and financial aid from Peiping and Hanoi were to end \* \* \*. This basic

truth has got to be faced—you cannot kill an idea with a bullet or a bomb. You can only defeat it with a better idea."

It is at this point that young Gandhi offers "Moral Re-Armament" as a superior idea.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1965]

#### END OF THE PAUSE

The failure of the Communists to respond favorably to the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam is a tragedy for Vietnam and for the world. It inevitably will lengthen and intensify a war which serves the interest of no people and already has gone on too long.

That war, as President Johnson said last week, has "no purely military solution in sight for either side." It can only be ended by negotiation and a political settlement. The United States has made or agreed to numerous proposals for negotiations ever since the President on April 7 called for "unconditional discussions." Yet the Communists, at every turn, have given a negative response.

North Vietnam and Communist China have rejected not only all American proposals but also the plea of 17 nonaligned chiefs of state for unconditional negotiations. They have turned down the French suggestion of a new Geneva conference without preconditions, the Soviet endorsement of a Cambodian conference, the British effort to send former Foreign Minister Gordon Walker to consult them, Secretary General Thant's offer to visit Hanoi and Peiping for exploratory talks, and India's proposal for a ceasefire monitored by an Afro-Asian force.

Nevertheless, it was essential to make still another demonstration both to American opinion and to the world that Washington was prepared to be flexible and reasonable. Also it clarified whether the bombing of North Vietnam was the chief block to negotiations—as Soviet, French, Indian, and even Canadian leaders had suggested.

There can be little doubt on this question now. Hanoi asserts that the pause was accompanied privately by a time limit and an American demand that Vietcong attacks in South Vietnam halt; these are points that Washington would be wise to clarify. But the remainder of the statement by the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry makes it clear that a decision has been taken against negotiations at this time.

In the end, Peiping's proximity has proved the potent factor, and Hanoi has decided to continue the war—at least through the monsoon offensive that now seems to be opening. It is extraordinary, in these circumstances, to find Prime Minister Shastri, of India, joining Moscow in calling for an immediate halt in the bombing of North Vietnam—without any reference to the halt that has just been tried.

The focus of attention now will turn to the battlefields of Asia. The summer rains will hamper American air support for Government forces, but the basic military-political balance in Vietnam is unlikely to be altered in the course of the summer or afterward. The negotiations rejected by the Communists now will have to be accepted by them at some later date. When that date approaches, the precedent of a bombing pause undoubtedly will be invoked again to help bring about the negotiated settlement that not only is desirable, but inevitable.

#### SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION SPEEDUP NEEDED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, during the past 3 months I have heard many Senators voice their views in this Chamber with regard to the importance of soil and water conservation to the future of America.



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1965

No. 91

## Senate

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 19, 1965, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. YATES as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from May 20 to May 23, 1965, vice Mr. St GERMAIN, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 327) to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 436) to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

### NOTICE OF BRIEFING FOR SENATORS ON FRIDAY ON SITUATION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Secretary of State will brief the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, Friday, May 21, in the com-

mittee room, S-116, the Capitol, on the situation in the Dominican Republic. Any member of the Senate who is interested is invited to attend.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported adversely without amendment:

S. Res. 102. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Rept. No. 203).

Mr. RIBICOFF subsequently said: Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 102.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles (Rept. No. 207);

S. 133. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr. (Rept. No. 208);

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty) (Rept. No. 209);

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Carleen Coen (Rept. No. 210);

S. 449. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialogowski (Rept. No. 211);

S. 450. A bill for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey (Rept. No. 212);

S. 579. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire (Rept. No. 213);

S. 582. A bill for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev (Rept. No. 214);

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo (Rept. No. 215);

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Maria Tsilis (Rept. No. 216);

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Andreina Viselli (Rept. No. 217);

S. 1040. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Rafala Monarca (Rept. No. 218);

S. 1064. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe (Rept. No. 219);

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang (Rept. No. 220);

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast (Rept. No. 221);

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian (Rept. No. 222);

10649

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in the secret of Thy pavilion, we would take refuge from the strife of tongues. By tasks too difficult for us, we are driven unto Thee for strength to endure and for wisdom to rightly interpret the signs of these trying times.

To Thy sustaining grace, in this dedicated moment, we lift up the thronging yearnings which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting Thy children in all the world, for which our human wisdom finds no answer.

Above the noise of crashing social systems, hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our devotion and compassion help to heal the open sores of the world, as we serve the present troubled age.

Through the lips that speak in this forum of freedom, above all differences, may there be heard by a listening world the solemn summons to men of good will, of all colors and all nations, to a new commonwealth of all people, in which power shall be administered as a sacred trust, dedicated to the common good.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

S. 1138. A bill for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson (Rept. No. 223);

S. 1197. A bill for the relief of Angelina Martino (Rept. No. 224);

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Sp. Manual D. Racelis (Rept. No. 225);

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp. (Rept. No. 226);

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi (Rept. No. 227);

S. 1468. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Eyre (Rept. No. 228);

S. 1498. A bill for the relief of Nikolai Ar-tamonov (Rept. No. 229);

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of the Jef-ferson Construction Co. (Rept. No. 230);

H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser (Rept. No. 231);

H.R. 2139. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes (Rept. No. 232);

H.R. 2354. An act for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired (Rept. No. 233); and

H.R. 3995. An act to transfer certain func-tions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 234).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho (Rept. No. 235);

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon (Rept. No. 236);

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim (Rept. No. 237);

S. 826. A bill for the relief of Har Gobind Khorana (Rept. No. 238);

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Wright G. James (Rept. No. 239); and

S. 1388. A bill for the relief of David Lee Bogue (Rept. No. 240).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Ming Chup Chaw (Rept. No. 241).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 313. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of In-vestigation (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 516. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commis-sion, and for other purposes," approved Au-gust 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize ap-propriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution (Rept. No. 206).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C. (Rept. No. 204).

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,  
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:  
One hundred and seventy-nine postmaster nominations.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
E. Herman Burrows, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina; and  
Paul D. Sossamon, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of North Carolina.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Joseph N. Tierney, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Com-mittee on the Judiciary:  
F. Russell Millin, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri;  
Francis M. Wilson, of Missouri, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Missouri; and  
Olin N. Bell, of Missouri, to be U.S. mar-shal for the eastern district of Missouri.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., of New York, to be an assistant attorney general;  
Joseph P. Hoey, of New York, to be U.S. at-torney for the eastern district of New York; and  
Justin J. Mahoney, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of New York.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Edward F. Boardman, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Florida.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
W. Arthur Garrity, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massa-chusetts.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan; and  
Harold D. Beaton, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Don J. Young, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio;  
James E. Doyle, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Wisconsin;  
Lavern R. Dilweg, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission;  
Joseph P. Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio;  
Newell A. George, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas;  
Ernest W. Rivers, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Ken-tucky;  
Raymond J. Pettine, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island;  
Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Minnesota;  
Lawrence M. Henry, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado;  
William T. Thurman, of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Utah;  
John Terrill, of Wyoming, to be U.S. mar-shal for the district of Wyoming;  
George A. Bayer, of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska; and  
Cvcell H. Meek, of Iowa, to be U.S. mar-shal for the northern district of Iowa.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:  
Frid Moore Vinson, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina:  
S. 2001. A bill to provide for the extension of second-class mailing privileges to publi-cations of State educational television agen-cies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:  
S. 2002. A bill to amend the Internal Reve-nue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct from gross income the expenses, not exceeding \$300 a year, paid for transporta-

tion to and from his place of abode and his place of business or employment; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear un-der a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2003. A bill for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.; and

S. 2004. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Mallalieu Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR PUBLICATIONS OF STATE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AGENCIES

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the ex-tension of second-class mailing privileges to publications of State educational tel-evision agencies. I ask unanimous con-sent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately re-ferred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as re-quested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The bill (S. 2001) to provide for the extension of second-class mailing privi-leges to publications of State educational television agencies, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, was re-ceived, read twice by its title, and re-ferred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. South Carolina has pioneered in what is generally recognized as the model edu-cational television system in this Nation. Through this system, every school dis-trict in our State is provided with both basic and supplementary educational ma-terial of outstanding quality. More than that, this system has broadened its edu-cational activities to include special pro-grams in medicine, in nursing, in business education, and in public affairs at the adult level. It has been an educational program to serve all segments of our pop-ulation in the fullest possible way.

To aid in its program, to make avail-able to the public its various programs, to provide essential background material, and to acquaint the public to be served with both the nature and the timing of its various programs, our educational television department publishes a news-letter. This is an essential part of bring-ing its activities to the attention of the public and encouraging the full use of educational television programs.

Such a newsletter is given general dis-tribution. It represents a public service made without charge and has, ac-cordingly, no paid subscription lists.

Under a ruling by the Postmaster Gen-eral made under title 39, United States Code, section 4355, this newsletter may not be distributed as second-class matter through the postal service. This section extends this privilege to practically every other educational newsletter. Because the statute does not specifically identify educational television, however, this priv-ilege has been denied our educational television department. This proposed



May 20, 1965

latures, as the only restricting power is in the Constitution, itself.

In Butler against Thompson, affirmed by the Supreme Court, 241 U.S. 937, the Court had before it an act of Congress which was subject to an interpretation that it purported to prohibit the State of Virginia from changing its constitution with regard to certain aspects of its poll tax. The Court, in rejecting such a construction of the act, said:

This act does not attempt to place Virginia in a straitjacket so far as the election laws of Virginia are concerned. If the act made that attempt, the act would be invalid.

S. 1564 does attempt to put selected States in a straitjacket insofar as their election laws are concerned, and is therefore invalid.

## CONCLUSION

Mr. President, last week the Senate rejected an amendment on the grounds that it would violate the Constitution. In view of the manifold unconstitutional aspects of the provisions remaining in the bill, one can only conclude that the Senate has resolved to strain at a gnat and swallow the camel. Be assured, however, if the Senate insists on following this course that the indigestion which results will be of a major magnitude.

## THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have withheld any extensive comment on the Dominican Republic crisis until I felt that I had at least been sufficiently briefed so that I had a set of facts that would justify my making some judgments.

The members of the subcommittee have done their best to inform themselves in regard to developments in the Dominican Republic since the President of the United States sent in the 1st Marines to evacuate American nationals. We have asked for briefings, and we have sought the facts; but I am not in a position this afternoon to say that we are fully apprised of the events that have occurred in Latin America in respect to American activities there. However, I feel not only that I have analyzed a sufficient body of information and evidence to justify my presenting these observations this afternoon, but also that I have a clear duty and trust to perform in so doing as chairman of the subcommittee.

We are getting a great deal of information from the press. And as is the case so frequently in recent years, the press accounts of what is going on in the Dominican Republic are quite at variance with what we are told in the official briefings.

I desire to have the Senate know that whenever any facts can be presented to me or to my subcommittee that would warrant my forming other opinions and expressing other views, I shall not hesitate to do so.

At the present time, there is disturbing news from the Dominican Republic, as we read it in the press this morning, under the headline, as the Washington

Post puts it, "U.S. Troops Aid Junta As Rebels Lose Ground."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the story published in the Washington Post be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the American people, the Organization of American States—and, indeed, the whole hemisphere—have been repeatedly assured that U.S. troops are not in the Dominican Republic to impose our will, but merely to maintain order until the Dominicans themselves can construct a government. However, the story published in the press this morning is not the first piece of evidence that U.S. troops have been more neutral on the side of the military junta.

The Record will show that the day on which the President of the United States sent marines into the Dominican Republic I spoke on the floor of the Senate and pointed out that under our international law the President had the right—and, I believe, in view of the circumstances existing—the clear duty, to send American troops into the Dominican Republic for the limited purpose of evacuating American nationals and the nationals of other countries who wished to associate themselves with the evacuation.

I made that statement because we are already receiving criticism over the wires—some of it bitter—from Latin American leaders in Chile, Colombia, Venezuela, Argentina, Peru, and other Latin American countries protesting what they call a return to the Marine intervention policies of the United States from times past when our foreign policy was branded derisively throughout Latin America as gunboat diplomacy.

I said on the floor of the Senate that afternoon that I would like to assume that the criticisms that were so soon emanating from Latin America were made by Latin American allies who had not been informed, as the President had been informed, by the military junta that it could no longer give the assurance of protection to American nationals and the nationals of other countries. The criticism that was coming over the wires from Latin America used a fighting word in Latin America, in which the criticism of the United States is very often framed and phrased—the word "intervention."

We all know the sensitivity of Latin Americans in regard to U.S. intervention. We have some black and sorry and bloody chapters in American history in regard to our policies in Latin America. We have nothing to be proud of concerning some of our so-called legitimate interventions in Latin America.

Mr. President, as I argued on the floor of the Senate that Friday afternoon, when the President sent our marines into the Dominican Republic, intervention is not the term to apply to a situation in which the head of a state sends airplanes

or vessels and the necessary personnel to take out American citizens whom the Government cannot protect.

In that speech I completely supported the President's right and, as I said, duty, as the Record will show, to send marines in to take out those American citizens. However, after reading the criticisms from our Latin American allies, I also, in that speech, warned that we would be in violation of international law, in violation of our commitments and obligations under the Organization of American States' Charter, which we signed, and in violation of the Rio Pact if we remained after U.S. nationals had been removed, or if we took sides in the dispute, or if we decided for ourselves what form of government should be established in the Dominican Republic.

I am sorry to say that as of this hour, in my judgment, the evidence is overwhelmingly against the United States in respect to our living up to our clear international obligation not to intervene by taking sides or aiding one side in a revolution in Latin America.

As the result of the course of action that President Johnson has followed in the Dominican Republic, over and beyond exercising his right to evacuate American citizens, we probably have set back our relations in Latin America 25 years, so far as the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress objectives are concerned. I am sad about that. It is unnecessary, uncalled for, and unfortunate.

It is to the credit of the President of the United States that he immediately called upon the Organization of American States and all the members thereof to assume their obligations under the charter and under the Rio Pact and other agreements that have been signed by members of the Organization of American States.

I quite agree with the attitude of the President of the United States, or my interpretation of the attitude of the President of the United States, as I have read his comments in the press, that the Organization of American States did not act with great dispatch. I go further than that, speaking for myself, by saying that I find myself very much in sympathy with the observations made in editorials in the New York Times which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, along with some observations that have been made by several columnists, including Arnold Toynbee and others bearing upon this matter.

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

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Organization of American States did not act with greater dispatch and, in my opinion, is still not acting with adequate dispatch.

Our good allies to the south of us must face up to the fact that it will not be possible to maintain a desirable stability in the Western Hemisphere, that we shall not be able to prevent the effectuation of serious threats to freedom of constitutional government in the Western Hemisphere unless every signa-

certain of the States which fall within certain prescribed statistical formulas while leaving unimpaired the authority of other States to impose such voting requirements.

In the case of *Coyle v. Smith*, 221 U.S. 559, the Supreme Court stated:

This Union was and is a Union of States, equal in power, dignity, and authority, each competent to exert that residuum of sovereignty not delegated to the United States by the Constitution itself.

To this we may add that the constitutional equality of the States is essential to the harmonious operation of the scheme upon which the Republic was organized. When that equality disappears, we may remain a free people, but the Union will not be the Union of the Constitution.

Fifth, S. 1564 violates the provisions of section 2, article IV, guaranteeing equal privileges and immunities to the citizens of the several States by depriving the citizens of certain statistically selected States of the constitutional privilege of setting qualifications for electors.

Section 2 of article IV of the Constitution provides:

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

By invalidating and nullifying the privilege of the citizens of certain States to set qualifications for electors, the bill would deprive the citizens of certain States of privileges protected by the Constitution and which would remain in force with regard to citizens of other States.

Sixth, S. 1564 constitutes a bill of attainder in violation of clause 3, section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

Article I, section 9, clause 3, of the Constitution provides that:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

The Supreme Court, in *Cummings v. Missouri*, 71 U.S. 277, defined a bill of attainder as follows:

A bill of attainder is a legislative act, which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. . . . These bills . . . may be directed against . . . a whole class.

Punishment . . . embraces deprivation or suspension of political or civil rights.

In describing bills of attainder, the Court, in the same case said:

The legislative body in addition to its legitimate function, exercises the power and office of judge. . . . It pronounces the guilt of the party, without any of the forms of safeguards of trial; it determines the sufficiency of the proof produced. . . . It fixes the degree of punishment in accordance with its own notions of the enormity of the offense.

The bill convicts the citizens of certain States of violations of the 15th amendment to the Constitution without a trial, or any of its safeguards.

The Congress would by this bill determine the sufficiency of proof of guilt by the imposition of a statistical formula, rather than by proof of actual fact.

The punishment imposed is the deprivation from the selected States of the political right to fix qualifications for voters.

Seventh, S. 1564 constitutes an ex post facto law in violation of clause 3, section 9, article I, of the Constitution.

The bill would impose a punishment—deprivation of the political right to fix qualifications for electors—on the citizens of those States or political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the voting age population registered or voted in November 1964.

Punishment is inflicted for the failure to vote the set percentage. When the act of not voting in sufficient numbers was committed in November 1964, the act did not constitute a punishable offense.

This bill, by making action committed in November 1964 punishable, which was not punishable when committed, constitutes an ex post facto law.

Eighth, S. 1564 violates the due process requirements of the fifth amendment as well as the privileges and immunities provisions of article IV, section 2, by attempting to establish a classification on an irrebuttable presumption.

The bill establishes an irrebuttable presumption that when less than 50 percent of the voting age population either was not registered or did not vote in the November 1964 election, in States or subdivisions in which more than 20 percent of the population by the 1960 census was nonwhite, that there have been and are violations of the 15th amendment.

In *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 13 L. Ed. 2d 675, the Supreme Court stated:

Classification must always rest upon some difference which bears a reasonable and just relation to the act in respect to which the classification is proposed, and can never be made arbitrarily and without any such basis . . . arbitrary selection can never be justified by calling it classification.

In *Hinder v. Donnan*, 285 U.S. 312, the Court held that a classification could not be based upon conclusive presumption.

Ninth, S. 1564 violates the due process provisions of the 15th amendment, withdraws rights and privileges without affording the right to a hearing.

Under section 3(a) of the bill, legally imposed voting qualification requirements imposed by the citizens of certain States would be invalidated and the right of the citizens of those States to fix voter qualifications withdrawn upon specified certification of statistical information by the Attorney General and/or the Director of Census. The States and subdivisions affected, and the citizens thereof, would have no opportunity for a hearing before the imposition of the penalty.

In *Gurfield v. United States*, 211 U.S. 219, the Supreme Court stated:

The right to be heard before property is taken or rights or privileges withdrawn which have been previously awarded is of the essence of due process of law. It is unnecessary to recite the decisions in which this principle has been repeatedly recognized. It is enough to say that its binding obligation has never been questioned in this Court.

Tenth, S. 1564 violates the due process provisions of the fifth amendment because it is lacking in the requisite precision required of statutes which affect the basic freedoms.

Section 3(a) of the bill purports to invalidate and suspend powers reserved to the citizens of the several States; namely, the power to establish voter qualifications which do not discriminate on account of race, color, or sex.

The power to establish voter qualifications was specifically reserved to the States and to the people of the States by the 10th amendment, and a more basic freedom is hard to imagine.

In *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*, 84 S. Ct. 1668, the Supreme Court held that "precision must be the touchstone or legislation so affecting basic freedoms."

Section 3(a) is so ambiguous as to completely fail this test.

This section purports to invalidate the application of "tests or devices" only in those States or political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age either were registered or voted in the elections of November 1964.

The ambiguity is illustrated by the following question. In a State in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age voted in November 1964, and in which the nonwhite population was more than 20 percent of the total population according to the 1960 census, would the use and enforcement of literacy tests be invalidated in a county within the State in which less than 20 percent of the total population was nonwhite and in which county more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age voted in the presidential election of 1964?

The ambiguity is apparently intentional, for the consequences of precision on this point would be fatal to the constitutional issues of the bill.

Eleventh, S. 1564 violates the due process provisions of the fifth amendment in that it flouts the due process requirement of presumption of innocence until proven guilty.

One of the most fundamental elements of due process is the presumption of innocence until there is proof of guilt.

Under the bill, the people of those States and political subdivisions which fall within the selective formula of section 3(a) would be presumed guilty of the 15th amendment violations until the accused initiate an action in court to prove their innocence.

To escape the punishment prescribed by the act, States and subdivisions would be required to initiate an action in which they would have to carry the burden of proof of their innocence.

Twelfth, S. 1564 violates the Constitution by imposing a prior restraint on a prima facie lawful and constitutional act of State legislatures.

The bill would impose a prior restraint on the legislative act of selected States which touched the field of voting qualifications or procedures. The bill would prohibit the enforcement of such State legislative acts until the Attorney General or a specified court, in an action initiated by the State, held such acts to be constitutional.

The Congress does not have the power to restrict the authority of State legis-

May 20, 1965

10731

tory to the Organization of American States Charter throws away the escapeism of "let George do it."

We are all in the same international boat in the Western Hemisphere, we free nations, and that is why I believe the Organization of American States ought to set up a peacekeeping corps, a hemispheric police organization, so that no nation, particularly the United States, will be put in the position where, if threats to the peace are to be prevented, it will have to fulfill the function of "letting George do it."

But it is a deeper problem than that, Mr. President. It is too bad that the Organization of American States has not sent in an effective peacekeeping corps. It is too bad the junta and rebel forces have not given heed to the pleas of the group given the assignment by the Organization of American States to seek a cease-fire.

For that matter, I think it is most unfortunate that the Organization of American States has not given overt demonstration of delight and satisfaction in having the United Nations interest itself in the threat to the peace that has arisen in the Dominican Republic.

It is interesting to read some of the newspaper editorials and correspondents' stories based upon a false major premise that the United Nations has no right to go in so long as a regional body is not deemed to have exhausted all its procedures and influences.

The setting up of a regional organization, be it the Organization of American States, NATO, SEATO, or any other regional group, does not supersede the United Nations in its obligations. Quite to the contrary. The United Nations has a right—and I believe, on the basis of the facts that have developed in most of the threats to the peace in various parts of the world, it has an obligation and duty—to make itself immediately available to any regional organization to strengthen the arm of that regional organization in taking the necessary steps to maintain peace.

I was very much disappointed in Mr. Adlai Stevenson, just as I have been disappointed in him before, in the past 2 years, as our Ambassador to the United Nations. It was perfectly obvious in the Security Council that he was arguing in a manner that left him open to only one interpretation; if the English language is to mean anything—namely, that he was representing the position of the United States that the United Nations should not interest itself so long as the Organization of American States was expressing some interest in the Dominican crisis.

The position of the Ambassador, speaking for the United States in the United Nations, should have been exactly the opposite. Ambassador Stevenson should have had instructions, and we ought to have evidence that he made the recommendation that the United Nations should join the Organization of American States in using peacekeeping facilities available in the United Nations to try to resolve the threat to the peace in the Dominican Republic by way of peaceful procedures rather than bullets.

But be that as it may, I have a great deal of sympathy for the President of the United States, if I correctly interpret the newspaper accounts of his attitude that the Organization of American States has not been the most effective instrumentality in trying to resolve the crisis in the Dominican Republic. However, I will not give up. I am a staunch supporter of the objectives of the Organization of American States. I want to see it strengthened, not weakened.

I urge now that all the nations in the Western Hemisphere that have signed the Charter, including the United States, resolve to do what they can to make up for lost time in connection with the Dominican Republic crisis, and urge the United Nations to do everything it can do and to be as effective as possible under the circumstances that confront us in this crisis.

We have troubles enough in the Dominican Republic—and throughout Latin America, for that matter—without compounding them by confirming the widespread Latin American suspicion that we are really on the side of such unsavory, reactionary characters as Antonio Imbert Barrera who indiscriminately brands all his opponents as Communists.

One of the greatest mistakes we made was more than a year ago when our Government recognized diplomatically the military junta in Latin America.

Once before I gave the Senate an account of that situation, but I repeat it in abbreviated form today, because it ought to be made a part of this speech if my position on this matter is to be understood by those who care to understand it.

More than a year ago I attended a briefing in the Cabinet Room in the White House, attended by several other Senators as well as by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, and the then Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Edwin Martin. I can say this because the information as to the purpose of that meeting was made very well known at the time, or shortly after the meeting, by information media that did not stem at all from the Congress of the United States.

At that meeting the representatives of the State Department recommended immediate recognition of the military junta in the Dominican Republic, representing that another coup was about to take place that would be bloody and anti-American, and that one of the reasons why the coup, to be conducted by the military junta, was to take place was that the United States had not recognized it.

I became lost in those semantics. I could not see any thread of cause-to-effect reasoning in such a proposal which would justify my reaching the conclusion that I should join in the recommendation that the military junta be recognized. The argument, it seemed to me, should have caused a warning flag to go up in the thinking of the participants in the conference that we certainly are not going to recognize de facto governments, even if they are de facto, because they seem to be out of sorts with us because

we have not recognized them prior thereto.

The argument is always the argument heard when the State Department wishes to alibi and rationalize and seek to excuse its following an unsound course of action in recognizing a military junta, that the only way we can have stability in a strife-torn Latin American country, or any other country in the world, is to give our diplomatic support to military dictators, which we have been doing in Latin America for a long time past—sometimes to our everlasting discredit and national shame.

As I listened to the rationalizations of the State Department, which for a long time has followed the course of supporting strong men in uniform in instance after instance in Latin America, I realized that this was another example of a proposal to repeat that costly mistake.

When the President called upon me for my advice on the recommendation that was made, I became the only Senator in the group who strongly urged him not to follow the advice.

I pointed out that in my opinion it would play directly into the hands of the Communists, that it would weaken every free government in Latin America, and that it would increase the danger to every free government in Latin America from two sides; namely, the Communists and the military. I pointed out that we should support constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic, not military tyranny, that we should be supporting constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic, not a military dictatorship; and that our policy should be one of saying to the people of the Dominican Republic and its military junta leaders that the only government the United States will recognize in the Dominican Republic will be a constitutional government when the country returns to constitutionalism.

I pointed out further that I held no brief for President Bosch, that I knew nothing about the allegations as to his philosophy or his inefficiency, but, neither had I heard of any proof offered before my committee which sustained the propaganda circulated in this country by supporters of the military junta, that Bosch deserved to be overthrown. I have had no proof since which would justify support of the proposition that Bosch should have been overthrown. I have studied rather carefully everything which has been offered as so-called evidence. I have yet to listen, to read, or have submitted to me by way of exhibit, one scintilla of evidence to show that former President Bosch of the Dominican Republic is a Communist.

I further pointed out that Bosch was out of the country, but that the Constitution of the Dominican Republic is not out of the country, and that the Constitution of the Dominican Republic calls for a succession to the vacancy which has been created. The Congress of the Dominican Republic did not flee the Dominican Republic. It remained, and is still there.

I pointed out further in the Cabinet meeting that, in my judgment, we should not recognize the military junta headed



May 20, 1965

by Gen. Wessin y Wessin, an American-trained Dominican officer who, interestingly enough, is a man heavily financed by American business interests in the Dominican Republic which enabled him to execute the military coup when the Bosch regime was overthrown.

There is no denying that in overthrowing the Bosch regime, General Wessin y Wessin and his military coconspirators were motivated primarily because of the fact that both President Bosch and the overwhelming majority of the Congress of the Dominican Republic were in favor of applying the good American constitutional principle; namely, that the military should be brought under the control and direction of the civilian government.

What is wrong with that?

We should have supported that great principle. We, as a great democratic Nation, lead the world as an example of constitutional excellence in government, so far as our domestic policy is concerned—and note my qualification, Mr. President, so far as our domestic policy is concerned—but, unfortunately, we do not have a clean record of supporting constitutionalism so far as our foreign policy is concerned. There, we are a "Jekyll and Hyde" as a nation in foreign policy. Too frequently we support dictatorships and military tyrants to overthrow constitutionalism. We try to excuse our actions on the ground that we must bend the knee at the altar of international political expediency. Nonsense.

I urged further that we make very clear that we are not going to recognize a military junta, but that we would recognize a government in the Dominican Republic under which its people are given the opportunity to restore their congress to power and to restore their constitution to effective operation.

I said further to the President of the United States at that conference:

You have the wrong group here to advise you. This is not the group from which you should be getting advice on this issue. You should at least get advice from another group. You should seek the advice of the Presidents of Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, and Costa Rica. You should seek the advice of the former Governor of Puerto Rico, Muñoz Marín, and the ex-President of Costa Rica, Jose Figueres. I know that time does not permit to get that advice, but you can take judicial notice of what it would be. For those democrats in Latin America, those supporters of freedom in Latin America, those Latin Americans with a great executive record of seeking to set up constitutionalism in their countries, would, in my opinion, unanimously, recommend against the advice given to you in this conference by the State Department and my Senate colleagues.

I can hear them say: "You recognize the military junta headed by this military tyrant, Gen. Wessin y Wessin and his coconspirators, and you will let down freedom in Latin America. You will demonstrate that when the chips of freedom are down, the United States cannot be counted upon to support freedom. You will play into the hands of every potential military junta in every country in Latin America—and there are very few countries in which there is not always the constant threat that

the military may still feel its power and take over.

"You will play into the hands of the Communists. You will weaken free governments in Latin America, because you will place them in greater danger, by these examples, of being overthrown."

One of the most recent examples is Honduras. At the very time when we were meeting in the Cabinet room, there was great concern as to what would be the American diplomatic policy toward Honduras. We made the same mistake in regard to Honduras. We ended recognizing the military tyranny in the Dominican Republic, and we followed it by recognizing the military tyranny in Honduras.

Let the RECORD show what the facts were about our Siamese twin recognition at that time, hitched together with the Dominican Republic and Guatemala.

Ten days before the presidential election in Honduras, when a popular candidate for the Presidency was known to be far ahead in that election, and would be swept into power by an overwhelming vote in a free election—there was no question about this being a free election—the Honduran Government was overthrown by a military junta. Why? The major reason, I am satisfied, was that this candidate for the Presidency was running on a platform the major plank of which set forth the good American constitutional principle, namely, that the military ought to be brought under the control of the civilian government.

That is the last thing that the Honduran military proposed to have happen. So they staged a revolution. They overthrew the government. The candidate for the Presidency had to flee the country. There has been no free election since.

The United States, in spite of that black chapter of military tyranny in Honduras, shortly after it recognized the Dominican military junta, recognized the military junta in Honduras.

By "recognition," of course, we also mean "aid." It is never enough for us to recognize; we believe we have to finance any junta we recognize.

Senators should go with me into Latin American countries and listen to some of the biting and bitter criticism of our Government on the part of our friends in Latin America on the course of mistaken policy in Latin America that the Johnson administration has followed since it came into office in respect to the matter of recognizing military juntas.

Of course, it can be said it was done by others, too. It was. That does not justify this administration's doing it.

That happens to be some of the background of the Dominican situation. I am very sorry that the Johnson administration made those two inexcusable diplomatic mistakes. A part of the reason for the problem in the Dominican Republic today goes back to both of those mistakes. We cannot follow a policy outside the Dominican Republic of playing "footsie" with military tyrants and not have it wash off onto us by way of justifiable criticism in respect to our policies in the Dominican Republic.

I am not arguing that in the Domini-

can Republic we should support the rebels, either. I am arguing for a truly neutral position. I am merely saying that we should avoid taking sides in the hatred and bitterness that prevail in the Dominican Republic.

I also point out that if maintaining order was one of the reasons why we went into the Dominican Republic, we have been doing a rather poor job of it.

The course we seem to be pursuing in the Dominican Republic threatens our position, not only in the Dominican Republic, but also throughout the hemisphere. It threatens to undo the slow and painful gains which have been made through the Alliance For Progress. I hope very much that we shall reconsider this course before it is too late.

#### AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

The actions of the United States in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are linked in a number of significant ways. Consider, for example, the international legal implications of American involvement in both places.

The Department of State, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has prepared what purport to be legal justifications for the use of American Armed Forces in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

I ask that these memorandums be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### LEGAL BASIS FOR UNITED STATES ACTIONS AGAINST NORTH VIETNAM

##### I. THE ISSUE

This memorandum considers the question whether United States-South Vietnamese actions against military targets in North Vietnam are justified in international law, particularly in light of the United Nations Charter and the 1954 Geneva accords on Vietnam. It concludes that these actions are fully justified.

##### II. THE FACTS

On February 27, the Department of State issued "Aggression From the North," a report of North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam. That report establishes beyond question that North Vietnam is carrying out a carefully conceived plan of aggression against the South.

The evidence shows that the hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam were trained in the North and ordered into the South by Hanoi. It shows that the key leadership of the Vietcong, the officers and much of the cadre, many of the technicians, political organizers, and propagandists have come from the North and operate under Hanoi's direction. It shows that the training of essential military personnel and their infiltration into the South is directed by the military high command in Hanoi. It shows that many of the weapons and much of the ammunition and other supplies used by the Vietcong have been sent into South Vietnam from the North. The evidence plainly indicates that under Hanoi's overall direction the Communists have established an extensive machine, both political and military, for carrying on the war against South Vietnam.

The history of Hanoi's campaign to conquer South Vietnam is a long one. It was documented earlier in a report entitled "A Threat to the Peace" issued by the Department of State in December 1961. In a special report of June 1962, the International Control Commission in Vietnam concluded

May 20, 1965

that there was "sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt" that North Vietnam was sending arms and men into South Vietnam to carry out subversion with the aim of overthrowing the legal government there, in violation of the 1954 Geneva accords.

To meet the threat created by these violations of the Geneva accords and by North Vietnam's aggressive intervention contrary to general international law, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam requested U.S. assistance. We had been providing Vietnam since 1950-51 with both economic and military aid. This assistance was continued after the conclusion of the 1954 Geneva accords, within the limitations prescribed by those agreements. It had become apparent, however, by 1961 that this limited assistance was not sufficient to meet the growing Communist threat. Consequently, in 1961, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam requested additional aid from the United States. The United States responded with increased supplies and with larger numbers of training and advisory personnel to assist the Vietnamese forces in prosecuting the war against the Vietcong. This response was proportioned with the design of sustaining Vietnam in its defense against aggression without extending the conflict beyond the borders of the country.

The Communists, however, increased their intervention without regard to obligations under international law and international agreements by which they were bound. They stepped up the assistance from the north and increased the use of neighboring Laos as an infiltration route, in violation of the freshly concluded 1962 Geneva agreement for the settlement of the Laotian question.

In more recent months North Vietnam has sharply increased the infiltration of men and equipment into the south, and virtually all personnel are coming in are natives of North Vietnam. Dramatically illustrative of Hanoi's role is the discovery along the South Vietnamese coast on February 16, 1965, of a huge cargo of arms, ammunition, and other supplies, delivered by ship from North Vietnam. Major attacks by organized units are being launched against government forces. The North Vietnamese have even attacked U.S. vessels in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Thus, what began as covert and indirect aggression has become open armed aggression. This aggression has been carried out across the internationally agreed demarcation line of 1954 between North and South Vietnam, and across international frontiers between Vietnam and Laos.

### III. INTERNATIONAL LAW—THE U.N. CHARTER

As has been seen, North Vietnam is engaged in a continuing armed aggression against South Vietnam in violation of international agreements and international law.

This being the case, what are the Republic of Vietnam and the United States entitled to do under international law by way of response?

Under international law, the victim of armed aggression is obviously permitted to defend itself and to organize a collective self-defense effort in which others who are willing may join. This right is recognized in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Article 51 states:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by the members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such

actions as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

As has been seen above, the whole course of conduct of North Vietnam, particularly as it has evolved in recent months, adds up to open armed attack within the meaning of article 51. Indeed it is more than a single armed attack: it is a continuing program of armed aggression carried on across international frontiers and established demarcation lines. In these circumstances, South Vietnam has requested and received assistance from the United States and other nations in a collective defense effort.

Article 2, paragraph 4, of the charter is also relevant to the Vietnam situation. Article 2, paragraph 4 provides that "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In the first place, it is plain that the use of force against territorial integrity and political independence has been initiated by North Vietnam and not by anyone else. Second, paragraph 4 of article 2 of the charter does not place an absolute prohibition on the use of force. It permits the use of force in a manner consistent with the purposes and principles of the charter. Moreover, the charter itself specifically provides for the use of force in certain circumstances—action through the United Nations itself, action through regional arrangements and action in self-defense. The actions of the United States and the Republic of Vietnam, being defensive in character and designed to resist armed aggression, are wholly consistent with the purposes and principles of the charter and specifically with article 2, paragraph 4.

It was as a measure of self-defense under article 51 that the United States responded in August 1964 to the North Vietnamese attack on our vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin. Those measures were immediately reported to the Security Council in accordance with article 51. The Security Council did not see fit to take any action to maintain or restore international peace and security in the area. Indeed, North Vietnam refused to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council and explicitly denied the right of the Council to examine this question.

The attacks against South Vietnam have mounted in intensity since August. In these circumstances, it has been mutually agreed between the Government of South Vietnam and the U.S. Government that further means of providing for the collective defense of South Vietnam are required. Prompt defensive action has been decided upon, and airstrikes have been made against military installations and facilities in North Vietnam which support the aggression against the South. The actions taken constitute a limited and measured response, fitted to the situation that called for it. Again, these measures have been reported to the Security Council in accordance with article 51 of the United Nations Charter. As yet, the Council has taken no action to maintain an effective peace in the area. Until the regime in Hanoi decides to cease its aggressive intervention in South Vietnam, or until effective steps are taken to maintain international peace and security in the area, the Governments of the United States and the Republic of South Vietnam have every right to continue their individual and collective self-defense against the Communist armed aggression coming from North Vietnam.

### IV. THE GENEVA ACCORDS

It has been demonstrated that the North Vietnamese have repeatedly violated the 1954 Geneva accords in a most serious and flagrant manner. In so doing, of course, North Viet-

nam is ignoring an international agreement which it signed and by which it is bound. In addition, by the continued presence in neighboring Laos of North Vietnamese forces and their use of Laotian territory for infiltration into South Vietnam, North Vietnam is violating solemn commitments which it undertook in the 1962 Geneva agreements to refrain from such activities.

In these circumstances, international law recognizes the principle that a material breach of a treaty by one party entitles other parties at least to withhold compliance with an equivalent, corresponding or related provision until the other party is prepared to observe its obligations.

The actions of the Republic of Vietnam and the United States are fully consistent with this principle. North Vietnamese violations of the Geneva agreements have created an immediate danger to the continued independence and integrity of the Republic of Vietnam. The response of South Vietnam and the United States is designed to meet this threat created by North Vietnam's disregard of the accords. The extensive North Vietnamese violations certainly justify South Vietnam at least to withhold compliance with those provisions of the accords which limit its ability to protect its very existence. Both South Vietnam and the United States have made clear that the actions which they have taken will no longer be necessary if North Vietnam would comply with the accords.

### LEGAL BASIS FOR U.S. ACTIONS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

#### I

U.S. action in the Dominican Republic was emergency action taken to protect lives and to give the Inter-American system a chance to deal with a situation within its competence.

The United States initially landed troops in the Dominican Republic under conditions in which immediate action was essential to preserve the lives of foreign nationals—nationals of the United States and of many other countries. This kind of action is justified both on humanitarian and legal grounds. The United States continued its presence in the Dominican Republic for the additional purpose of preserving the capacity of the OAS to function in the manner intended by its charter—to achieve peace and justice by securing a cease-fire and by reestablishing orderly processes within which Dominicans can choose their own government, free from outside interference. With the adoption by the OAS Meeting of Foreign Ministers of a resolution providing for the establishment of an inter-American armed force, the U.S. military elements in the Dominican Republic will be included in that force.

The primary purposes for which the American States established the OAS, set forth in article 1 of its charter, are "to achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and their independence." The OAS thus exists to assist the American States to maintain their rights to defend their integrity and to provide for their preservation and prosperity. The action of the United States has given the organs of the OAS the essential time in which to consider the situation in the Dominican Republic and to determine means of preserving the rights that country has under the Inter-American system. The propriety of a regional agency "dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action" is expressly recognized by article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations.

#### II

The initial landing of U.S. Marine forces during the night of April 28-29 was ordered

May 20, 1965

by the President of the United States to protect the lives of U.S. nationals and those of other countries. The action was taken after the United States had been officially notified by Dominican authorities that they were no longer able to preserve order. The factual circumstances of the breakdown of order in the Dominican Republic were such that the landing could not have been delayed beyond the time it actually took place without needless sacrifice of many more lives—both foreign nationals and Dominican citizens—entailing serious danger to the peace and security of the hemisphere.

After U.S. forces arrived in the Dominican Republic, it became apparent that the structure of government had broken down to a point where there was not only no authority capable of preserving order but also no mechanism by which the Dominican people could freely choose their own government. The same evening when U.S. forces were initially dispatched to Santo Domingo, the United States requested an urgent meeting of the Council of the OAS. A meeting of the Council was held on the morning of April 29, and organs of the OAS proceeded to meet in continuing session thereafter on the Dominican situation.

The United States refused to observe merely the form of legalistic procedures to the detriment of fundamental rights of a nation under the OAS Charter. On April 28 the military junta in Santo Domingo, which had proclaimed itself to be the government, addressed a request to the United States to send in Armed Forces and crush the rebels. The United States could have recognized this group as the government of the Dominican Republic, and could have responded to their request. The United States declined to follow this course because it would have amounted to taking sides in the internal struggle and would, therefore, have resulted in actual interference with the freedom of the Dominican people to choose their own government. Such a course of action would have been inconsistent with the principles that govern the Inter-American system.

The obligations of nonintervention contained in articles 15 and 17 of the OAS Charter did not preclude the United States placing Armed Forces in the Dominican Republic for the humanitarian purpose of saving lives. Nor did those obligations require the United States to withdraw its forces in the days immediately after their landing, when it was entirely apparent that there was no local means of keeping order and providing essential public services in Santo Domingo. In fact, it would have been irresponsible for the United States to withdraw its forces when such a course would have endangered seriously the lives of foreign nationals not yet evacuated and would have led to a full-scale resumption of bloody civil war among the contending Dominican factions.

The United States, in maintaining elements of its Armed Forces in the Dominican Republic, acted to preserve the situation so that the organs of the Inter-American system could carry out their intended responsibilities under Inter-American treaties and assist the people of the Dominican Republic in reestablishing democratic government under conditions of public order.

The actions of the United States were designed to help give effect to the resolutions adopted by the OAS. These resolutions (1) called for a cease-fire; (2) appealed for the establishment of an international neutral zone of refuge; (3) dispatched a five-member commission to the Dominican Republic; and (4) called upon member governments to supply food and medicine to the people of the Dominican Republic. Without continued action by the United States, the OAS machinery could not have become effective.

Acting upon the recommendation of the five-man commission, the meeting of Foreign

Ministers resolved on May 6 to request the establishment of an inter-American armed force. This resolution recognized that the formation of the force would "signify ipso facto the transformation of the forces presently in Dominican territory into a force which will not be that of one state or group of states but that of the OAS, which Organization is charged with the responsibility of interpreting the democratic will of its members."

The meeting of Foreign Ministers is now considering other reports and recommendations from the five-member commission on the preservation of public order and the formation of a new Dominican Government. All of these efforts would have been frustrated if the United States had withdrawn its forces and thus invited a renewal of anarchy.

### III

There is a further consideration which supports the action taken by the United States. Available information has suggested that what began as a democratic revolution fell into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators. If a movement under such control had succeeded in establishing itself as the government of the Dominican Republic, the seizure of power by a totalitarian regime would in all likelihood have been irreversible. The OAS would have been deprived of any realistic possibility of assisting the Dominican people to determine freely their own political future. Rather than let such a risk materialize, the United States acted to preserve the situation pending consideration by the OAS and the taking of such steps as the OAS might recommend.

Participation in the inter-American system, to be meaningful, must take into account the modern day reality that an attempt by a conspiratorial group inspired from the outside to seize control by force can be an assault upon the independence and integrity of a state. The rights and obligations of all members of the OAS must be viewed in light of this reality.

The American States have formally recognized the dangers of international communism to the inter-American system. The Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, meeting at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system" and "adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alignment of such a government with the Communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere." This meeting of Foreign Ministers therefore urged "the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance."

### IV

The United States continues to support its commitment to the preservation of the right of all free peoples in this hemisphere to choose their own course, without falling prey to international conspiracy from any quarter.

The United States continues to support the OAS as the institution through which it is right can be realized when outside interference makes collective assistance to a sister republic necessary.

United States forces are not occupying the Dominican Republic. They are not assert-

ing authority to govern any part of the country. They are not taking sides in the civil conflict. U.S. action has been taken in order to help preserve for the people of the Dominican Republic their right to choose their government free from outside interference.

Experience has shown that if a group led by Communist conspirators and inspired by an outside power is permitted to seize control of a country by force, any further consideration of the right of the people of that country to choose their own course is an empty gesture.

U.S. forces continue to be present in the Dominican Republic only in support of OAS efforts to organize effective measures to prevent such a denial of freedom and further loss of life. As President Johnson has stated: "The moment that the Organization of American States can present a plan that will bring peace on the island and give us the opportunity to evacuate our people and give some hope of stability of government, we'll be the first to come back home."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that these two memoranda will provide some grist for the law review mills of this Nation. These memoranda can be torn to pieces—and they should be.

If these memoranda constitute a fair evaluation of the international law field of the U.S. State Department, one of the greatest needs in the State Department is to hire a few competent international lawyers, because these memoranda would not receive a passing grade in any international law course in any law school in the United States.

I do not blame the lawyers of the Department of State for the weaknesses of these memoranda. They had an impossible task—their job was as tough as that of the court-appointed law firm designated to defend a man accused of murder whose plea is "not guilty" even though there were a dozen eyewitnesses to the crime.

This is an ignominious position for any legal officer—to be called upon to provide legal justification for acts which on their face are *ultra vires*. The United States should never get itself in a position of *ex post facto* justification. If we expect to promote an orderly international community we must, above all things, live within the law of that community.

Mr. President, the United States has been living completely outside the law in Vietnam for 11 years, since 1954. We have been an outlaw nation in southeast Asia for 11 years. The Communists have, too. North Vietnam has, too. So has South Vietnam. So have the Vietcong. But what argument is it, because others engage in outlawry, that we should engage in outlawry, rather than go to the courts to seek the enforcement of existing law?

That is what we should have been doing. It is a sad thing that Adlai Stevenson, the Ambassador of the United States at the United Nations, has not insisted on it, or resigned his position as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. President, so far as our legal justification for ignoring the United Nations Charter in Vietnam and our unilateral stretching of the SEATO treaty to impose an obligation on the United States to send troops to Vietnam to engage in an undeclared war, I refer to a chapter

May 20, 1965

10735

in a remarkable booklet prepared by Don R. Larson and Arthur Larson entitled "Vietnam and Beyond." In chapter 2 these eminent scholars state unequivocally:

The true fact is that the United States has had no obligation to South Vietnam or anyone else under the SEATO treaty to use its own armed forces in the defense of South Vietnam.

I wonder if Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, will now say that those eminent international law scholars are gullible academic men.

Some days ago I paid my disrespects to Dean Rusk for the shocking, disgraceful, uncalled for and insulting speech that he made attacking the academic men and women of this country because they do not agree with him on Vietnam.

In that speech I did what I would have to be moved very deeply before offering to do. I challenged Mr. Rusk to join me in a public discussion of American policies in Vietnam on any campus or any number of campuses he wishes to name, and let him present to those campuses any justification within the framework of international law, or any justification on the basis of any other premise, for America's course of action in Vietnam. But I warned him that in that debate or those debates I would not protect him with any executive privilege, because if he desires to participate in that public discussion, the bars are down as far as telling the American people what the State Department, the White House, and the Pentagon should have been telling them for a long time past—the facts about America's policies in Asia and her plans in Asia. The American people are entitled to an open government that practices a precious safeguard of freedom; namely, full public disclosure of the public's business. They are not getting it, and they have not got it for a long time in Asia.

Short of a declaration of war, the American people are entitled to know about the war plans of their Government in Asia, for the American people will do the dying by the many millions if the administration continues to lead our country and mankind into a massive war in Asia.

Mr. President, if my country can follow the policy it is now following and have a great many military victories—military victories that will make it look as though our escalating of the war is paying off—none of those military victories will produce peace, for all those military victories will only intensify for many decades and generations, an intense hatred of the Asiatics for the people of the United States. We the people will suffer because of this inexcusable, uncalled for, unconstitutional, unjustified American war in Asia.

The Senate knows that only a few days ago I stood with only two other Senators in voting against the bill that was introduced, not because the President needed the \$700 million, because his own lips told us that he did not need it—he had the authority to use funds without passage of the bill—but as a vehicle to obtain another commitment from the

Congress of the United States in support of his policy in Asia.

At the time I said, and repeat today, that it was interesting to listen to the reservationists in the Senate, for Senator after Senator, as a reservationist, rose and said, "This does not commit me. This does not mean I am giving him a blank check. This does not mean that I do not expect to be consulted when more troops are sent over or when there is a proposal made really to expand the war."

My reply to them, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, was, "Whom do you think you are kidding? No one but yourselves. You are being consulted right now. You vote the President the vote of confidence that he is asking for, and that is the end of the consultation."

Events since that time have already proved how right I was, because already a good many thousands more have been sent over.

I should like to hear the Senator who was consulted.

Mr. President, what the Senate did was what it cannot do constitutionally. It sought and attempted to delegate to the President of the United States a warmaking power, and that cannot be done under the Constitution. We cannot make war legally without a declaration of war. That is why in my speech in opposition to the bill, in opposition to a vote of confidence in the President's Asian policy, I referred to an attempt on the part of the Congress to approve an undeclared war in Asia. In that speech I suggested—and repeat today in my speech—that there is a great deal of difference in all the international legal consequences between acting under a declared war and acting in violation of our international obligations as we are doing in Vietnam, for if there should be a recommendation for a declared war, and if Congress should vote it on the basis of the present facts, the senior Senator from Oregon would still vote against the declaration, for I know of no justification for declaring war in Asia. Judging from whom we are fighting, the only country that such a declaration of war could refer to would be North Vietnam. But a declaration of war against North Vietnam, or a proposal for one, would force an interesting debate, not only in the Congress, but at the grassroots of America. We would find an entirely different attitude on the part of millions of fellow Americans if it were proposed that we should go all the way and formally declare war—although we are making war, and it is our war. The South Vietnamese are now in a secondary position.

The South Vietnamese are doing what the United States tells them to do and only what the United States tells them to do in conducting this war. But a declaration of war would greatly change our international law relationships with all the world. It would be interesting if we declared war against North Vietnam and Great Britain continued to send her supply ships into North Vietnam, as she is doing now.

It is interesting, is it not, that we get words of praise from the Prime Minister of Great Britain about our activi-

ties in South Vietnam? But I ask him from the floor of the Senate this afternoon: "Mr. Prime Minister, when are you going to stop all your trade with North Vietnam?" We could ask that question of other so-called allies, too.

If there had been a declaration of war, there would have been a great change in international law relationships with the rest of the world. I have no doubt in my mind that that is a factor that is considered in connection with the course of action we are following in South Vietnam.

So far as the obligation of the United States to act under the terms of the United Nations Charter is concerned, these authors state:

There is one obligation in Vietnam \* \* \* that when other means of dealing with a threat to the peace have failed, the matter "shall" be referred to the Security Council.

That is not permissive; that is not optional; that is mandatory language, as we lawyers say. The sad fact is that the United States had no intention of doing it in the past and shows no intention of doing it in the future. I have yet to hear even a whisper that Adlai Stevenson has ever recommended it. We have failed in our obligation to this principle.

So far as the opinion of the Legal Adviser of the State Department, entitled "Legal Basis for U.S. Actions in the Dominican Republic," is concerned, I note only that it does not have the audacity to quote articles 15 and 17 of the Charter of the OAS: I do not wish to imply that legal counsel for the State Department has never found those articles in the charter. I do not wish to imply that legal counsel for the State Department did such a poor job of legal research that he did not even discover the articles. I only wish to imply that he found it convenient to omit any consideration of them from his legal memorandum. What do those articles provide?

I read as follows:

#### ARTICLE 15

No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Note, Mr. President, that article 15 uses the word "intervene." It is that word that some of our Latin American critics have seized upon in protesting even the sending of American troops into the Dominican Republic to bring out American citizens at the request and invitation of the Government that we had recognized. Bad as that Government was, our recognition of it, of course, established diplomatic relations with it and placed upon us the responsibility of fulfilling obligations in relation to that diplomatic recognition.

Thus, as I said earlier in my speech, the use of this language in the Charter of the Organization of American States does not prohibit the President from going into a country and bringing out



citizens of our country when a government we have recognized informs us that it cannot protect their lives. That is not intervention in terms of the artistic meaning of the word in international law. "Intervention" is a word of art. To apply it to the fact situation in which our Government responded to an invitation of the Government of the Dominican Republic to come to a lifesaving rescue mission does not justify our being charged with intervention.

Article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States reads as follows:

## ARTICLE 17

The territory of a state is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another state, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever.

I digress to say that when we have standing offshore an American ship, when we have American airplanes landing on an airbase, for the limited purpose of putting passengers aboard and taking them out of a country, we are not engaging, even temporarily, in occupation.

Also, when we are dealing with the term "military occupation," we are dealing with words of art in international law. A country does not militarily occupy unless it enters a country and engages in a form of territorial seizure; unless it enters to engage in a process of moving out the existing government and interfering with its rights of sovereignty.

If the United States had limited its activities in the Dominican Republic to rescue operations, merely sending in troops to bring out our citizens, it would not in any way have interfered, even to the slightest extent, with rights of sovereignty.

Article 17 continues to read:

No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized.

We did not intervene, we did not occupy, during that period of time, which, I am sad to report, did not last very long, a period in which we sought merely to rescue only American lives. The evidence is perfectly clear that after a short period of time the United States changed its objective in the Dominican Republic. The information I have received from reliable sources is that there was a slowing up of the evacuation until it finally came to a complete halt and we desisted from evacuating. We dug in and soon found ourselves in a position in which we were not evacuating, but were opposing. We were engaging in combat. When we started that operation, we moved outside the framework of the Charter of the Organization of American States. That is why we shall find that this action on our part has cost us dearly in prestige throughout Latin America.

Articles XV and XVII speak for themselves. I do not believe that the dispatch of more than 20,000 American troops to the Dominican Republic after foreign nationals, including Americans, had been substantially evacuated, or given the opportunity to evacuate from the Dominican Republic, can be fitted into the language of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

The President's effort to seek an OAS cloak for our forces in the Dominican Republic is having the most dubious success in Latin America. The damage has been done. Once again our actions have spoken louder than our words.

Mr. President, I am as conscious as anyone of the dangers implicit in the expansion of communism in Latin America or anywhere else in the world and the record will show that I was one of the first Members of this body to oppose Castro.

The RECORD will show that I was the first to oppose Castro, and I was the first to oppose him for some days. It did not take me very long to see that all that we had done was to substitute a totalitarian dictator with at least some Communist leanings. As I said in one of my first speeches, "I do not know whether he is a Communist or not. However, I know he is following the Communist line and is adopting the Communist procedure." All we did was substitute one type of totalitarian for a Fascist totalitarian Batista.

Mr. President, that is the sorry record against us in Latin America. And we are not going to be allowed to forget it.

While the Eisenhower administration was seeking by its aid programs to buy the affections of the Cuban Communist, I was protesting his wholesale executions and reading into his disregard of the rule of fair trial and law, a sure indication of the direction of his development.

Be that as it may, I am deeply apprehensive that the actions of the United States in recent months in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are encouraging Communism, rather than discouraging it.

The very presence of 20,000 American troops in the Dominican Republic, and their aid to the junta, has given a shot in the arm to anti-American sentiment in all the hemisphere. After 30 years of effort to remove our imperialist image in Latin America we have by one stroke of policy destroyed the good neighbor edifice which we and our neighbors had so laboriously built.

We speak of encouraging the holding of "free elections" in the Dominican Republic. I think we can safely predict that the only kind of candidate who could now win a free election in the Dominican Republic would be a candidate running on "anti-American platform. This is where our policy has led us, not only in the Dominican Republic but in much of the rest of Latin America.

The American Nation is on the verge of reaping a harvest of hatred for our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Our hypocrisy has been exposed. We have talked of the law, of the United Nations Charter, of the Organization of American States, in tones of sanctimonious morality. But our deeds have not filled our words.

I am afraid that we must pay a costly price.

I close by saying that I hope that in the not-too-distant future, as the chairman of the subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I may be able to give a happier report than, I am satisfied, the

facts have compelled me to give today in regard to the most unfortunate and mistaken policy which we have come to practice in the Dominican Republic. Would that we had taken our nationals out and then gotten out ourselves.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1965]  
U.S. TROOPS AND JUNTA AS REBELS LOSE GROUND—IMBERT'S GAINS ARE PROTECTED BY AMERICANS

(By Barnard L. Collier, Herald Tribune news service)

SANTO DOMINGO, May 19.—U.S. Marines and paratroopers gave both direct and indirect help to the forces of Gen. Antonio Imbert Barrera today as Imbert's junta troops captured the rebel-held Radio Santo Domingo and conducted a house-by-house cleanup of rebels in the northern sections of the city.

United States officials still denied that U.S. forces were aiding the Imbert junta, but officers on the U.S.-controlled perimeters said they were under orders to shoot any rebel who tried to stop the junta forces.

American troops were seen several times firing into rebel positions facing the junta corridor" across the city.

Late this afternoon, the American forces moved a mile north along the corridor, securing territory won by the junta.

At the same time, they moved 2 blocks south all along the corridor into the main rebel stronghold, the Ciudad Nueva waterfront district.

U.S. troops at three checkpoints, leading into Ciudad Nueva stopped all trucks carrying food from entering today. American officers at the scene said the intention was to starve the rebels into submission if they put up too much resistance to junta troops.

[In Washington, Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, told an OAS meeting that he is "not prepared to commit troops of the United States to slaughter Dominicans."

[Bunker's remark came as he opposed a Venezuelan resolution calling on the Inter-American peace force in Santo Domingo to intervene in the fighting there and bring about a cease-fire. Since almost all the outside troops there belong to U.S. forces that President Johnson has promised to commit to the peace force, the Venezuelan request, in effect, called on the United States to stop the fighting.

[The resolution was withdrawn by the Venezuelan delegation after it became apparent that the United States would not agree to it. The OAS then unanimously adopted a substitute Argentine resolution calling on both sides in Santo Domingo to submit to a new cease-fire.]

## IMBERT EARLS TALKS

Earlier in the day, Imbert insisted that he was "going to win this war against the Communists" within a day or two. He refused to listen to any talk of a cease-fire or negotiations with Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, leader of the rebels who overthrew a military-backed civilian junta on April 25 in an effort to bring back exiled constitutional President Juan Bosch. Imbert said he would talk with Caamano only to discuss surrender terms.

Imbert had been under heavy American pressure until today to call off his military drive again the Caamano forces and step down in favor of a coalition government.

He now appears to have won this clash. The U.S. Embassy continued to say Wednesday it was displeased with the junta's actions. But American forces appear to be helping the junta troops in any way they can, short of directly fighting their way into rebel territory.



## CLAIM U.S. HELP

The junta-held radio station broadcast Wednesday that the 24,000 U.S. troops here were helping them to win the battle "against international communism" and that the assumption of power by any man allied in any way with Bosch was out of the question.

This appeared to rule out any chance of Antonio Suzman, a wealthy pro-Boschist, from taking power. Suzman was said to have been approved by both the United States and Caamano's forces as an acceptable compromise leader in this crisis.

## REPORTS FROM SCENE

News dispatches from Santo Domingo reported:

A spokesman for the U.N. mission here said both the junta and the rebels have agreed in principle to a 12-hour cease-fire Friday so that the Red Cross can evacuate dead and wounded from the battle area in northern Santo Domingo. This truce was requested by the U.N. Security Council today.

At a rally after the capture of Radio Santo Domingo, Imbert told 1,000 followers, "We have absolute control of the Dominican Republic."

Dan Kurzman of the Washington Post reported, however, that four newsmen who toured the country this week were unanimous in finding overwhelming popular support for the Caamano forces.

The junta forces' main advance was a 10-block drive eastward from the radio station. Commodore Francisco J. Rivera Caminero, armed forces secretary and Imbert supporter, told reporters that rebel fire from the run-down houses in the area, strong early in the week, had nearly ceased Tuesday afternoon.

## REBELS MAKE CLAIMS

A rebel spokesman claimed the junta advance had been halted roughly at the middle of the northern sector. The spokesman predicted junta troops would pull back during the night under rebel counterattack.

Rebel forces claimed to have captured a U.S. marine. U.S. authorities acknowledged a Marine was missing from his post but declined details.

A U.S. official said efforts to form a coalition government of national reconciliation—presumably under Guzman—had failed, at least for the moment. "There must be a reappraisal," he said. "There has to be when something doesn't materialize."

The death toll from the battle was not known, although hospitals reported 30 dead. Some estimates said there were more than 100 dead, including civilians.

A junta spokesman said 800 rebel prisoners had been taken. The rebels issued no figures.

## MANY HOMES DAMAGED

Newsmen driving through the battle area said many homes were damaged by machine-gun and tank cannon fire. Junta troops entered nearly every house and searched for arms, according to refugees fleeing the area during the fighting.

Many of those at Imbert's side during the rally had served in the government of Donald Reid Cabral, ousted by the rebels 26 days ago in the coup that led to the civil war.

In a bid to gain support for the junta, Imbert's aides announced after the rally that two of Reid's unpopular austerity measures had been canceled.

## CANCELED MEASURES

One was a \$30 tax on any Dominican leaving the country. The other required an importer to deposit for 6 months 40 percent of the value of all imports. Both measures were designed to adjust an unfavorable balance of payments and prevent a devaluation of the peso.

Imbert said that \$10 million deposited with the Central Bank under the 40-percent

law would be returned this week. Commercial banks in the capital are closed and there has been a shortage of currency.

Junta sources said that U.S. Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann talked with Imbert Tuesday night before returning to Washington with another special American presidential envoy, former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin.

The sources said that Mann discussed renewal of economic aid with Imbert but did not mention the idea of a coalition government. The meeting could not be confirmed with U.S. officials here.

## EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1965]

## DOMINICAN SEQUEL

The cold war is getting hot again. Local wars and civil wars are confined with difficulty to one country, as Vietnam and now the Dominican Republic are proving. The world is getting more dangerous as the United States actively shows its determination to stop Communist subversion in other countries, or even, as in the Dominican Republic, the threat of communism.

In the Caribbean, U.S. intervention has undoubtedly resulted in a grave setback to the inter-American system. Decades were spent in creating a policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of hemispheric nations and in a collective system of security based on the Rio Treaty and the Bogota Charter. These documents stand; but they are fractured, and time will be needed to heal the wounds.

The Organization of American States is reluctantly but wisely moving in—as the United States has urged—to do what it can to take the issue from its unilateral North American phase into a collective hemispheric mediation. President Johnson is trying to repair the breach with other American states by sending special envoys to the various capitals and by stressing the OAS role at the present stage.

Under the United Nations Charter, regional organizations such as the OAS are given the task of settling regional affairs if they can. The significance of yesterday's Security Council meeting was merely to provide a forum to attack the United States and for the United States to defend itself. Ambassador Stevenson, as always, was as eloquent and effective a spokesman as possible, but since the American case was put so recently and so fully by President Johnson there was nothing new that he could say.

The overwhelming strength of the American forces in Santo Domingo should bring an uneasy peace fairly soon. What will never end is argument about the U.S. contention that it is saving the Dominican Republic from a Castro-type revolution. President Johnson concedes that the uprising began as "a popular democratic revolution." The former Ambassador to Santo Domingo, John Bartlow Martin, who talked to the rebel leaders, was quoted afterward as saying that the movement became "Communist dominated" only in the last 3 or 4 days.

It is therefore arguable that U.S. intervention was what brought the Communists to the forefront. This is what ex-President Juan Bosch believes. He claims that his liberal and democratic followers had victory in their grasp when the United States intervened and turned the tables. Ideas of this sort are going to plague hemispheric relations for some years to come.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1965]

## THE DOMINICAN MORASS

The United States is getting more and more deeply involved inside the Dominican Republic, politically as well as military. What began as an uprising has become a civil war in a state of suspended animation. Whether

there was or was not a genuine threat of a Communist coup—and U.S. correspondents are emphatic in casting doubt on Washington's assertions that there was—it is clear that Dominican and Latin American communism has been strengthened in reaction against the American intervention.

What may have seemed to the American public to be a simple operation when President Johnson first sent in marines on April 28 has become a complicated, confused, and potentially explosive act of force majeure, with profound effects on the whole Inter-American System. Some of the United States' best friends in Latin America are included among the anti-Communist governments and peoples whom American intervention has alienated. The man in whose name the rebellion was started, the strongly anti-Communist Juan Bosch, may yet prove correct in his bitter comment that the United States, by its intervention, will create far more Communist sympathizers in the Dominican Republic and Latin America than were on hand—whatever their number—when the revolt began.

The Dominican situation is proving that the best intentions mean little or nothing in the face of contrary realities. No one could doubt the sincerity of Under Secretary Mann when he stated in an interview with the Times that the United States does not want to dictate the kind of government the Dominicans choose. But the fact is that the U.S. intervention bolstered a right-wing military group against a movement that, while it had some Communists within it, was for the most part democratic in spirit and intention. The idea of supporting the Bosch elements against the Communist minority in the rebel ranks was apparently never even entertained.

When it became clear that the military junta's first leader, Gen. Wessin y Wessin, was adamantly opposed in the Dominican Republic and throughout Latin America, Washington came up with another—but equally unpopular and rightwing—protégé. American correspondents on the spot agree that General Imbert, now head of the junta, was chosen, groomed, and put in by the Americans and is being kept in power by Americans.

U.S. representatives refused even to talk with the rebel group headed by Lieutenant Colonel Caamaño until yesterday although Colonel Caamaño clearly has a considerable following throughout the Dominican Republic. In his enclave in Santo Domingo, surrounded by American troops, he has thousands of fanatically dedicated and well-armed followers.

In present circumstances the stalemate can be broken in only two ways. One is a cleanup by the American troops of the rebel enclave in Santo Domingo, with inevitable slaughter and destruction. The other is continued negotiation with the Caamaño-Bosch group. Of the two methods, it is a peaceful settlement that holds the best hope—we believe the only hope—of controlling ultimately the Dominican Communists.

In the long run, even if the marines once again stay on for years, it is the Dominicans and not the Americans who are going to decide the fate of the Dominican Republic.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 6, 1965]

## A LITTLE TOO VEHEMENT

The vehemence of President Johnson's efforts to defend his military intervention in the Dominican Republic suggests an inner uncertainty that does not quite square with the clenched fist and the bellicose front he presents to the public. Sympathetic Americans will be inclined to overlook some of his excesses—such as the rocking-chair remark which was widely interpreted as a subcon-

May 20, 1965

scious thrust at the late President Kennedy—in view of the strain he has experienced. But bald distortion of the truth cannot and should not be ignored.

At his walking news conference Tuesday, the President represented himself as having decided to send troops to Santo Domingo after the Organization of American States "met and talked and talked and debated and then adjourned" without a decision. Thus he sought to convey the impression that he took unilateral action—which is clearly prohibited by the OAS Charter—only after failing to obtain collective action under the treaty.

This is a serious misstatement of fact. Mr. Johnson ordered the Marines into the Dominican Republic on Wednesday night, April 28, and did not lay the question before the OAS until the following day. It is true that the OAS could not agree on immediate action, but one of the reasons may have been that it then faced an accomplished fact of American intervention. By the time Organization met on the United States call, Marines and troops were pouring into Santo Domingo by the thousands. The plain truth is that the President simply kicked the treaty procedures of hemispheric consultation and collective decision into the ashcan when he decided to use American armed power.

Mr. Johnson contends he had to act quickly in order to save the lives of Americans in a deteriorating situation. Perhaps history will prove him right in that respect. But evacuating Americans is clearly not the mission of our troops now. The main question at the moment is not why the troops went in, but what purpose they are going to serve by staying there, and for how long.

One week after American intervention the OAS has voted to send an international force to Santo Domingo. That should help. But there is a warning in the fact that such important countries as Mexico, Chile, and Venezuela refused to support the move. Unless American influence is promptly thrown behind a political settlement that will permit our occupation to be ended, the President's hasty adventure bids fair to poison inter-American relations for years to come.

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1965]  
WAR CHANGES SANTO DOMINGO INTO CITY OF  
THREE HOSTILE WORLDS

(By Tad Szulc)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 19.—It is nearly 4 weeks since war—and war is the word to describe what is happening here—has come to shatter the life of Santo Domingo.

In 25 blood-spattered days, the 300,000 inhabitants of this Caribbean capital have learned how to live under a rain of missiles and bullets in a city slashed by war into three hostile, miniature worlds separated by military lines.

First, there is the shrinking world of the rebels of Col. Francisco Caamaño Delfo. It is the passionate, often hungry, but defiant world of the constitutionalist revolution. Its brain is the great Copello Building on narrow Conde Street downtown where the rebels have their headquarters.

Its heart—and its defenses—are in the narrow streets and ancient houses of the rebel zone. There, armed soldiers and civilians, including women and teenagers, kept their vigil as the junta forces pounded the rebels in the north, on the far side of the security corridor manned by U.S. troops.

The rebel zone downtown is sealed off from the outside by the security corridor in the north, the Caribbean in the south, and Ozama River in the east and the international safety zone in the west.

From the international zone, rebel territory can be entered only through one checkpoint where U.S. marines and junta policemen behind tanks, barbed wire and sand-

bags, carefully funnel through long lines of traffic during the day. At night, the checkpoints are the outposts of a no man's land.

From the security corridor, the rebel world can be entered through checkpoints held by paratroopers of the 82d Airborne Division, who search all passersby for weapons.

The only economic activity in the downtown rebel territory is in an occasional bar, foodstore or barber shop.

Food is not yet in short supply. But the rebels say that U.S. troops have stopped the flow of food from the countryside.

The rebels try to keep their area orderly. There has been virtually no looting along Conde Street, the city's main shopping area, and sanitation employees and rebel fighters clear away the rubbish.

The Caamaño regime has tried to function as a government, but its "ministers" cannot pay its employees and their control of the city's activities is bounded by the limits of the rebel zone.

The rebels control the telephone exchange and the U.S. military commanders and the Embassy communicate with Washington through two direct lines.

The second world of Santo Domingo is the territory held by the junta. It is, however, spread all over the city's area.

The headquarters of Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, head of the junta, is on the grounds of the international fair in the western section of the city, behind the U.S.-controlled international safety zone.

The junta world then reappears on the east bank of the Ozama River, which is also controlled by U.S. forces.

There, the center of the junta's activities is San Isidro Air Force Base, where the junta has its military headquarters and its aircraft.

Part of the junta world is also in the northern area, following the last 5 days of fighting. But that area is still a battlefield.

This is the world of the cannon, the bazooka, the recoilless rifle, and the machine-gun.

#### DIPLOMATS AND SNIPERS

The third world of Santo Domingo is the international safety zone.

Two U.S. Embassy and U.S. military headquarters are at its eastern fringe, the Marine expeditionary brigade is in the Hispaniola Hotel and the international diplomatic center is in the Hotel Embajador.

This world is perhaps the most frantic of the three.

Diplomats of the United States, the United Nations, and the Organization of American States rush from place to place in cars.

At night there is sniping, and yesterday the zone was shelled for the first time by antitank weapons fired from an undetermined spot.

The lobby of the Hotel Embajador is filled with Marine patrols, airborne rangers, Chinese farmers awaiting evacuation, newsmen of 11 nationalities, agents for the junta and for Colonel Caamaño, moneychangers, carpet-baggers, and children who play games with the soldiers.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 9, 1965]

IS U.S. GOLIATH OR ST. GEORGE?—AMERICA IS MAKING ITSELF HEIR OF COLONIALISM, TOYNBEE WARNS

(By Arnold Toynbee)

LONDON.—For the past 20 years the Government and people of the United States have been acting on the belief that communism is on the march for the conquest of the world and that it is the manifest destiny of the United States to save the world from this fate.

According to this view, America has not only been saving the world; she has been saving it with the world's grateful, and indeed enthusiastic, support. This is why Americans have been puzzled and angered at

demonstrations of anti-American feeling in Asian, African, and Latin American countries. These facts are incompatible with the American picture.

This picture is not founded on facts. The current picture resembles the medieval Christian picture of the Church's struggle with heretics, and the Roman picture of the Roman Empire's struggle with the Christian church. In each of these cases the adversary who had to be defeated had been identified with the powers of evil and had been credited with superhuman wickedness and potency. He had not been studied objectively, to find out what he was really like.

#### COMMUNIST OBJECTIVE

Whether or not "history is bunk" and whether or not it was Henry Ford who said that, the American picture of current history is "bunk" unquestionably. It is true that the conversion of all mankind is one of the official objectives of the Communist faith. Communism has taken over this objective from its parent, Christianity. It is also true that communism, like both Christianity and Islam, has not propagated itself solely by preaching, but has sometimes resorted to force.

Yet, during the 20 centuries of the Christian era up to date, Christianity has not come near to achieving its objective of converting the whole of mankind and, in the second century of the Communist era, the prospects for communism do not look any more promising. Moreover, communism has never been the paramount ideology of any government that has subscribed to the Communist faith.

#### SAME IDEOLOGY

The predominant ideology of the governments—and the peoples—of the Communist countries is, in fact, the same as the American Government's and people's predominant ideology. All over the world today, the predominant ideology is neither communism nor free enterprise: it is nationalism.

Today, the nationalism of the non-Western peoples is pitted against the nationalism of the Western peoples. The revolt of the "native" majority of mankind against the domination of the Western minority—this, and not the defense of freedom against communism by the leading Western country the United States, is the real major issue in the world today.

The American people have not yet recognized this.

The mirage of communism is still veiling the truth from their eyes. The present American misreading of the facts is perilous for America and for the world.

Is the United States St. George fighting the dragon? Or is she Goliath fighting David? The question is important, because St. George was a winner but Goliath was not.

#### RING OF SINCERITY

While there is an unmistakable ring of sincerity and of genuine desire for peace in President Johnson's two recent public declarations, his assumption is that the United States is St. George, whereas she may in truth be the Goliath that the Vietnamese and the Chinese and the Russians see in her.

"There is no human power capable of forcing us from Vietnam," the President has said. An ancient Greek would have shuddered to hear his leader thus provoking the envy of the gods.

Twice within one lifetime, Germany's military power has appeared to be irresistible and, each time, Germany has crashed. Goliath has succumbed to David, and this has been the usual fate of Goliaths in the past.

America, without realizing what she has been doing, has made herself the heir of British, French, Dutch, and Japanese colonialism, and consequently has drawn upon herself all the odium that the European and Japanese colonialists formerly excited.

May 20, 1965

UNTENABLE POSITION

The United States leaped into France's forcibly vacated place in Vietnam at the moment when France's debacle in Vietnam had demonstrated that colonialism had ceased to be practicable. In assuming this anachronistic role America was lending herself in an untenable position.

Today, President Johnson is willing to negotiate without making it a condition that America's opponents in Vietnam shall first stop fighting. He has, however, made it a condition that South Vietnam shall remain separate from North Vietnam, whatever the wishes of the Vietnamese people may be.

The United States also insists that South Korea shall remain separate from North Korea, and Taiwan from continental China; and, in all these three cases, the United States in enforcing her fiat by military action.

Now the imposition of the fiats of Western governments by force is the humiliation that has been inflicted on the non-Western peoples during the last 200 years.

ABSOLUTE EQUALITY

When they had got rid of the European and Japanese imperialists, they thought, for a moment, that they had recovered their freedom. But now the Americans have jumped in and are dictating, in their turn, to the Asians what the Asians may or may not do, and this is infuriating them.

The only practical basis for coexistence between the non-Western majority and the Western minority of mankind is a relation of absolute equality. All Western powers, including the puissant United States, as well as feeble Portugal, will have to accept equality in the long run. The sooner they

accept it the smaller the price that they will have to pay.

If only America could see through her mirage of communism, perhaps the truth might move her to make an agonizing reappraisal of her present unrealistic policy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, under the order of May 19, 1965, that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of May 19, 1965, until Friday, May 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

# House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Ezra M. Finkelstein, Town and Village Synagogue, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Then Daniel praised the God of the heavens. Daniel spoke, saying: *Praise be the name of God from everlasting to everlasting, for wisdom and might are His; He changes the seasons and times. He removes kings and He sets up kings. He gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who are endowed with understanding; He reveals things deep and secret; He knows what is in darkness, and with Him dwells the light.*

Eloheinu V-elohi Avotenu.

Our God and God of our fathers, look upon us with mercy, and graciously grant our petitions, spoken before Thee in the words of our teachers the Rabbis Elazar and Rav.

May it be Thy will, O Lord, our God, to cause to abide in our fortune love, brotherliness, peace, and friendship; to enrich our boundaries with students; to prosper our goal with hope and with future; to set us a share in paradise; to cause us to obtain good companions and good impulse in Thy world, that we may rise in the morning and find our heart longing to hear Thy name.

May it be Thy will, O Lord, our God, to grant us long life, a life of peace, of good; a life of blessing, of sustenance, of bodily vigor; a life in which there is fear of sin; a life free from shame and disgrace; a life of prosperity and honor; a life in which we may have the love of Thy teachings and a fear of heaven; a life in which Thou shalt fulfill all the wishes of our hearts for good. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1734. An act to conserve and protect domestic fishery resources.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of de-

termining the program for the rest of this week, and next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we will consider, if the rule is adopted, the atomic energy authorization today. I would hope we would complete consideration of it today. If we do, at the end of the day we hope to go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, but there are no bills from the committee.

We will call up on Monday and consider on Monday and Tuesday, H.R. 7750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week we will call up the agricultural appropriation bill, followed by H.R. 5883, bonding provisions of Federal labor laws. This will come up under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Then H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments. This is under an open rule providing 2 hours of general debate.

Then H.R. 5241, amending section 20a (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act regarding interlocking directorates. This will be called up under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The last three bills mentioned would follow the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly. We will take them up in that order after the appropriation bill is acted on.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Can the gentleman from Louisiana give us any guideline as to what the legislative program might be or might not be on Memorial Day weekend?

Mr. BOGGS. That is week after next. Memorial Day comes on Sunday. Monday is an official holiday. So I presume there will be no legislative business on that day, but I think we will have a full week thereafter.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

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

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

There was no objection.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

## KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 5798) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 5798

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations from the land and water conservation fund established by section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for the acquisition of lands adjacent to national forests as authorized by section 6 of such Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire by exchange, purchase, or otherwise, the real property described in section 3 of this Act. Upon such acquisition the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are extended to include such real property.*

Sec. 2. In the acquisition of the real property described in section 3, the Secretary of Agriculture shall be guided by the following policies:

(1) He should make every reasonable effort to acquire the property by exchange or negotiated purchase.

(2) The property should be appraised by the Secretary of Agriculture before the initiation of negotiations, and the owner or his designated representative should be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during his inspection of the property.

(3) Before the initiation of negotiations for the property, the Secretary of Agriculture should establish a price which he believes to be a fair and reasonable consideration therefor and should make a prompt offer to acquire the property for the full amount so established. In no event should such price be less than the appraised fair value of such property, as determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. The real property authorized to be acquired under authority of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

Section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter); section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter; section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter), lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

Section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 to 7 inclusive, strike out "for the purpose of authorizing appropriations from the land and water conservation fund established by section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 for the acquisition of lands adjacent to national forests as authorized by section 6 of such Act."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "exchange or".

Page 2, line 7, after "appraised" insert "at its fair market value".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "his" and insert "an".

Page 2, lines 12 to 19 inclusive, strike out all of paragraph (3).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 435

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to promote protection and conservation of the outstanding scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho and lands adjacent thereto for public use and enjoyment, the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are hereby extended to include those of the lands hereinafter described which are not now within such boundaries. In order that they may be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire the following lands at their fair market value:*

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter;

section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter);

section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter;

section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter), lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AMENDMENT BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of H.R. 5798, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 5798) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. WHITE of Idaho (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I speak today on behalf of the preservation of Upper Priest Lake in Bonner County, Idaho, unquestionably one of the most remote and beautiful bodies of water in the Nation. And there is urgency in my message.

H.R. 5798, a bill that would seal off the lake from private development and protect this scenic gem in its unspoiled forest setting, must become law before this month ends, or the lake's shoreline will be subject to subdivision and commercial development.

In its present state, Upper Priest Lake can be reached only by boat and is surrounded by State and federally owned land, including the Kaniksu National Forest. I believe it is in the public interest that the 417 acres of private land involved be made a part of the national forest through negotiated purchases, as provided in H.R. 5798.

It has been only through the intervention of a national semiscientific organization, Nature Conservancy, that subdivision of a 140-acre parcel of private land for cabin sites has been delayed. This organization provided a loan to the owners to buy a year's time in which to save the lake. This period of grace is nearly over, and because of this, Mr. Speaker, I request that the membership be allowed to pass H.R. 5798 by unanimous consent.

#### COMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency

may have until midnight on Saturday to file a report on H.R. 9874, the housing bill. The bill number I used in this request was an error. Therefore I renew the request and ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H.R. 7984, the Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 103]

Adams	Grabowski	Nix
Andrews	Griffin	Pelly
George W.	Halleck	Powell
Andrews,	Hansen, Iowa	Price
N. Dak.	Hansen, Wash.	Race
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Battin	Harvey, Mich.	Roberts
Blathnik	Hébert	Ronan
Bonner	Holland	Roncalio
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Schmidhauser
Callan	Johnson, Calif.	Selden
Callaway	Kluczynski	Shipley
Clark	Landrum	Sickles
Clausen,	Lindsay	Smith, N.Y.
Don H.	Long, Md.	Stafford
Culver	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Curtis	Mackay	Thomson, Wis.
Diggs	Martin, Ala.	Todd
Dole	Martin, Mass.	Toil
Flood	Martin, Nebr.	Tupper
Fogarty	Mathias	Watkins
Foley	Morrison	Willis
Fraser	Morton	Yates

On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. MADDEN of the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 395, Report 359) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 395

*Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as*



ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

# **AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COM- MISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966**

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 394, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 394

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8122) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 394 provides for consideration of H.R. 8122, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate.

As originally submitted to Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission's request called for a total authorization of \$2,592,035,000 for fiscal year 1966.

H.R. 8122 authorizes a total of \$2,555,521,000—\$2,260,776,000 for operating expenses and \$294,745,000 for plant and capital equipment—for the Commission for fiscal year 1966—a difference of \$36,514,000.

In addition, the bill would authorize the AEC to enter into two new cooperative arrangements with organizations outside the Federal Government for construction and operation of nuclear powerplants embodying advanced concepts. Included within the total amount, this bill would authorize to be appropriated to the AEC is the sum of \$132,363,000, which the AEC could utilize for these cooperative arrangements. The bill would also authorize AEC to waive use charges on leased special nuclear material for one project in an amount estimated to be \$6,443,000, and to purchase uranium enriched in the isotope 233 produced under the arrangement.

There is a provision in the bill rescinding prior year authorizations for five projects amounting to \$60,955,000, exclusive of waiver of use charges. No additional funding is provided for these projects unless justification is subsequently resubmitted to Congress and new authorization provided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 394.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, we are considering House Resolution 394, which will permit consideration of H.R. 8122, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission. A 2-hour open rule is requested, waiving points of order. I am in support of the rule.

H.R. 8122 authorizes appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal 1966 of \$2,555,521,000.

It also authorizes the AEC to begin two civilian cooperative power reactor projects which are to utilize a so-far-unused source of energy.

Of the authorization, \$2,260,776,000 is for operating expenses and \$294,745,000 is for the plant and capital equipment expenditures.

Great progress is being made by the AEC in harnessing atomic power for peaceful uses.

Under section 106 of the bill, authorization is given to the Commission to enter into a cooperative project with a State, its departments and agencies, or with privately, publicly, or cooperatively owned utilities or industrial organizations, for participation in the research and development, design, construction and operation of a thorium seed-blanket nuclear power plant.

Section 107 of the bill would give authorization to the Commission to contract with a utility or group of utilities and an equipment manufacturer or other industrial organization for participation in the research and development, design, construction and operation of a high-temperature gas-cooled nuclear powerplant.

Under this section—107—the Public Service Co. of Colorado plans such a plant in its system. I am advised by the committee that this electric utility system would spend approximately \$45 million, which will purchase the power factor from the AEC manufacturing unit.

The Government authorization is \$47,306,000 making a total estimated cost for this project of some \$92,306,000.

Under section 106, an agreement is under consideration for construction by the State of California to supply power to pump water for the State's water supply project. I am advised that the State of California's estimated participation is \$80 million, of which \$40 million will go toward reactor costs and the remainder toward normal plant construction. The Government authorization is \$91.5 million, for a total of \$171.5 million.

What payments or other charges are contemplated in the future by companies which then desire to obtain the patent information derived from these coopera-

tive programs? The answer, as I understand it, is that no payments are to be made. The Government owns the patent rights to all patents developed under the cooperative program, even those traceable to the private participant. The Government policy is to make all such information available free of charge to other companies. Once the process is developed, the patents are available to all interested parties.

In Tennessee we are fortunate to have the Oak Ridge project of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has meant much to the State of Tennessee. Although it is not in my district, it is in the district of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from the second district of Tennessee, JOHN J. DUNCAN. It performs a very worthwhile service, as I am sure the other agencies and operations of this Commission do throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule. Reserving the remainder of my time, I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the gentleman on the Rules Committee or the gentleman who brought the rule to the floor of the House today will explain for the benefit of the House, why all points of order are to be waived under this rule, House Resolution 394.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to explain to the gentleman. As I understand, the restrictive language in section 103, on page 7 of the bill, makes the waiver necessary. It reads as follows:

(1) such construction project has been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission and (2) the Commission determines that the project is of such urgency that construction of the project should be initiated promptly upon enactment of legislation appropriating funds for its construction.

As I understand it, the waiving of the points of order was necessary in a time of national crisis and urgency for the Commission to commence construction of a necessary project immediately, without authorization by the Congress.

Mr. HALL. In other words, the gentleman is saying that this is an authorization for an immediate start on this particular construction because of a national emergency?

Mr. QUILLEN. Crisis or urgency. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

# **AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE AEC 1966**

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8122) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10791

In other cities which have managed to renew themselves, some strong, high-spirited knight has entered the stage at this point—a determined, courageous mayor, like Richard Lee in New Haven; a brilliant planner, like Ed Bacon in Philadelphia; or a skillful urban renewer, like Ed Logue in Boston or Justin Herman in San Francisco.

In Fresno, the "knight" was the collective effort of three groups—Downtown Association of Merchants and Property Owners; the city government, which adopted the council-manager system in 1958; and the urban renewal agency. Each had strong leaders, but it is a measure of the solid political ground under the Fresno Mall that all three groups closed their ranks tighter after, strangely and tragically, their three leaders died within a year.

By that time, says a Fresno official, "Victor Gruen's plan had captured us and kept us together."

It also helped that the three groups shared equally in the cost of preparing the plan. Even the chamber of commerce accepted the untried idea with enthusiasm—perhaps because Fresno's businessmen, for the most part, are young.

"Maybe that also makes us more daring and broadminded," said one. "At any rate," he added, "we decided right from the start that if we did anything at all, we'd do it right."

Fresno chose architect-planner Victor Gruen because it liked his famous Fort Worth plan. It called for closing off the entire central business district of the Texas city to automobile traffic. The streets and squares were to be converted into pleasant outdoor spaces where people could roam at will. To make this possible, a freeway lined with parking garages would loop around the pedestrian haven. From the garages, people would either walk, or ride on little electric trains or moving sidewalks. The buildings would be serviced by underground track passages leading right into them.

Fort Worth, for various reasons, never carried out the plan. But it works extremely well in the heart of rebuilt Coventry, the center of England's car industry, and several other European cities.

In this country, the idea of separating people and cars has, of course, proven itself in several suburban shopping centers. And some 50 cities from Miami Beach to Kalamazoo, have attempted to cure downtown automotive paralysis by closing a block or two to motor traffic.

But Gruen warns that a well-functioning urban heart is not just a matter of paving a street and putting up a few potted trees. You can't just simply subtract automobiles, he says. You must also add new dynamism and variety.

In Fresno, the first to apply the idea extensively as part of a comprehensive redesign of an existing American city, it took 5 years of planning and building before the mall was constructed. And the mall is just the beginning. Both functionally and esthetically it is carefully related to a whole new downtown, including a new courthouse, convention hall, and civic center which are now under construction.

"Our aim," says Gruen's partner in charge of the Fresno project, Edgardo Contini, "is to eke out as much beauty and urban design of the existing grid system and the existing, still serviceable buildings as possible without destroying either."

The planners began by getting the highway people to change the location of their proposal for new freeways so that they would effectively serve and define a downtown area large enough to be viable and leave room for expansion. It was probably the first time in America that planners got ahead of highway engineers and that both collaborated fruitfully for the benefit of a city.

The next step was to create the necessary parking spaces to make the pedestrian mall possible and to rearrange the traffic pattern. The mall, covering six long continuous blocks as well as a block each of three cross streets, was completed last September at a cost of \$1.5 million—a good bit of which disappeared underground for the re-laying of utility lines and building new drainage systems.

Designed by landscape architects Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams, it is sheer and sustained delight. The artistic sophistication of the patterned pavement, the fountains, sculptured waterways, light fixtures, trash bins, planter boxes, and islands of trees and greenery matches that of the best sculpture courts in our modern art museums. The almost overly rich variety of forms, colors, ideas, and surprises is only matched by the inventive thoughtfulness with which it serves the comfort of people.

The pavement is easy to walk on and softly ebbing and flowing so rain water won't collect. The fountains, cascades, pools, and jets, all different and fascinating designs, are automatically geared to the wind velocity so people won't get wet. In some, the water gushes along stylized brooks that splash over richly colored and patterned blazed adobe sculptures. Some you can cross on little bridges; others tempt you to run along them, dragging your hand in the water. All of them help to cool the mall in the hot Fresno sun.

For the grownups, there are places to sit in the sun amidst greenery, in the shade under arbors or protected from the wind behind handsome mosaic walls.

For the children, there are marvelous little playgrounds, some donated by merchants, with enchanting, modern play equipment.

There is, of course, a sidewalk cafe and another to come. There is the almost obligatory clock tower, a little reminiscent of Naum Gabo's famous street sculpture in Rotterdam and a little skimpy and skinny.

But there are also eight excellent sculptures, some commissioned from young unknowns, others by famous sculptors. The "piece de resistance" is a cast of Auguste Renoir's "La Grande Laveuse," handsomely displayed under some chaste planting in a quiet corner of the mall.

These sculptures were donated by local businessmen. Such was their enthusiasm that their art committee collected \$200,000. It would accept only a \$5,000 minimum and no interference with its professionally guided selection and placement of the art works. Yet, even the car dealers pitched in.

The fact that these sculptures are placed, not in a serene museum atmosphere, but amidst the bustle of a lively marketplace, gives them a new, exhilarating quality.

This is still a typical, rather jazzy American main street. A few of the stores, to be sure, have been handsomely remodeled. One rather rundown block will be replaced. But the rest is still a jumble of high and low, passable and ugly business buildings and store fronts. There is still, despite hopes for some esthetic control, the usual, often vulgar array of advertising signs. In time, greater consistency and some restraint may still assert itself. But even as is, the strong design of the mall itself seems to drown out the visual noise on the sidelines. For once good design beats bad design.

And between all these wonders, shaded by 169 trees, wind noiseless and slow-moving little electric trains, driven by attractive girls who will collect a dime from you and let you on or off wherever you wish.

It is not surprising that business along the Fresno Mall has already improved by more than 20 percent. It draws people from afar, not only to shop but also because it is simply a nice place to be.

The new sense of belonging and cohesion the mall has given Fresno and its more than

60 ethnic groups, is most tangibly expressed in the art festival it inspired. It started with the mall's opening festivities last fall but is to become an annual affair held in May. Devoted to dance, drama, literature, music, and painting, the festival presents some serious offerings by out-of-town guests at places other than the mall and under roof. This any city might do.

What makes the festival Fresnoian and unique are the high school band concerts, the Japanese and Armenian folk dancing, the Buddhist choir, the children's gymnastic performances, the puppet shows, the amateur art exhibits.

This is the city where William Saroyan was born and lives, and its new mall is where Saroyan's America comes to life—as you watch the little Japanese, Mexican, Caucasian, or Negro faces become enraptured as they listen to a pretty young Fresno actress telling them about Cinderella.

Around the corner from the story teller and the clown kneels Renoir's strong, yet graceful, bronze nude. She holds her cleansed laundry with almost surprised incredulity. She, too, seems astonished to find herself in a small California city, a symbol of what may herald the renaissance of urban life in America; a new merging of art and life.

#### JOHNSON'S NO-NONSENSE DIPLOMACY SETS BACK MARXISTS IN CARIBBEAN

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

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see the Portland Press-Herald endorse the President's policy in the Dominican Republic. The President well deserves the assurance contained in the paper's editorial of May 3, which follows:

#### JOHNSON'S NO-NONSENSE DIPLOMACY SETS BACK MARXISTS IN CARIBBEAN

The dust has not yet settled in Santo Domingo—or to use a euphemism, the Dominican Republic—but the fog is clearing a bit, and it is beginning to appear that the prompt intervention by this country prevented the Reds from turning the country into another Cuba.

The revolt was touched off a week ago Saturday by young army officers seeking return of constitutional rule and reinstallation of Juan Bosch as president. They failed to win a quick victory and, discouraged, began dickering with members of the ruling civilian junta, then supported by most of the navy and air force elements. During this lull in the fighting the leftists moved in to take advantage of the breakdown in authority, and by Tuesday morning thousands of civilians had somehow been armed by the rebels and the fighting in Santo Domingo became so fierce that Washington began offering to rescue Americans and other nonresidents. By Thursday night President Johnson had decided to send in Marines and Army personnel, and despite the criticism of other Latin nations it seems to have been a wise precaution.

Fidel Castro's sister is being quoted as saying that the Cuban dictator has been slipping men and arms into the Dominican Republic ever since the 1963 expulsion of Bosch. The Allen-Scott column this morning declares that after the Bosch overthrow the Republic's new envoy to the Organization of American States submitted shocking evidence of Red infiltration both to the OAS and to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee.

With the CIA also busy there, it may be that the administration was not taken by

STAT

complete surprise when the rebellion was taken over—as it appears now—by Marxists. But for Johnson's hard diplomacy, the Caribbean might well be witnessing an extension of Castro's rule, and we hope the OAS will be sufficiently impressed as to take collective security measures of its own.

#### OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN VIETNAM AND THE WORLD

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in his historic speech at the Johns Hopkins University on April 7, President Johnson said this about the situation in Vietnam and about our responsibilities elsewhere in the world:

We fight because we must if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

We must deal with the world as it is, if it is ever to be as we wish.

In the long history of the world, despotism has become a venerable institution—but freedom is still young. If we are to see liberty succeed and prevail in the world, I believe we must be prepared for many a long and bitter struggle in its defense.

I have no illusions about the difficulty of those struggles. But the knowledge of our President's resolute and resourceful actions in matters of foreign policy has given me confidence recently. Fortunately many other Americans—newspaper editors among them—agree; today I would like to offer for the Record an editorial from the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette of April 28:

#### L.B.J.'s MESSAGE

Once again, at his news conference yesterday, President Lyndon B. Johnson set forth in easily understandable terms the purposes which guide his decisions regarding southeast Asia and the conflict in South Vietnam.

The primary intent, one which has been voiced by this country for all the years since the end of World War II, is to block the swallowing-up of free and independent countries by communism through subversion fed and financed by their Communist neighbors.

Overthrow of free governments by terrorism in the streets, across the countryside in hamlets and farming areas, hit-and-run tactics of guerrilla gangs is the Communist idea of "wars of liberation." Communism has openly pledged to support such wars as a means of subverting the entire world to that ideology.

It was Castro's tactic. Indonesia practiced it to gain control of independent areas in that Pacific region. And, although Sukarno disclaims communism, he is associated with Russia and Red China and continues to send his guerrilla bands into areas of Malaysia in an effort to further subvert free people. The same tactic disrupts many governments of Latin and South America.

By refusing to bow to terroristic takeover of a nation this country pledged to support as a neutral product of the 1954 agreements on Indochina, President Johnson is telling the world—and communism specifically—that Communist inspired "wars of liberation" will not be condoned. He is telling the world that such armed assault on a neighbor, fed by convoys along back roads and by shadowy ships which sink at night along the shore, is just as much aggression as attack by marching armies.

He is telling the world that the United States will no longer be taken in by the term "wars of liberation."

#### ABOLITION OF RESIDENCE IN AID TO THE BLIND BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to eliminate residence as an eligibility requirement to receive aid to the blind in the federally supported State programs of aid to the blind.

My bill does not embody a novel concept, nor does it represent a departure from our accepted practices and established legal provisions. Rather, it is completely consistent with our American traditions and constitutional precepts that an American is a citizen of the entire land, not just of a boundaried part; that the whole Nation is his domain; that he may travel from State to State without restriction or restraint, seeking his fortune where he will, abandoning an old life of frustration and failure for a new life of promise and challenging hope.

By tradition and by legal concept and provision, an American is a citizen of all America, and all America is his homeland, he may establish his home in any part of America.

The greatness of America has come, in no small measure, from the free movement of its people—from East to Midwest, from Midwest to Far West—from farms to factories—from centers of static society, stagnant economy, to the very edge of the wilderness, where life—fluid and unfixed—offered opportunity for all who dreamed and hoped for the one new and better chance, and found it waiting for them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America has grown to greatness because its people held full rights of citizenship throughout the whole Nation, and they were free to go wherever fortune beckoned them from the life they knew—a life of failure or success; a life low or high in station—to the challenge of new lands and new industries, new hopes fulfilled, new dreams transformed into reality, a life that put renewed vitality into old and weary aspirations.

The full width and length of America should always be—must always be—the open and unrestricted domain of all Americans if we are to continue to grow and develop as a nation—and this should be so, must be so, whether a man is in need of public help or is prosperous; whether he is rich or poor; highly trained and skilled in a trade, business, or profession, or without any training or skill at all, but still is desirous of trying once more in a new place to find his place; to build his life in a new locality, in a different field of economic endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an opponent of residence laws in programs of public welfare, for they freeze a man in his place; deny to him the right to go somewhere else, to try again in spite of ill fortune or adversity, to seek again for the realization of his shattered hopes and scattered dreams in a fresh assault on life in a strange land and among stran-

gers—a strange land to him, but nevertheless a part of vast America—strangers to him, but still his fellow Americans.

It is my belief that all Americans must possess the right to move freely where their dreams lead them in America; where opportunity invites them in America.

This right to move freely throughout America should not be denied to men in need who have their sight; it certainly should not be denied to men in need who are without their sight.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a requirement in all Federal-State public welfare programs that, to qualify for aid, a person must live in a State for a specified length of time.

I am particularly opposed to such a residence requirement in the federally supported aid to the blind programs provided for under title X of the Social Security Act.

Over the years, Congress has endeavored to make the Federal-State aid to the blind programs a means by which needy blind persons might be helped to achieve rehabilitation—might ultimately free themselves through their own efforts from a lifetime of dependency upon public assistance; might free the community of the obligation of providing support for them the remaining years of their lives.

Abolition of residence requirements in the Federal-State aid to the blind programs would be another forward step in making these programs truly programs offering a means of achieving full rehabilitation to normal, productive lives.

The bill I have introduced would abolish residence requirements in aid to the blind programs in the States.

It would restore to men and women who are blind and dependent upon such programs a basic right of their American citizenship: the right to move anywhere in the country without loss or hazard, without forfeiture or restraint.

A man who has lost his sight still possesses an almost limitless capacity for profitable productivity, but because of the nature of the economic environment in which he resides he may be unable to find employment; because he is needy and dependent upon public sources for support, he cannot leave his home community or State, devoid of job opportunities for him, to reestablish himself in a more advantageous area of the Nation, because public assistance would not be available to him in the new State—since he would lack the years of residence in the new State to qualify him for such aid.

So, Mr. Speaker, this man remains in his barren community—barren for him—barren of employment opportunities for a man who is blind. And, because he dare not venture toward new horizons that offer him hope and a better future, but also offer only starvation until he can find work, until he can earn again—he remains where he happens to live and continues to live—not too well—but continues to live for the rest of his life as a public charge, a permanent recipient of public assistance.

Thus, this man who is blind, denied freedom of movement because he is needy and because of the restrictiveness of State laws, lives a lifetime of depend-

A2516

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

nickname that probably accounts for the use of more parentheses than any other moniker in the public print.

The name, sometimes causes confusion. Witness Perle Mesta, the hostess with the mostest, writing in McCall's magazine about one of her galas in connection with the last Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City. Among the guests, she gushed, was her "good friend from Alaska, Senator Ed. BARTLETT."

Alaskans wouldn't make such a social blunder about our Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, being honored here this weekend for a distinguished career which now spans 20 years in Congress.

Who is this man among 99 others who sits in the highest legislative body of the land, and represents Alaska with pride and honor on the national and international scene? Well, don't look here for an analysis of his contributions to the territory, the State, and the Nation. But here is an inside glimpse at Bartlett-behind-the-headlines, the Senator who enjoys grapes for breakfast, nibbled while shaving with a cordless electric razor while he studies the latest news from every newspaper published in Alaska.

This is an Alaskan who lives on 49th Street in the Nation's Capital, and zips to his office (a 12-minute drive if he hits the traffic right) in a Volkswagen bearing Alaska license plate No. 49. The Senator from the 49th State arrives at work in the Old Senate Office Building each day with a fresh rose in his lapel. He carries two other roses with him—one of which is given daily to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine. The other is a spare, in case the steamy heat of Washington wilts the one in his buttonhole.

The roses are cut each morning by BARTLETT from among the many in his backyard—a garden tended with great skill by the Senator's wife, Vide. But the brilliant array of roses must share space in the yard with an old-fashioned grinding wheel, at which BARTLETT occasionally sits, pedaling away at a knife-sharpening chore.

He works at a desk piled high with a collection of papers reflecting the ebb and flow of the affairs of state, using two spindles rising from the clusters of reports and documents on which to spear important memos, reminders, and messages. His work at senatorial duties occupies him from early morning to late in the evening, and the Bartletts shun all but the most important of the countless social functions which sap the strength of many in the Washington whirl.

There's a 7-foot totem pole in his office and an Alaskan bearskin rug on the floor of his den at home and the only television set in the house is on the blink, unrepaid because he reads so much that he doesn't have time to which it anyway. Like all of us, he worries about his weight—but has given up on such things as a grapefruit diet to beat the bulge.

He's one of the most popular men in the Senate, a friend of the President, a friend to every displaced Alaskan in the Nation's Capital. He has an unabashed love affair for Alaska, a deep respect for his office and for the U.S. Senate. The Senate, he once said, is "the very highest goal one can attain, unless you consider the Vice Presidency or the Presidency."

Who's this fellow BARTLETT? He's a man who keeps a king-size sack of dog biscuits inside the kitchen door so he can feed the neighbor's hound every morning. He's an ex-gold miner. He's an ex-newspaperman. And he's rated by the veterans of the Senate Press Gallery as one of the top dozen Members of the Senate. That's who Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT is.

## Proliferation of Obscene Literature

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation communities are being made aware of the grave dangers created by the proliferation of obscene literature. It is well known that the purveyors of pornography have concentrated their efforts to get their wares into the hands and the minds of the young. There can be no doubt that this situation has created a national problem of great and growing proportions.

On April 5 of this year, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 980, the purpose of which was to establish the principle that a parent, as a patron of the postal service, has the right to be protected from receiving through the U.S. mails unsolicited mail matter which, in his opinion, is obscene.

I believe that all of us agree that the most effective way for citizens to combat the spread of pornographic literature is to wage a community campaign on the local level. Such a campaign has been undertaken in the city of Syracuse. The local news media and many civic organizations have joined in an effort to make parents aware of what is being pushed upon their children by the sellers of pornography, to arouse their concern and sense of outrage, and to plan an effort to put an end to the sale of indecent literature to children. I should like to include here a portion of a speech by Mr. Thomas Higgins, who is president of the Merchants National Bank and Trust Co., of Syracuse, in which he mentioned this effort. The occasion of the speech was the annual Tipperary Hill, Post 1361, American Legion award dinner.

The speech follows:

A PORTION OF A SPEECH BY MR. THOMAS HIGGINS AT THE ANNUAL TIPPERARY HILL, POST 1361, AMERICAN LEGION AWARD DINNER

The Tipp Hill Post is to be commended on another score. It has always embraced the principle that we tell all America not just what is pleasing to hear, but what is true and good and right to hear. Furthermore, that we tell all America not only what we have done in the past, but what we are resolved to do in the future.

I think the greatest thing that the Tipp Hill post has done in the past year has been to join forces with our two local newspapers; and with all decent thinking people in waging a war on smut literature which gradually is poisoning the minds of our youth. You may be interested to know that this smut industry is now a \$2 billion a year business. Just think of it—\$2 billion of dirt and the sad part of it all is that 75 percent of this obscene, foul, and filthy literature finds its way into the hands of youngsters under 18 years of age. The other day I was discussing this smut literature with a friend of mine and he made a statement which really shook me, and I have thought about it many times since. He said:

"Tom, I would rather have a mad dog loose in my backyard with my children than to have this smut literature in their hands."

Tomorrow and for a lot of tomorrows, let us all think of that statement by my friend.

May I suggest to all of you good people that you do one of two things, preferably both. Either join the Citizens for Decent Literature Committee which is active in Onondaga County under the chairmanship of Judge Leo Yehle or at least write to the Reader's Digest and ask for a reprint of an article entitled, "Poison in Print and How to Get Rid of It."

We all owe it to our children, our grandchildren, to ourselves and our community to do everything in our power to help eradicate this vicious disease which is eating away at the minds and souls of our youth.

Please don't be apathetic about this threat to our children. Don't let anyone tell you this is censorship. I abhor censorship as much as anyone else but believe me this is not censorship in any form whatsoever.

I would like to see all of the clergy of Onondaga County unite in a march against smut literature. We all want America to be the greatest country in the world. Let's make certain that she does not become the pornographic capital of the world.

# U.S. Acted in Santo Domingo as OAS Should Have Done

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evansville, Ind., Courier of May 2, 1965:

COURAGE OF COMMONSENSE: UNITED STATES ACTED IN SANTO DOMINGO AS OAS SHOULD HAVE DONE

Sending U.S. forces to the neighboring Dominican Republic was an act of necessity. We may deplore the necessity, but we cannot deplore the action. President Johnson's prompt decision illustrated the courage of commonsense. The action had to be swift, or not at all.

There are signs that some members of the Organization of American States are unhappy with this action. But the United States merely did what the OAS should have done, had it been equipped. If the action had awaited time for the OAS to go through its usual mumbo jumbo, it would have been too late.

The urgent issue was the rescue of Americans whose lives were in danger. That is a first duty of the American Government in any situation. Rescue of other nationals who wanted to leave, including even some Dominicans, could be nothing more than an act of mercy.

At the time of this writing, it still was unclear whether the disorder was being pushed primarily by Communist elements, or whether a few simply had followed the usual Communist practice of joining any disturbance. The presence of some known Communist agitators was enough to indicate the possibilities.

The Western Hemisphere cannot tolerate any more Castros in its middle. Whatever

STAT

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2515

this time. We switch you now to "The Man from UNCLE."

MYNA BIRD and BYE-BYE BIRDIE (rushing to the set). Hot-ziggety. Whoo-pee. At last.

ELBIE (glowering). Birdie Bird, why'n't you take those kiddies out and show them how to plant flowers on the freeway? (puzzled). But how come they cut me off like that?

BIRDIE BIRD (consoling). It's because you aren't on regular, Elbie. Just odd hours, night and day.

ELBIE. You're right, Birdie Bird. I'm going to get me a regular peace program—7 to 9 nightly, all three networks. And I even got a title: "My Day and Why I Did It."

Will Elbie explain things? Will he ever stop? Be sure to tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy always used to say: "Talk is cheap. And there's a lot of other good things to be said for it, too."

## Labor's Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a new philosophy in this drive for Central Government control—the drive is for a \$2 minimum wage. Of course, we can expect few employers to provide jobs for the young and unskilled at \$2 an hour, but the Great Society is going to take care of that by having the unskilled trained in some Government-financed school. Instead of using the minimum wage as a floor below which no one is permitted to fall, the plan is to establish the level as a bed upon which all can rest.

It can only mean deterioration of the presently bad system which keeps young people from finding jobs and puts them on the street to spawn crime.

The Washington Evening Star carried an editorial in the May 19, 1965, issue which is worth serious consideration of every Member of Congress before they consider selling their vote for a mess of AFL-CIO pottage. The editorial is as follows:

## LABOR'S REWARD

President Johnson has called upon Congress to give labor a very large slice of the Great Society pie.

This follows the election returns of 1964, in which labor contributed much to the President's victory and to the Democratic sweep of Congress. Political debts of this sort have to be paid, or at least an attempt must be made to pay them.

Clearly, however, the President recognizes the dangers which lurk behind some of the AFL-CIO demands. This is especially evident in his comments on his recommendation to broaden and presumably to increase (no amount was specified in the labor message) the minimum wage. Congress, Mr. Johnson said, should consider carefully the effect of higher minimum wage rates on the incomes of those employed, and also on costs and prices, and on job opportunities—"particularly for the flood of teenagers now entering our labor force." This is another way of saying that if Congress goes to extremes

in this area, it will not only be inviting inflation, an unduly high minimum wage will collide head on with the administration's effort to provide jobs for those who are both young and unskilled. The AFL-CIO has urged an hourly minimum of \$2. This is more than many employers could or would pay for the services of the unskilled, yet these constitute the bulk of the unemployed. The President and Congress cannot have it both ways. Little or no progress will be made in reducing this segment of unemployment if the cost to prospective employers becomes prohibitive.

Another absurdity in the message is the proposal to spread employment by imposing double, or penalty rates, for excessive overtime. It may be that some employers would rather pay time and a half overtime than to increase their labor force, with accompanying fringe-benefit costs. But this does not take into account those industries in which intermittent peak workloads call for occasional overtime. Why should the Government be trying to force these employers to hire permanent additional workers whose services might be needed only 3 or 4 months in the year?

There are numerous other economic recommendations in the message, and no estimate of costs. The costs, however, will be high.

The proposal with the highest emotional content concerns repeal of section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act—which permits States which wish to do so to ban the union shop. Under the union shop, employees must join a union, usually within 30 to 60 days after taking a job. It is our view that, as a matter of principle, no man should be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job. This will be a close fight and a bitter one. If Congress finally repeals section 14(b), however, then at least a provision should be written into the law to prevent unions from denying membership to Negroes and thereby depriving them of job opportunities. Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, has just made an interesting speech to the International Ladies Garment Workers in which he said that "deeply ingrained patterns of discrimination" in labor unions have not been broken. This speech should be read by every Member of Congress who may be inclined to vote for repeal of section 14(b), and then call it a day.

A Salute to Senator E. L. (Bob) Bartlett  
of AlaskaEXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a trip to my home State of Alaska, where I joined with countless other Alaskans in honoring Alaska's senior Senator E. L. (Bob) BARTLETT, through the medium of a testimonial dinner, recognizing his 20 years of dedicated service to Alaska in Washington, D.C.—first, for 14 years as Alaska's lone territorial delegate; then, for the last 6 years as U.S. Senator.

On the day of the Bartlett dinner, Alaska's Anchorage Times printed two excellent tributes to this outstanding citizen of the 49th State. In order that my colleagues may be aware of the ap-

preciation which we Alaskans feel toward our senior Senator, I insert those editorials here:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, May 15, 1965]

## WHY ALL THE FUSS ABOUT SENATOR BARTLETT?

Why all the fuss about Senator BARTLETT? Because he has done so much for Alaska during 20 years as a Member of Congress, that's why.

Alaskans are swarming around to take part in a festive tribute to him tonight. Everybody wants in the act.

They ought to want in. The celebration is more than an opportunity to show proper gratitude for extraordinary service rendered by an extraordinary public servant.

It is also an opportunity to be associated with a man who will loom high in the history of Alaska. A man who inspires good and noble qualities in all of us. A man who has reached the heights of achievement without losing the original quality of humility that makes him a true friend and neighbor.

When the Alaskans are seated for dinner tonight with the Senator in the position of honor, a great moment will have arrived.

Here will be a group of Alaskans who are grateful to their leader. They will be representative of thousands of more who would be present if they were able.

At the same time, the guest of honor will be able to see that good work is not in vain. That constituents are not all greed, selfishness and demanding. That public life is not all tension, anxiety and strife.

Only a great man could have come through 20 years of public service with a record like Senator BARTLETT's. He was tutored on the ways of Washington in the territorial days when a Delegate to Congress was hardly more than a dignified beggar. He went hat in hand to committees and agencies trying to get them to do him the favor of providing something good for Alaska.

BARTLETT's training stood him in such good stead that he has grown into a position of influence as a full-fledged Member of the upper House. While Alaska made the transition from Territory to State, BARTLETT made it from Delegate to Senator. And that is no simple task for it meant sharing the responsibility for the Nation and much of the world in addition to the problems pertaining to the baby State.

Historians will tell of the benefits that accrued to Alaska from BARTLETT's hand. The list will be long.

And no historian can make such a list without emphasizing the work of Senator BARTLETT in winning statehood for Alaska.

For 13 long years it was BARTLETT, then serving as Delegate, who worked with the committees of Congress to win favorable action on statehood legislation. It was BARTLETT who worked with the numerous Federal agencies to win their support.

It was BARTLETT to whom most Members of Congress and the other Federal agencies looked for their impressions and observations that could either help or hinder statehood legislation.

Alaskans take personal pride in BARTLETT. Each one considers him "my man." Each feels he has a proprietary right to a part of him. And why not? His successes are our successes, and he has enriched us by providing so many.

[From the Anchorage Times, May 15, 1965]

## VIGNETTES AND VIEWS, SATURDAY SUNDRY

(By William J. Tobin)

His real name is EDWARD LEWIS BARTLETT, but if you call him anything but BOB most people won't know who you're talking about. But everybody knows BOB—a childhood



May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2517

is necessary to prevent a Communist takeover in any American country, big or little, ought to be undertaken in self-protection for the whole area, especially the countries of Central and South America.

If any of our Latin American friends feel unhappy about this regretful necessity, they need only ask themselves: Which would they rather have? A temporary U.S. rescue mission? Or another Communist dictatorship to be used as a base for new infiltrations in Venezuela or Peru, or some other free American country?

The United States already has announced it is prepared to "transfer its responsibility to the OAS at the earliest possible moment."

The sooner our forces can leave the better Americans will like it. But we will not leave U.S. citizens, or other innocent victims, to the mercies of mob rule, whether inspired by local ruffians or more sinister elements.

Until then, the whole hemisphere should have but a single, prayerful hope: That some leader in the Dominican Republic can establish a stable, non-Communist government, capable of keeping order—and quickly.

China, killed just to stay in power—only 49 million (13 million people alone in 1962). The U.N. said nothing.

When the United Nations was established in 1945, communism controlled only 200 million people, in and around the Soviet Union. Today, communism strikes terror in some 900 million people in Europe and Asia. Roughly almost one-third of the world's population is living under Communist influence and control. Is this the peace guaranteed by the United Nations?

By all means let's give Communist China a seat in the United Nations—our seat. And since we do not want the Red Chinese coming to New York, let's ask them to move the U.N. headquarters to Peiping or Moscow where it really belongs.

If mere survival has become more important to Americans than freedom, then the men who sacrificed their lives for us in battles of the past have been asked to fight, to bleed, and to die in vain.

BILLY MCILHANY.

dangers more than the safety of 2,000 American civilians.

It is a threat to the security of the entire hemisphere. The situation is made to order for Fidel Castro and his well-organized subversives in the Caribbean.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 30, 1965]  
MARINES FOR A DOUBLE PURPOSE

The landing of Marines to protect Americans in the Dominican Republic should also serve a larger purpose. This is to preclude a Communist takeover along the lines of Fidel Castro's conquest of Cuba for the Reds.

President Johnson acted forthrightly in sending the Marines ashore. He did so with approval from congressional leaders of both political parties, and we believe they represented the views of their constituents in supporting the President's action.

Mr. Johnson also saw to it that full information on developments was supplied to the council of the Organization of American States. The OAS, representing all the free nations of the new world, is properly as concerned as the United States to prevent another Cuba.

No government in the hemisphere is safe if Communist agents can foment insurrection—whatever the pretext—in order to seize power. Members of the OAS might well send token forces to Santo Domingo to help snuff out the threat to peace there. Such steps are clearly authorized by OAS pacts, and were invoked during the Cuban missile crisis.

Squeals of outrage over the use of Marines already are being heard from the Communist bloc, and may be expected to grow louder. These merely underscore the truth about the bloody doings in Santo Domingo.

President Johnson is proceeding with measured prudence. The lives of the 2,000 Americans in the Dominican Republic certainly must be safeguarded so long as teenage hoodlums with machineguns are allowed to spray bullets where they please.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald,  
Apr. 29, 1965]

## THE MARINES HAVE LANDED

Yesterday this newspaper pleaded: "Let's have no second Cuba in the Dominican Republic."

Today it makes no difference whether we said this or whether someone else did. The pertinent fact is that President Johnson has acted swiftly to prevent just such a catastrophe. He has sent a powerful Marine unit ashore for the ostensible purpose of protecting American nationals in the hotted-up civil war. One faction in that conflict would return Juan Bosch to power with the help of undisguised cadres of Communists.

It is all very well to argue that we have no real business in Santo Domingo. The same argument was made—much to our woe—in that vacillating venture known as the Bay of Pigs, which has cost the United States worldwide prestige and a Red foothold one jump from the U.S. mainland.

We think that Mr. Johnson moved wisely last night.

He was careful to consult the friendly council of the Organization of American States.

He conferred with and responded to the Dominican Government in power (though beleaguered) which requested our help.

He brought in the congressional leadership.

It is clear, however, that the marines are there to stay a bit, for their "assistance will be available to the nationals of other countries."

Well, let them stabilize the situation, not in the selfish name of any entrenched and selfish colonialism but to protect the national interests of two proud peoples in political freedom in the Caribbean.

## U.S. Forces in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for insertion in the Record three highly interesting editorials from recent newspapers: one from the Miami Herald of April 30; one from the Miami News of the same date; and a third from the Herald of April 29.

In the midst of increasing public confusion, these articles enunciate quite simply the reasons for our dispatching U.S. forces recently to the Dominican Republic: to protect American lives; to prevent another Cuban-style Communist takeover in our hemisphere, and to prevent the kind of anarchy which would make impossible any international peacekeeping and stabilizing action.

I strongly recommend these informative articles to my colleagues:

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Apr. 30, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SWIFT RESPONSE

President Johnson's reply to the information that some 2,000 American lives were endangered by the Dominican revolt was swift and effective.

His sending of the Marines may raise some hackles among Latin Americans who recall the "gunboat diplomacy" of earlier years, but those feelings can be soothed later.

The President's immediate responsibility was to respond to a notice that no one could guarantee the safety of U.S. nationals in the Dominican Republic. This is entirely believable, considering that one of the first acts of the rebels was to put guns in the hands of a few thousand unorganized civilians.

U.S. spokesmen have been careful to state that the Marines are there only to protect Americans and other foreign nationals who request aid. Nevertheless, the presence of American forces could, or should, impose some restraint on the Santo Domingo rebels. We shall see.

The U.S. suggestion that the Organization of American States put its peacemaking machinery to work at once was a wise one. The chaos in the Dominican Republic en-

## Student Opposes United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record I include a letter written by Billy McIlhany, an eighth-grade student from Roanoke, Va., High School which appeared in the Roanoke World News on Tuesday, April 20, 1965.

It is gratifying to find so many young students in America who do a little thinking for themselves and recognize the dangers which can come to this country by way of a world government.

The letter follows:

[From the Roanoke (Va.) World News,  
Apr. 20, 1965]

## STUDENT OPPOSES UNITED NATIONS

Congratulations to the United Nations and their friends everywhere. Another great success for peace has been accomplished. This is of course in the light of news reports stating that legislation will soon give Alcatraz Island to the San Francisco chapter of the United Nations Association, which will convert it into an international peace symbol, flying the United Nations symbolic flag. And of course most of these good but misguided people do not realize that the peace sought by the United Nations, and to be symbolized by their island, is the Communist peace, which means literally and simply, a situation or condition, in any country or for any people, in which all resistance to communism has been completely destroyed.

For certainly that is exactly where the United Nations flag belongs—over a maximum security prison, or an island which will be remembered in the public mind as a maximum security prison. The action seems to me quite symbolic, as a maximum security prison is exactly what the whole world will become if the United Nations is successful.

Less than 1 month ago a report said how many people the Red Chinese under Mao Tse-tung have murdered since 1949. These were just anti-Communists, citizens in

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

A2518

## Aid to Higher Education

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Record a series of three editorials by the Riverside, Calif., Press-Enterprise.

H.R. 3220, a bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, will soon be before the House.

This proposed legislation would provide approximately \$1,450,000 to the State of California, a large portion of which would be allocated to the University of California Extension Service which plays an active role in programs relating to community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use.

I believe that the University of California Extension Service has done a remarkable job for the educational system of California as well as for the people of the various communities which it serves.

The following editorials are historically important as few newspapers in this country have become really informed about the possibilities for using the university extension service in nonagricultural areas:

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, Apr. 6, 1964]

## EXTENSION: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE, CHANCELLOR BACKS AID PLAN

Chancellor Herman T. Spieth of the University of California at Riverside, today publicly announced his support of a proposed Federal plan to finance additional university extension programs.

The bill, introduced in Congress by Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, Democrat, of W. Va., would make it possible for the university to increase its education services to business, industrial, and professional groups and to the general public.

A publicly supported program of general extension as provided by Congressman BAILEY's bill (H.R. 4386), to be operated by State universities and land-grant colleges would stimulate these institutions to bring new research and other knowledge to individual and groups in communities through programs of adult education, Chancellor Spieth said.

The bill provides for a yearly appropriation of \$20 million to each State and an additional \$8 million to be divided among the States on the basis of population. Each State would have to provide its own matching funds to share in the \$8 million fund.

Under the proposed program, each college or university could use the money to offer adult education courses in any field of study taught at the school or in which the school conducts research.

However, duplication of instruction offered by the cooperative agricultural or home economics programs or by federally financed vocational education program would not be allowed.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, Apr. 5, 1961]

## EXTENDING EXTENSION

While the program for aid to education which the President is urging on Congress may seem comprehensive, it neglects one important phase of education: adult education.

In all effort to fill this loophole, Congressman Cleveland Bailey, Democrat, of Ohio, has introduced a bill providing a modest plan of support for the adult extension programs of State universities and land-grant colleges.

The plan does not include agricultural instruction. Agricultural instruction is already substantially supported by the Federal Government and has been for many years.

Indeed the record of success in the joint Federal-State program of agricultural extension has undoubtedly contributed in a major way to the unique character of this country's farm problem. We refer, of course, to America's farm surpluses as compared with the shortages which plague most of the world.

Extension of Federal aid to other areas of adult education promises similar benefits.

The increasing complexity of modern industry demands greater knowledge and greater skills. And the task of helping people find this knowledge and skill can't be accomplished entirely during the normal school years. Part of it is the problem of adult education.

The same can be said for the greater demands of citizenship in a shrunken, terrifying world. Here, too, part of the educational task, and an important part, is with adults.

The need for Federal encouragement is indicated by the great disparity in what various States are attempting. Some universities (Southern Illinois University is a notable example) have extension programs which have a constructive influence on almost every phase of community life. In other States nothing at all is being done.

Congressman Bailey's bill would provide a modest push—a \$9 million one—toward a national program. It deserves wide support.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, June 1, 1964]

## GREATEST EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

The Nation has just passed the 50th anniversary of the act of Congress which established the Agricultural Extension Service administered by the land-grant colleges.

This program was a sort of internal point IV program. Herbert Hoover once called it "the world's greatest educational institution." Certainly, it has been of great moment to California—now producer of the largest value of agricultural cash crops in the Nation. It has been of prime importance to Riverside, with the remarkable contributions of the University of California's Citrus Experiment Station, now known officially as the Citrus Research Center and Agricultural Experiment Station.

Not only has Agricultural Extension been technical adviser to the Nation's farmers as they reduced the ratio of manpower required to feed the Nation from 1 farmer for every 7 consumers to 1 for every 27. But it has enriched the whole context of rural life with its home demonstration programs, its network of 4-H clubs and other youth activities, and, more recently, its nonpolitical and social problems.

Only more recently have the Nation's universities begun to cultivate a field now far more crowded and just as much in need of help as the rural districts of the Nation. But in the last decade or so they have been coming alive in a variety of ministrations to urban and suburban populations.

University Extension, almost since the founding of the liberal arts college at University of California at Riverside, has been offering a wide variety of adult education courses, seminars, and institutes. In the last 2 years they have come under such subject groupings as "The Executive Profile," "Government in Action," "Value of the Arts," "The Southern California City," "Race, Property, and Government," and "Development of Creative Abilities in Children." To extend its reach the division has spotted its offerings not only in Riverside but also in San Bernardino, Ontario, Barstow, and Palm Springs.

The extension efforts of the university, a fledgling in a limited field a half century ago, now begins to approach saturation coverage of areas which touch the lives of almost every Californian who harbors a desire for knowledge and self-improvement, or an urge to make an informed and effective contribution to his community.

## The President Makes Some More Good Appointments

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, an editorial appeared in the Providence Journal, which voices strong approval of many of President Johnson's recent appointments.

I heartily concur and place the editorial as part of my remarks:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, May 1, 1965]

## THE PRESIDENT MAKES SOME MORE GOOD APPOINTMENTS

Several of the Federal appointees just named by President Johnson will find ticklish or controversial problems awaiting them as they step into their new positions. Their approach to the problems is expected to reflect any changes in direction or emphasis that the administration may have decided upon in these various areas.

One area is antitrust activity. Speculation has been heard for some time that the Johnson administration prefers a more cautious and less vigorous prosecution of the antitrust laws. The administration has made great efforts to win the support and respect of the business community, but these efforts have been handicapped from time to time by the energy and zeal of William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. Orrick now is stepping down to return to his law practice in California. He will be replaced by Dr. Donald F. Turner, an authority on antitrust legislation and a member of the faculty at Harvard Law School. It remains to be seen whether the change in the leadership of the Antitrust Division will mean any change in the division's policy, emphasis or scale of activity.

Three of the presidential appointments lie in the field of transportation.

Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has been named Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. Mr. Boyd has demonstrated exceptional administrative skill while heading the CAB. In his new position, he will assume broader respon-

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2529

materials, and counseling—consistent with the effective use of the assistance to reach sound, agreed-upon objectives. The emphasis is upon self-help and a growing sense of community and individual responsibility. One result of this principle in operation is an unusual economy in rendering assistance; it also runs counter to the concepts of "foreign aid" held by many of its practitioners.

15. There is a maximum use of indigenous resources; always there are resources available to a community, some nearly always unknown to the people.

16. The professional counselors are citizens of the country. The philosophy, policies, and methods of Futures can be, and are, learned. Indigenous men and women of the highest quality, intelligent, sensitive, devoted, and otherwise well equipped to serve the less fortunate, can be found.

17. A modest Futures' loan or grant is essential for some projects. Nominal grants sometimes have great morale value. Loans are made when there is to be an economic return, and always there must be a direct, significant benefit for the children.

18. The Futures program operates successfully in rural areas and in the slum outskirts of urban centers. These are the areas, throughout the world, where underprivilege is most prevalent, with a vast population movement from the former to the latter.

19. Important to an extension of the work is the inevitable "chain reaction" as communities learn from the achievements of other communities.

20. Futures cooperates with institutions and other organizations, foreign, international, and indigenous, which have consonant aims and programs.

21. Futures believes that a nationwide program of improvement is most likely to succeed as the result of collaboration between government and indigenous private organizations developed for this purpose. Such collaboration is already underway successfully on a local and state basis in Antioquia, Colombia, through Futures' counterpart organization, Futuro Para la Ninez. Government can contribute material resources and trained personnel on a nationwide basis while Futuro, with more adequate financing, can furnish professional leadership in the areas of policy formulation, personnel training and inservice development, program demonstration and experimentation, and operational research. In such an arrangement, the private and governmental sectors of society each makes its distinctive and invaluable contribution to the common good.

### Sun Valley Receives International Publicity

SPEECH  
OF

**HON. GEORGE HANSEN**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, world famous Sun Valley, in my congressional district, is mentioned in an advertisement being used this spring in 47 leading national newspapers and magazines in England, France, Germany, Mexico, and Australia/New Zealand by the U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Travel Service has done well to include this rare and beautiful spot in its cam-

paign of "see America." However, I commend Sun Valley to all Americans, as well as to Europeans and those others to whom the ads are directed.

In addition to the recreation and pleasures to be had at Sun Valley, it is just a short distance from Craters of the Moon, unique among all national monuments. It is also a "jumping off" place for the rugged Sawtooth Mountains and Idaho's primitive area.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I place this advertisement in the RECORD. It is also with pleasure that I extend an invitation to all of you to visit with us in Idaho. I know you will like us.

The advertisement follows:

**BRONCO-BUSTERS AND BACH—THIS YEAR ENJOY THE ROCKIES AND NORTHWEST: START AT SEATTLE, WASH., AND DISCOVER THE SPECTACULAR UNITED STATES—GLACIERS, TOWERING PEAKS AND DUDE RANCHES**

Dine in the revolving restaurant atop Seattle's 60-story Space Needle, golf at the hill-top Jefferson Park course, cruise beautiful Puget Sound. Plan to be there between June and mid-August during the Seattle Seafair—boat races, water shows and gay parades are all part of the festivities.

At Mount Rainier, drive up through the clouds to walk on a "live glacier"; 5,000 wild elk are an attraction at nearby Olympic National Park. So are the lush "rain forests." Ideal growing conditions produce magnificent flowers and trees—spruce up to 51 feet around.

#### AMERICA'S LAST FRONTIER—ALASKA

The largest State in the Nation—and still not completely explored. Today, dynamic Anchorage is only a 3-hour side trip from Seattle by air. You'll see Mount McKinley, highest peak in North America. Turn south to the State capital, Juneau. Then enjoy Alaska's spectacular scenery by riding the car-carrying ferries along the Inside Passage to Skagway. You'll be fascinated by the city's reenactment of Alaska's gold rush days—complete with can-can girls, gambling halls, and gun duels.

#### FLY TO THE CITY OF ROSES

One-way air fare from Seattle to beautiful Portland, Oreg., is \$4.13s.2d. If you arrive in June, the famous weeklong Rose Festival (June 4-13) will be a highlight of your Northwest tour.

Rent a car and drive to snowcapped Mount Hood, only 60 miles to the east. Another day, see famous Crater Lake, a giant blue jewel set in the heart of an ancient volcano.

#### COWBOYS AS TOUGH AS SADDLE LEATHER

Sun Valley, the international sports center in Idaho, should be one of your stops in the Rockies. Then on, higher and higher, to Montana's Glacier National Park—nature's dazzling display of jagged peaks, valleys, lakes, and waterfalls—with 1,000 miles of horse and foot trails.

Now you're in the Big Sky country, where a man can breathe deep and free. Stay at a "dude ranch" and have steak and potatoes for breakfast before riding the range with broncobusting cowboys. Dance under starry western skies. Fish trout-packed waters. And stop at colorful, historic Virginia City, Mont., an authentic old mining town.

Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming is a sightseer's paradise. There are over 200 geysers, and you'll like meeting the huge black bears (from inside your car). And the border of another national park, Grand Teton, is only 10 miles away. A \$2.25.11d. car fee entitles you to tour and camp in all 32 great national parks. Then drive on to join the riproaring fun at Cheyenne's "Frontier Days" (July 27 to August 1)—one of the country's most famous rodeos.

#### BACH IN THE ROCKIES

Drive south to Colorado and take a day's excursion on the cliff-hugging railroad between Durango and Silverton. It will transport you back to the days of the great silver strikes. Nearby, at Aspen, extensive programs (June 28 to August 30) of classical and modern music, lectures, and forums attract international visitors every year.

### With One Eye Toward Beauty—And Another on the Dump

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Compost Science is published quarterly, and is sent to about 10,000 municipal and industrial officials throughout the country who are responsible for the treatment of organic waste materials. Its editorial policy has been to stress the importance of utilization of such wastes and report on research and experiences of waste utilization throughout the world. Mr. Jerome Olds, the editor of Compost Science, has brought to my attention the editorial in the current issue. I believe my colleagues, particularly those from large urban areas, will find this editorial of particular interest, and it follows:

#### WITH ONE EYE TOWARD BEAUTY—AND ANOTHER ON THE DUMP

American research is truly fantastic.

We've been reading about Early Bird—the first "product" of COMSAT and what it will mean to the communications field. We've been reading about Houston's Astrodome—the Eighth Wonder of the World (as long as baseball games are played at night there). And bridges, and antibiotics, and jets. One accomplishment after another. Chalk them up to research.

But one field has been continually plagued by lack of research—the solid wastes disposal field. Somehow when the R. & D. projects were being assigned, this one got left by the wayside. And the result of this no research are showing—stinking and polluting, in fact.

Warned President Johnson earlier this year:

"Modern technology, which has added much to our lives, can also have a darker side. The air we breathe, our water, our soil, and wildlife are being blighted by poisons and chemicals which are the by-products of technology and industry. The same society which receives the rewards of technology must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for control."

In his message on natural beauty, President Johnson had this to say about solid wastes:

"Continuing technological progress and improvement in methods of manufacture, packaging, and marketing of consumer products has resulted in an ever-mounting increase of discarded material. We need to seek better solutions to the disposal of these wastes. I recommend legislation to—

"Assist the States in developing comprehensive programs for some forms of solid waste disposal;

"Provide for research and demonstration projects leading to more effective methods for disposing of or salvaging solid wastes;

A2530

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

"Launch a concentrated attack on the accumulation of junk cars by increasing research in the Department of the Interior leading to use of metal from scrap cars where promising leads already exist."

## A START IN LEGISLATION

The legislation recommended by the President has been introduced in the past few months into the House of Representatives. Nine identical bills—whose purpose is to launch a national research program for improved solid waste handling—have been sponsored by the following Congressmen: ROOSEVELT, ROYBAL, HAWKINS, VAN DEERLIN, CORMAN, and BROWN, of California; KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois; CELLER of New York; and DINGELL of Michigan. The bill, known as the "Solid Waste Disposal Act," would provide the funds necessary to carry out the program.

Composting would specifically benefit from the proposed legislation, which would also provide for research into sanitary landfills, incineration, grinding and disposal to sewers. The grants would be used to demonstrate the "reliability, engineering, operating, agricultural, horticultural, and economic potentials of the processes under study."

In order to assist States to inventory existing practices of solid waste handling and disposal and "develop State programs for the improvement of such practices in the interests of protection of the health and safety of all the people," the Surgeon General would be authorized to appropriate \$2 million for each of 3 succeeding fiscal years. To provide for the construction of demonstration plants, up to \$7,500,000 would be available. An additional \$7 million would be authorized to carry out the other provisions of the act.

The act itself would be administered by the Surgeon General under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The Surgeon General may appoint a Solid Waste Advisory Committee to advise and assist in the formulation of programs authorized by this act. The Committee shall also advise on the establishment of a program for the disposition of grant-in-aid and project grant funds to carry out the expressed intent of the act.

## NEED FOR ACTION

There can be no question of the need for this national research program into the solid waste disposal field. The problems are nationwide—rapidly expanding urban areas unable to cope satisfactorily with solid wastes exist throughout the United States. Pollution, health hazards and just plain ugliness have become all-too-common characteristics of our metropolitan areas.

Without doubt, it is time for an intensive national effort to come up with the needed solution.

## Sweet Reason Prevails in Big Steel Talks

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's persuasive influence in helping avert a nationwide steel strike is known to most of us. The President's brilliant success in getting men of opposing views to sit down and reason together is interestingly described in an editorial of May 3, 1965, edition of the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee.

## The editorial follows:

## SWEET REASON PREVAILS IN BIG STEEL TALKS

A new dimension in labor-management responsibility was written in Pittsburgh by the United Steelworkers Union and big steel when they agreed to a 4-month interim contract pending final settlement of their dispute—thereby averting a strike which could have depressed, even crippled, a booming, healthy economy.

Up to now steelworkers slavishly had followed that old, old union battletory, "no contract, no work," and lacking a contract, would strike. By agreeing this time to accept an interim 11.5 cent hourly pay hike while negotiating outstanding differences, the steelworkers displayed a mature, responsible attitude which does labor proud.

No! should it be overlooked either that President Lyndon B. Johnson's influence had a part in bringing about this interim agreement. Again his persuasive hand is felt at a critical moment; again men sat down at his urging, and as Johnson fondly likes to put it, "reasoned together."

The interim contract may have a new influence upon labor-management relations. If this represents a precedent, hallelujah. If the example may help avert other strikes—hallelujah.

Few realize how disastrous a steel strike could have been to the economy. At the moment the Nation is experiencing a prosperity which has triggered expansion, expansion, expansion at a time when expansion, expansion, expansion is crucial to the national fortune.

The strike called, the long battle begun—all of the gains, or a great part of the gains, could be lost.

Never has the steel industry gone into a strike but that shock waves ricocheted throughout the entire industrial base, producing retrenchment, withdrawal.

For example, the 116-day steel strike in 1959 idled more than 500,000 directly associated with producing steel and 250,000 in industries directly dependent upon steel. Dwindling stockpiles produced black market sales. Foreign steel, taking advantage of the idle furnaces here, rushed in to service markets the American steel industry never has regained fully.

The direct cost to workers was estimated at \$1 billion in wages alone. On top of this, the companies lost more than \$1 billion in profits, never to be recouped; railroads lost more than \$175 million in freight revenues and the Government lost more than \$1.2 billion in taxes.

This time commonsense prevailed. Men reasoned, and the furnaces remain lit. Now the pressure is off of negotiators as they proceed toward a solution of their differences.

ness in the face of great danger; resolution in pursuing a difficult and lonely task; dedication and purpose in searching for stability in a highly threatening situation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly impressed by two recent editorials, one in the May 4 edition of Newsday, and the other in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of May 7. They comment quite effectively, I believe, on affairs in the Dominican Republic and on the President's conduct, and I submit them now for entry in the RECORD:

[From Newsday, May 4, 1965]

## THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, AND WHY WE ARE THERE

President Johnson, as of noon yesterday, was sticking to his explanation that Marines and paratroopers are in the Dominican Republic purely to protect Americans still there and to assist in their evacuation. That is the diplomatic explanation. If by chance it happens that the presence of U.S. forces and tanks cuts off a left-wing-cum Castro Communist uprising at the roots, that is so much gravy.

In fact, the United States has every reason to prevent a takeover either by Communists or by those willing to work with them. A little reflection on what happened to Cuba upon Fidel Castro's accession to power will elucidate the reasons. We cannot risk another focus of infection in the Western Hemisphere. If the heads of most Latin American countries could at this moment speak frankly, they would express great relief that we acted as resolutely as we did. The difficulty is that just about every Latin American country has a powerful left-wing component, along with a lesser number of Communists willing to fish in troubled waters. That accounts for the public expressions of shock and dismay by such delicately balanced heads of state as Eduardo Frei, of Chile.

We would not now have Castro in Cuba if we had moved with more toughness at the time of the Bay of Pigs. We cannot afford to have a government in the Dominican Republic that is susceptible to Fidel's influence, infiltration, and possible future takeover.

The Monroe Doctrine was written to deal with foreign infiltration. Communism is the ideology of a foreign power. Perhaps we had better recast the Monroe Doctrine to cover infiltration as well as actual invasion. The events in the Dominican Republic urgently suggest that such a reconsideration is in order.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 7, 1965]

## HISTORIC STEP BY THE OAS

The Organization of American States took an historic step yesterday when 14 of its 20 members voted to send military forces to keep order in the presently chaotic Dominican Republic. True, it was a close decision, since 14 was the minimum number required for action, but the vote could have great significance for the future.

Details remain to be spelled out, and the OAS will doubtless creak into action with vast heavings, but a far-reaching step has been taken. It may ultimately provide a solution for the urgent Dominican problem. Some such solution is sorely needed.

Various Latin American countries which have dragged their feet when asked to do something effective against Castro's Cuba, opposed the proposed Dominican operation. Those voting "no" were Mexico, Chile, Peru, Uruguay, and Ecuador, with Venezuela (surprisingly) abstaining. Since Venezuela is probably next on the Communist agenda of

## The Dominican Republic; Why We Are

There

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the outcome will be of the tense drama now in progress in the Dominican Republic. But I do know that this grave crisis has given all Americans a telling glimpse of the quality of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

He has shown boldness and decisive-

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2531

infiltration and conquest, one would have supposed that its government would be anxious to cauterize the festering Red sore in the Dominican Republic by joint action.

The percentage of Communists who are in leadership positions in and around Santo Domingo is a subject of dispute. The Johnson administration has been emphatic in declaring that the Reds have been running the show. Even if that is not quite correct, they undoubtedly are in important leadership positions. Let us not forget that in the early stages of the Cuban revolt, few Communists were involved, and Castro loudly denied any connection with communism.

The Christian Science Monitor's correspondent in Santo Domingo lists the principal OAS objectives as follows:

"To bring in at least token elements from a variety of Latin American lands.

"To set up OAS diplomatic machinery to support whatever Dominican Government emerges from the current uncertainty.

"To target in on a date for removal of all foreign troops and hold to that date."

If the foregoing, or most of it, can be achieved, it will be cause for congratulations all around. It is to be presumed and hoped, however, that the OAS would not support just any government that happened to get the upper hand—such as one dominated and controlled by Communists.

Meanwhile conditions in the Dominican Republic, and especially in the capital, Santo Domingo, are indescribably bad. Bodies litter the streets, the smell of death hangs over the city, garbage is uncollected and there is general chaos. Food, medicine, and public order are sorely needed.

Much remains to be done before the situation in the Dominican Republic can be stabilized. It appears, however, that events are moving in the right direction.

### The New Jersey Investigation Into the War on Poverty

#### SPEECH

OF

**HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the conduct of the war on poverty has resulted in considerable attention to the details of the battle in my home State of New Jersey. Since the appropriate committees of Congress appear too preoccupied to carry out the full study of the program nationally, as suggested by Members from both sides of the aisle, it is encouraging to know that the New Jersey State Legislature will be acting in this area.

Under the chairmanship of State Senator Nelson Stamler, of Union County, a bipartisan committee of three assemblymen and three senators has been created to examine the workings of the poverty program within the State. The justifiable criticism of the high salaries being paid poverty war officials is only one phase of the investigation. Although some partisan outcry has been heard over the study, I think that most New Jersey citizens, and most Americans, will agree with the editorial appearing in the April 30, 1965, edition of the *Herald-News* of Passaic, N.J. The editorial points out that there has been no dif-

ficulty in recruiting workers for the Peace Corps, where no salary complaints have been heard, and that the bureaucrats running the poverty program have as yet to test themselves against the late President Kennedy's admonition to ask not what their country could do for them, but to ask what they could do for their country.

As the editorial concludes, "Let the investigation proceed," at all levels of government.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Herald-News*, Apr. 30, 1965]

#### PROBING THE POVERTY WAR

The decision of the Republican-controlled legislature to investigate the administration of the war on poverty in New Jersey may be politically inspired, as the Democrats claim, but no one can deny that there is need for turning the spotlight on the program.

The investigating committee of three assemblymen and three senators is headed by Union County's Senator Stamler, who will be remembered for his gambling investigations in Passaic and Bergen Counties when he was in the State attorney general's employ. Properly conducted the investigation should be much more than the "witch hunt" which Democrats have branded it in an attempt to discredit it before it starts. The high salaries which are being paid to top officials in the poverty war have been widely publicized, not only in New Jersey but throughout the Nation. Criticism of what appear to be exorbitant salaries has been defended by Sargent Shriver, national director of the Johnson administration's poverty program. Mr. Shriver has said that the high salaries are necessary to attract the best qualified people.

But comparison has been made between the war on poverty and the Peace Corps, which is also directed by Mr. Shriver. The dedicated men and women who make up the Peace Corps have not been accused of being overpaid and yet they are among the Nation's most valued servants.

In his inaugural address the late President Kennedy admonished Americans to ask not what their country could do for them, but to ask what they could do for their country. The men and women who are running the war on poverty at all levels apparently have not tested themselves along the lines suggested by the late President.

Let the investigation proceed.

### Lawson B. Knott, Jr.: The Logical Man To Head General Services Administration

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made an excellent choice in selecting Lawson B. Knott, Jr., to head the General Services Administration.

Mr. Knott is a 30-year veteran of Government service. He is a dedicated civil servant, extremely capable, and at 53 has an excellent record of faithful service to our Government.

I personally do not think the President could have selected a more capable executive. Under Mr. Knott's able leader-

ship, I am confident that GSA will continue to render the high quality of service it has provided in past years.

Born in Wendell, N.C., Mr. Knott graduated from Duke University at Durham, and later from the National University Law School here in Washington. He began his Government career with the Re-settlement Administration in 1935, and continued his employment when it merged with the Department of Agriculture. In 1942 he joined the Corps of Engineers, and after World War II, served in a legal and administrative capacity until he transferred to GSA in 1956.

His rise in GSA was rapid and within only 3 years his abilities moved him upward to the position of Deputy Commissioner of General Services Administration's Public Building Service. Here he served until November 28, 1961, when he was appointed Deputy Administrator of GSA. He is married to the former Miss Marion Lunt, of Cedar City, Utah, and they have two children, Mrs. Neil E. Churchill, of Atlanta, and Gregory, a college student.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Knott's record serves as a splendid example for young people entering Government service to follow. The purpose of my remarks here today is to warmly congratulate him before Members of the Congress.

### Bonneville Power Authority Still Attempting To Invade Area

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on Sunday, May 16, 1965. It cogently sets forth reasons why the request of the Bonneville Power Authority for \$1 million for planning of transmission lines to southeastern Idaho should be denied.

I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

#### BPA STILL ATTEMPTING TO INVADe AREA

Defeated last year in an attempt to get a "foot in the door" appropriation for a Federal transmission line to southern Idaho, the Bonneville Power Administration is trying again. The request is the same as it was in 1964—\$1 million to design the proposed line. But the ultimate cost to the taxpayers has been raised to \$80 million from the original \$73 million because of the change in routing. The figures, however, are estimates which have a habit of falling short of reality. Moreover, the cost of the 1964 proposal, if related customer facilities were included, would have been \$130 million—not \$73 million.

But the huge price tag is not nearly as objectionable as the idea behind the proposal. BPA wants to carry federally subsidized power long distances over a federally subsidized transmission line. And this despite the fact that southern Idaho, served by two private utilities (Utah Power & Light and Idaho Power) has ample electric power available.



May 20, 1966

A2532

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

## SUGGESTS JOINT EFFORT

During an appearance before a Senate Public Works Subcommittee, Charles F. Luce of BPA suggested that the Federal Government and private companies might agree on joint construction of the proposed line. This was done on the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie.

His suggestion would be more impressive, however, if BPA had been more successful in carrying out congressional instructions to negotiate with private companies for the wheeling of Bonneville power to southern Idaho. Mr. Luce blamed one private company for the so-called deadlock and explained that as a result BPA is now asking for funds to plan for its own transmission line.

Could it be that BPA hopes to use talk of a Federal transmission line as a lever in negotiations over wheeling?

## SELLS AT LOW RATES

BPA sells power at amazingly low rates, now averaging about 2.35 cents per kilowatt-hour, although the agency operates in the red some years. This point was raised during the Senate subcommittee hearing, with Mr. Luce defending bookkeeping methods which, according to the General Accounting Office, enable the agency to hide some costs of power generation.

Mr. Luce explained that GAO accounting methods would not reflect congressional policy requiring Federal investments in Columbia River plants to be repaid in 50 years. Yet he also said BPA is considering a rate raise which would increase power revenues by about 4 percent. Perhaps widespread criticism of BPA's low rates and deficit operation is finally being heeded.

## UDALL OPENED WAY

BPA began operating in southern Idaho in 1963 when Secretary of the Interior Udall placed that territory in the agency's marketing area and gave it the marketing function for power generated at southern Idaho reclamation projects. Now BPA hopes to add to its power empire by getting congressional approval of a Federal transmission line.

We opposed BPA's request for planning funds a year ago. We oppose the latest request. And the million dollars for planning is only a first step. BPA appears determined to enter an area where ample electric power is already available, taking advantage of Federal subsidies for the cost of both generation and transmission. Congress said "no" last year. It should do so again.

## Bridges Versus People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press recently carried an editorial entitled, "Bridges Versus People," in which the newspaper expressed its puzzlement over critics of America's policies in Vietnam.

I, too, share the bewilderment of the newspaper. I cannot understand why citizens criticize American and South Vietnamese bombing of Communist bridges, depots, and supply lines in which few if any humans are killed and at the same time overlook Vietcong bombings of the American Embassy and terrorism of villages and hamlets in which many

lives are lost and numerous injuries are suffered.

The United States is not in Vietnam by choice. We are not there to gain conquest. We are not there to destroy property and people. Our sole purpose in Vietnam is to protect freedom in this vital area of the world.

If we withdraw from Vietnam now, we break our commitments to these freedom loving people. Then the cause of democracy will be damaged beyond repair.

The people of Thailand, the people of the Philippines, the people throughout southeast Asia are looking to the United States to see if we will adhere to our agreements and if we will fight to protect freedom. We must not let them down. We must keep our word. The President is doing this.

So I am proud of President Johnson's leadership. I am proud of the manner in which he is conducting our efforts in Vietnam. I think recent events have already proven that his policies are paying off with victory and I am sure that victory will be ours.

At this time I include in its entirety the April 28, Pittsburgh Press editorial:

## BRIDGES VERSUS PEOPLE

President Johnson at his press conference yesterday expressed wonderment that people who are disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam never seem to be upset by such events as the Communist bombing of our embassy in Saigon nor by Vietcong murders of women and children.

That will puzzle others, too.

There can be many arguments against war as an institution. But to condemn the use of force on one side, while condoning it on the other, must be either ridiculous or coldly cynical.

Nevertheless, a good many Americans—not a majority, to be sure—seem to have been caught up in this frenzy.

The fact is that the Communists are counting on just such a reaction in this country to help them achieve their goal. They believe our natural disinclination toward the use of force eventually will cause us to give in rather than fight to the finish in Vietnam.

As the President made clear, however, the Vietnam war is not going to conclude that way. We did not make the war, but we are there to stay. We are, in Mr. Johnson's words, not about to "tuck our tails and run home."

Meanwhile, it will be good for the American people to remember that, as the President indicated, it is more useful in war to blow up a cold steel bridge than to murder a child.

## No Compromise for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there are many rumors floating around about the content of the report of the Special Commission appointed by the President to review the closing of 32 Veterans' Administration installations. About a week or so ago our body of the Congress added to the appropriation for independent offices the \$23 million necessary to operate

these particular facilities for fiscal year 1966. Our action was a direct response to the strange and peculiar circumstance that the Appropriations Committee had provided no money in the bill for these 32 facilities, apparently proceeding upon the premise that the Commission would order all the facilities to remain closed.

It was my understanding the report of findings would not be submitted to the President until on or about June 1. But there must have been some premature leak last week, because the story is going the rounds that 5 of the 11 hospitals, 2 of the domiciliary homes, and 8 of the regional offices would be retained.

May I comment that if there are any who feel this sort of a compromise is a victory over the Veterans' Administration, I do not want to be included within their number. If one single hospital or one single regional office is allowed to be closed, it will be a loss through impairment of services to the veterans of our Nation.

I want to make it very plain here and now that I will continue opposition to all the closings with all the strength I can muster.

I am sure other Members will keep up this fight and it will not be confined simply to those who have districts that have directly felt the detrimental effects of this order. Every Congressman should realize that what can happen to one district can happen very soon to another and that unless there is a determination to fight now the closing order of last January can be just one step that will be followed by others over the years.

Since last January I have voted against several money bills which, if they had been defeated, would have provided the money to replace the alleged \$23 million savings many times over. Before this session of the Congress is over I will vote against other authorizations and appropriations in an amount greater than the amount of \$23 million which the Bureau of the Budget has said it must save, or should I say take away from our deserving veterans.

Compromise is not enough. The fight must continue for out and out revocation of the closing directive of January 13.

In conclusion, I wish to commend to my colleagues an editorial on the proposed compromise which appeared in this week's issue of the Stars & Stripes and which reads as follows:

[From the Stars & Stripes, May 20, 1965]

## VA HOSPITAL REPORT

When the President appointed a special commission to review the closing of some 32 VA installations it was ordered to report its findings to him by May 31.

Apparently some decision has been made by the Commission and what appears to be a premature release was announced last week. It is now reported that the Commission has agreed that 5 of the 11 hospitals cited in the VA order should be retained. Two of the four domiciliary homes would also remain open. It was also reported that at least one regional office in each State should be retained.

Whether this compromise is politically motivated is difficult to say at this time. Some observers feel that the ultimate decision is a victory for the opposition to the VA directive.

However, there seems to be a strong undercurrent of opposition to this particular line

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2535

country over the apathy and lassitude of college students. Public issues—even crises and conflicts—failed to move our students from their lethargy, and they were dubbed “the silent generation.”

Today, however, if we worry about our students it is not for their lack but for their occasional excess of zeal. It is, perhaps, a sign of the growing maturity of our collegians that where once spring was heralded by panty raids we now have the teach-in.

I welcome the institution of the teach-in. It offers, I think, an opportunity for free discussion and debate which is entirely in keeping with our best traditions. But I am disturbed by the prospect that these events may, if seized by the immature and the irresponsible, become mere demonstrations rather than genuine debates.

At Cornell University recently, for instance, Mr. Averell Harriman, our distinguished ambassador at large, was prevented from explaining this Nation's policy in Vietnam by an unruly and hostile mob.

Mr. Speaker, the search for truth can only be carried out in an atmosphere of open-mindedness and between men of good will. The purpose of any teach-in, as I see it, should be to produce clarity—not chaos; perspective—not propaganda.

In this connection, I submit two excellent editorials from the Pittsburgh Press of May 7 and May 13 for insertion in the Record Appendix:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, May 13, 1965]

THE LOADED TEACH-INS

Few Pittsburghers were surprised when it was announced that a teach-in would be held on Saturday at the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology to debate U.S. policy on Vietnam. Teach-ins are fashionable on American campuses these days and it was to be expected that the fad would spread here eventually.

It's not surprising, either, that the chief organizer of the so-called debate here is Dr. Robert G. Colodny, associate professor of history at Pitt who was affiliated with the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

A national Vietnam debate will be broadcast by telephone from Washington to the Student Union Lounge at Pitt and Porter Hall at Carnegie Tech. McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson, will defend the U.S. position and he will be opposed by George Kahin, professor of Asian studies at Cornell University.

More than 40 faculty members from 5 local colleges will speak at an 8 p.m. session at Pitt. Perhaps it's too much to hope that a reasonable number of these professors will take the “pro” side of the discussion of American foreign policy. Previous teach-ins throughout the country have been loaded in favor of opponents of Washington's policies.

Even when the Johnson administration's views have been defended, the audiences have tended to be hostile, preferring to ignore some of the frustrating dilemmas of international issues and favoring, instead, simple solutions to complex problems.

For example, at a Cornell lecture this week, W. Averell Harriman, U. S. Ambassador at Large, was interrupted repeatedly by unruly students when he tried to explain American policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. He was unable to conduct a question and answer period and was forced to leave. The boisterous students didn't want to hear the U.S. side of the story.

Properly conducted, the so-called teach-in at Pitt could be an aid to understanding of the U.S. Government's policies in the trouble-spots of the world. But the course of such demonstrations in other colleges and universities does not support such a hope; most of them have given rise to the idea that their organizers were more interested in propaganda than in fact.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, May 7, 1965]

BASED ON ERROR: CRITICS IGNORE VIET FACTS—INTELLECTUALS NEED THINK-INS

(By Bruce Blossat)

WASHINGTON.—America's intellectual community is under the heaviest fire it has felt in many years. It is worth inquiring why this is so.

The attacks, of course, represent a response to the sweeping criticisms many intellectuals (and a lot of others) have levied against U.S. policy in Vietnam. In rebuttal, some of these are now complaining that President Johnson and his supporters appear to want to muzzle them.

Even if the President would like to quiet his critics, he knows he cannot. And many who are assailing the intellectuals among them have no thought of that.

Their real complaint is that they are not being intellectual enough.

The charge is that their critical comment has far too often been founded on the quicksand of factual error, has been painfully imprecise, and has lacked the hard bite of well-thought-out judgments.

The critics' rejoinder has been to fault the President for not giving them the facts. But much vital information is a matter of open record.

WHOLESALE KILLING

Their high-pitched complaints against U.S. bombing of North Vietnam as dangerous, unnecessary, and above all inhumane, seem very close to being hypocritical.

Despite some protests to the contrary, they have not exhibited similar verbal compassion for the many thousands of South Vietnamese killed by the Vietcong since they began their murderous depredations back in 1957.

Nor have the North Vietnamese escaped Hanoi's brutality. Pursuing land reform, the Reds executed 50,000 civilians and jailed another 100,000.

Stripped of obscuring language, the case some intellectuals are making consists of categorical assertions—repeated with a kind of visceral stubbornness.

They say bombing is both bad and useless, that the great danger is escalation toward general war, that a proper neutrality can and should be achieved for Vietnam and all of southeast Asia, that America is overextended and has no business in Asia.

PROPAGANDA, NOT FACT

The role of bombing in any war deserves fair debate. In this instance, the complaining intellectuals have, somewhat arrogantly, made their own determination of its purpose and prejudged its effect.

In the nuclear age the prospect of escalation can never be dismissed lightly. But John P. Roche, a Brandeis University professor who is one of the intellectuals' own, is just one among many thoughtful men who can argue plausibly that escalation bringing Moscow and Peking into the war is an unlikely thing.

What can be levied against some intellectuals, then, is that they have not been living up to the best of their own breed.

They have been making propaganda, not reasoned argument rooted in fact.

They have made their case in a rash of teach-ins around the country. From their performance to date, their greater need would seem to be for a long round of read-ins and think-ins.

Financial Situation in the Nation's Capital

SPEECH  
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

(Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. O'KONSKI. The Nation's Capital is like the weather. We all generally talk about it but very few of us do anything about it. I am referring to the financial situation here in the District of Columbia. It is no different from that of any other growing city. The District of Columbia needs more schools. The people here need more policemen. They need more firemen. They need better streets and they need more of everything and anything that any modern growing city needs. Yet throughout the years the District of Columbia has been strapped financially because somehow or other the Congress of the United States has not provided enough money for them to do the job that needs to be done.

This year I decided to do something about it. So I have taken a deep personal interest in this matter and have made a very thorough study of the tax structure and the revenue structure here in the District of Columbia. I am today introducing a bill which I think will help to solve the financial problems of the Nation's Capital. I was amazed to learn, for instance, that the tax burden borne by the people within the Nation's Capital is not fair—I should really say it is small compared to the tax burden that we bear in other parts of the country. I might well say that this is sort of a taxpayers' heaven compared to the rest of the country.

I am glad to observe that the citizens of the District of Columbia realize this is true and are willing to assume a more fair share of the tax burden.

Let me use a few illustrations to show what I mean.

The tax on a package of cigarettes in the District of Columbia is only 2 cents a package. Across the line, in the State of Maryland, the tax on a similar package of cigarettes is 6 cents. How can we justify a 2-cent tax, a small tax, in the District of Columbia, which needs revenue, as compared to the tax in the State of Maryland of 6 cents?

Let us consider the matter of gasoline. The District of Columbia tax on a gallon of gasoline is 6 cents. Across the line in Maryland it is 7 cents. Across the line in Virginia it is 7 cents. How can we justify such a low tax in the District of Columbia, when there is a higher tax in areas surrounding the District? In my own State, incidentally, the tax is also 7 cents a gallon.

Let us consider the matter of beer. The tax on a barrel of beer, across the line in the State of Virginia, is either \$7 or \$7.50 a barrel. The tax on a similar

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

A2536

barrel of beer in the District of Columbia is only \$1.50.

Let us consider the matter of real estate taxes. I own a home here in the District of Columbia, for which I paid \$43,500, and it is only five blocks from the Capitol. The taxes on that piece of property are \$530. I also own a home in my hometown in Wisconsin for which the market value is \$26,000. I pay \$870 in property taxes on that home, or almost twice as much.

That gives an idea of the fact that the residents of the District of Columbia are not bearing their fair share of the burden of the tax load.

I have introduced today a bill to raise the real estate taxes by 40 cents per hundred; to raise the individual income taxes, which are "out of this world" compared to income taxes in many States and many localities; to increase the cigarette tax by 1 cent per pack; and to increase the beer tax to \$3.50 a barrel, which will still be \$4 less than in the State of Virginia.

If we pass this tax bill which I have introduced and give the city the \$50 million which is already authorized by law as a Federal payment, then for the first time in the 23 years I have been in Congress the District of Columbia finally will have enough revenue to do the job which needs to be done.

I hope that the Members of Congress will take a look at this bill and examine the tax structure and support my proposal.

### President Johnson's Policies in Vietnam Have the Support of the American Public

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made it clear to the world that we will not be defeated in Vietnam but that we are willing to enter into discussion with our enemies in southeast Asia if they will do so in good faith. He has shown that we are ready to defend the freedom of Vietnam and we will take whatever steps are necessary to do so.

In this determination, our President has the support and backing of the American people. An editorial in the Beaumont Journal, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, expresses this support. The editorial which was printed April 26, 1965, follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, Apr. 26, 1965]

#### IT'S UP TO THEM

Communist China's rejection of a British proposal to reconsider its refusal to allow Patrick Gordon Walker, former British foreign secretary, to visit Peiping for talks on Vietnam is not surprising. Red Chinese leaders had rather fight than talk, probably because they know they couldn't find words to justify their actions in southeast Asia.

But they waste a lot of words in refusing

entry to Walker, touring southeast Asia as a special envoy on the Vietnam problem for Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Here's what they say in Hsinhua, the official Chinese press agency, about Britain's attitude on Vietnam and Walker's proposed visit:

"It [the British attitude] inflates the arrogance of the U.S. aggressors." For that reason the agency explains, the request to allow Walker to visit Peiping "cannot be given consideration."

The refusal dashes the faint hope that if the Chinese were ready to consider President Johnson's offer of unconditional discussions, the presence of Walker would give them a good opportunity to pass the word to the waiting world.

What the Communist Chinese leaders fail to see, or refuse to consider, is the President's determination to hold our ground in South Vietnam. Yet, in a recent ringing speech that echoed around the world, the President made it clear to everyone that "we will not be defeated."

The fact is that the United States is prepared to pursue either of two courses: To step up the shooting in Vietnam or stop it completely. We will escalate the war if the Communists continue their aggression. We will stop the shooting if they show a willingness to talk peace in good faith and on sensible and acceptable terms.

The choice is theirs, not ours. It is up to them to decide whether to widen the war or narrow it; whether to fire the guns or silence them.

### The Dominican Revolt

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans want to commit our boys to fight on foreign lands. But in many cases this action is a necessity. When such necessities arise, every American wants his President to act decisively.

I am proud that President Johnson had not flinched, but has exerted powerful and positive leadership. This was never more true than when the President's mettle was tested in the Dominican Republic.

The necessity for American intervention was evident. The actions of President Johnson were truly those of a great statesman, and a great leader.

President Johnson made it clear about our purposes in sending marines into the Dominican Republic. America supports neither side in the Dominican dispute, only the side of freedom and democracy. We support self-determination without the subversive influence of international communism.

I am proud of the decisiveness which President Johnson displayed and I am sure his actions paved the way for progress and peace in that small but important nation.

At this time, with permission, I include in the RECORD, two editorials which comment on America's actions in the Dominican crisis. They are the April 29 editorial from the Chicago American, and the May 6 editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Apr. 29, 1965]

#### THE DOMINICAN REVOLT

President Johnson displayed good sense and firmness in ordering a Navy task force and 400 Marines to the Dominican Republic to protect and evacuate Americans. Not only were more than 1,000 U.S. nationals rescued, but the presence of the fleet, including the carrier *Boxer*, undoubtedly helped to stabilize the confused Dominican situation.

In the past, a similar demonstration by American ships helped to quell another Dominican revolt, that time against the junta which had ousted Dictator Rafael Trujillo. Whatever may be the criticism of our foreign policy elsewhere in the world, it seems we do know how to deal with the Dominican situations.

The present uprising demonstrates that the Dominican Republic has not quite come of age politically. But there are signs that this land, the cradle of Spanish civilization in the New World, may yet attain the stability that Venezuela, for example, has been demonstrating in recent years. Caracas, too, has had some recent violence, but on the whole, there has been a continuum of government that in Latin America amounts to stability.

The latest assault on the Dominican Government seems to have occurred because the army commanders were dissatisfied with the economy edicts of the junta leader, Donald Reid-Cabral, who represents the ruling families of the island. They were opposed by the air force commander, Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. General Wessin led the coup that ousted Dr. Juan Bosch September 25, 1963, making way for President Reid. The navy also supported the government.

President Bosch had been accused of communism, although his closest friends are such staunch anti-Communists as ex-Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico, and ex-President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. In the present uprising, in any event, three Communist parties in the Dominican Republic joined the army leaders in favoring the recall of Dr. Bosch.

Under the circumstances, the United States was forced to favor pro tempore President Reid, who was persona non grata with the United States immediately after the ouster of Dr. Bosch. Reid has been proving since that he wants to restore the economy of the Dominican Republic, and that he ultimately favors popular elections.

Also, he definitely will not let Fidel Castro's Communists get a foothold in the Republic. Reid at the moment is not in the new junta but he doubtless will be shortly.

The Communists, for their part, couldn't care less who was causing the upheaval. They supported Dr. Bosch as they support anyone who will destroy the existing order to make way for instability and ultimate communism. The prompt American action, and the support of the Government by the Dominican Air Force and Navy, may have given the ruling junta another chance to work for progress and peace.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, May 6, 1965]

#### A VICTORY FOR AMERICA

This has been a week of soul searing in America.

Columnists, commentators, editors, and barroom experts (the latter sometimes more realistic than their more learned brethren) have been examining and weighing Lyndon Johnson's blunt and brave words of last Sunday evening. They have been trying to determine whether this reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine in terms of the 20th century has enhanced or degraded the quality of America's leadership among the decent nations of the earth.

Naturally the conclusions vary as widely as the prejudices of those who draw them.

STAT

May 20, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2537

Some writers and speakers of a generally liberal persuasion are shocked and apprehensive.

They see the President's stand as a revival of dollar diplomacy and colonialism. They fear it will alienate the smaller nations. They sense a return of McCarthyism. They are convinced that Communist hands played no important part in the Dominican rebellion, but that, rather, this was a classical case of the downtrodden rising up against their oppressors.

Those who support the President, and happily (in our view) they are in a majority, see the Dominican affairs as a continuation of the Communist attempt to take over the unstable nations of Latin America.

These Americans hold that the evidence of Communist plotting in the island—not only the evidence supplied by Government sources, but also that which has come from experienced reporters—is overwhelming. They are convinced that if the United States had not taken a stand, promptly and vigorously, the Dominican Republic soon would have gone the way of Cuba, and the Communist takeover of tottering regimes in the Caribbean and Central and South America would have taken a tremendous stride forward.

This newspaper has no more knowledge of the events that took place in the Dominican Republic than our readers have had access to.

We could not prove that Juan Bosch or any of the other revolutionary leaders were Communist stooges.

But over the years we have seen an almost uninterrupted succession of Communist victories in diplomatic and military affairs.

We have seen the Baltic States and Middle Europe taken over by the Soviets.

We have seen China seized by "agrarian reformers" who turned out to be violent Communists.

We have seen Cuba occupied by the Communists.

We have seen Communist spies infiltrate the State Department in Washington, we have seen them steal out atomic secrets and deliver them to Moscow.

And through these American defeats, and many more, we have heard from our homebred ultraliberals the endless refrain: Old Joe is a good fellow; Mao is just a reformer; Castro is a man of the people; Alger Hiss was a tragic victim of McCarthyism. And so on and on, ad infinitum.

Now in the Dominican Republic, as well as Vietnam, is heard the same sobbing admonition: We Americans must back down. Revolution, whether Communist or otherwise, must be given a free hand to burn and murder and seize the reins of power.

Quietly but very firmly, Lyndon Johnson said America would not permit such suicidal nonsense.

Instead of calling a committee meeting and consulting interminably with the emerging and the uncommitted, he sent the Marines.

If he stands firm, if he continues resolutely to protect America's interests as he said on Sunday night he would do, we think the Dominican rebellion is already over, and has ended in victory for America.

And for that we say Hallelujah!

Some American liberals will quiver and quaver. Propagandists in the United Nations will thunder and threaten.

But responsible people the world over admire to see a powerful man take a strong position in defense of his own just interests. And as we see it, that is precisely the position Lyndon Johnson has taken on behalf of this Republic.

## A Tired American Gets Angry

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a vivid, expressive writer, Minnesota's own Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald, Luverne, Minn., takes a backseat to none. We are pleased to include in today's RECORD one of Mr. McIntosh's latest editorials which, obviously, speaks for many of us in our country today:

## A TIRED AMERICAN GETS ANGRY

I am a tired American.

I'm tired of being called the ugly American. I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American—weary of being lectured by General DeGaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

I am a tired American—weary of Nasser and all the other blood sucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the cash flow falters.

I am a tired American—choked up to here on this business of trying to intimidate our Government by placard, picket line, and sit in by the hordes of the dirty unwashed who rush to man the barricades against the forces of law, order, and decency.

I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the "new wave" of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American—nauseated by the lazy-do-nothings who wouldn't take a job if you drove them to and from work in a Rolls Royce.

I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than Government relief checks for three generations.

I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched America in an obscenity race—who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture—in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage, and the mobs who see Lenny Bruce as brightly amusing and Norman Mailer as compelling.

I'm tired of these artists who scavenge in the cesspools for inspiration and who refuse to look up at the stars.

I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines—and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro

but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

I am a tired American—who is angered by the self-righteous breastbeater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

I am a tired American—who resents the pimply faced beatniks who try to represent Americans as the "bad guys on the black horses."

I am a tired American who is weary of some Negro leaders who, for shock purposes, scream four-letter words in church meetings.

I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bed sheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes yet send their own children to private schools.

I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed.

They say they hate capitalism but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American who get more than a little bit weary of the claue in our State Department who choose to regard a policy of timidity as prudent—the same group who subscribe to a "no win" policy in Vietnam.

I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the "have nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the "Star Spangled Banner" and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flag pole.

I am a tired American—who wants to start snapping at those phoney "high priests" who want us to bow down and worship their false idols and who seek to destroy the belief that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation, under God, with truly mercy and justice for all.

## Amazing Boy, Amazing Race

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansans are proud of the outstanding achievement recorded on Saturday, May 15, 1965, by Mr. Jim Ryun, a senior at Wichita East High School. Jim became the

A2538

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

first high school track athlete in the Nation to crack the 4-minute mark in the mile run in strictly high school competition. He established a national high school record of 3 minutes 58.3 seconds in the mile run during the 1965 Kansas State High School Track Meet held at Wichita State University.

We place great emphasis today upon physical fitness for all Americans. Jim Ryun's accomplishments in track exemplify the results of personal sacrifice, training, and good coaching. His achievements are a source of pride and honor for his school, the city of Wichita, Kans., and our Nation.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita Eagle:

## AMAZING BOY, AMAZING RACE

Wichita's Jim Ryun is an amazing boy, who ran an amazing race here Saturday, breaking all high school records for the mile with his time, 3 minutes, 58.3 seconds.

Ryun, with his usual modesty, turned the spotlight right back on his teammates and coaches, praising them for their part in helping him set the record.

It does take teamwork to accomplish great things, and it takes nothing away from Ryun's feat to agree with him that he owes much to others. It took great coaching to help him get where he is. Former Wichitan Bob Timmons, who as east high coach was the first to notice Ryun's ability, particularly deserves credit for his patient and intelligent coaching of this great young runner. It's good that KU has won Timmons back as head track coach, and that Ryun will be running for KU next year. The whole State is proud of this boy, and happy that he will continue to run under Kansas colors.

Despite the help, however, Ryun of course owes most to himself. Others could coach and inspire, but nobody could give him the great courage and tenacity to keep working hour after grinding hour to turn himself from a good runner to the best. Nobody else could make him continue simultaneously to work hard to do well in his studies, either. Nor could anyone but himself make him continue to be modest and high-principled in the heady atmosphere of fame.

Kansas is accustomed to turning out great runners. But as the famed Glenn Cunningham said last year, Ryun is potentially the greatest of them all.

We're very proud of him.

### The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the race for supremacy of the world has boiled down to the race for supremacy over men's minds.

This is reflected in the classrooms of nations all over the world, and particularly in the classrooms of the Soviet Union. Mr. William Benton's article, "A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," reflects this thinking on the part of the Soviets as

well as anything which I have read on the subject.

The use of television by the masters of Russia gives a good idea of their manner of thinking in the area of education. Mr. Benton explains this in chapter VI of his article.

Chapter VI follows:

#### CHAPTER VI: THE T IN SOVIET TV MEANS TEACH

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.)

#### CHAPTER VI. THE T IN SOVIET TV MEANS TEACH

To Moscow's television chiefs, Minister Yelutin, as chief of higher education, is a close, welcome, and respected collaborator. That is because in the Soviet view the prime purpose of television is not to entertain but to enlighten. This, of course, means primarily Communist propaganda. But it also means culture and education. And Minister Yelutin stands for higher education.

Responsibility for all broadcasting in the U.S.S.R. is placed on the State Committee for Radio and Television. This functions as a ministry. At the time of my visit the chairman of that committee was Mikhail Kharlamov, a handsome and self-assured younger man who had served as Chairman Khrushchev's press officer at the Vienna summit conference, when Khrushchev talked with President John F. Kennedy.

Kharlamov was removed from his chairmanship when Khrushchev was ousted in October 1964. Alexei Adzhubei Khrushchev's son-in-law, was removed as editor of Izvestia at the same time. One may assume perhaps that both were removed partly because they were personally so close to Khrushchev, but partly because the Communist Party and the Soviet Government have always been so acutely sensitive about the control of communications. The new Government wanted its own men in the key posts.

However, the views Kharlamov expressed to me seem so thoroughly representative of the Soviet social process, and so likely to carry over into any new TV regime—and thus to remain valid—that I shall not hesitate to quote them here as representative of Soviet policy and goals.

Kharlamov was wholly confident about the forthcoming rapid development of Soviet educational television. He was almost exuberant about it, and his enthusiasm was contagious. He was convinced that most people underestimate the potential of television for education, and I agree.

"The U.S.S.R.'s forthcoming development of educational TV is the most important venture in the history of television," he declared with absolute assurance.

A joint council for educational television, with representatives from the broadcasting ministry and from the major fields of education, is being established. The council will work with a group called the Television Authority in developing and directing educational programs. Many top educators are to be inducted as consultants. Kharlamov seemed regretful that "the educators don't want to take the authority and the responsibility; it's easier for them to sit around and criticize!" He thus proposed to draft them. He proposed to use them to help him learn better how to use TV to speed up the learning process. Why should students, he asked, spend 10 years in the schools when much less time is needed? TV is part of the answer to the speeding up of education.

"Students now get so much redundant knowledge in the classroom," Kharlamov said. "Why study the history of mankind

from Adam and Eve to the present? I don't object to students knowing history, but can't they learn it outside of school? Further, why shouldn't we introduce all kinds of teaching machines (e.g., programmed learning) to help them instruct themselves? These new teaching methods will free a great deal of time for students. The teaching machines make it much easier for the students to cover all of mathematics through algebra, geometry, and calculus. Of course, some of these new techniques are experimental. We shall have to await the results of the experimentation. But we want to use not only TV but all modern techniques."

Charles Benton, Milan Herzog, and Ralph Buchsbaum, who followed up, my Moscow visit in September, spoke with another key figure in Soviet television, Vyacheslav Chernishov, minister of television for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. He described to them—as Kharlamov had described to me—the plan for increasing Moscow's present two TV channels to five or six. But whereas I was told that one of the new channels was to be reserved exclusively for educational TV, they were advised that present planning called for the programing of educational material on all channels "interchangeably, so that there will be 24-hour educational television." I suspect both things are planned.

Said Minister Chernishov: "The aim of Soviet television is not to entertain but to elevate." At the present time the TV schedule is so laid out that the very early hours of the morning are devoted to preschool children's programs, with puppets, cartoons, fairy tales, etc. Then come the elementary school programs, and these usually consist of films, with actors, addressed to the 7-to-9-year-old audience. These programs are designed to sharpen the child's ability for observation and perception. They are planned not for the classroom but for the home, and the hours are so set that the children will be at home and able to see them. The current philosophy in television programing for youngsters professes that children get enough curriculum activity in school, and therefore can afford to see at home a broadening rather than a teaching program. A program later in the day called "Outside the School Books"—aimed at the equivalent of our junior and senior high school students—consists of features designed to broaden knowledge. There are contests in geometry, chemistry, physics, etc. The programs have a game spirit—but with the purpose of enlightenment.

Many programs are aimed at the 30- to 40-year age group, especially persons who have not finished high school and are trying to complete their education with the help of television and correspondence courses. Special programs are also offered for professionals in various lines of national life; a program period may be directed on one day to the medical profession, the next to biologists, the next to pharmacologists, and so on.

Asked about pure entertainment, Minister Chernishov said, "We have one program called 'The Blue Light.' It is a Saturday evening spectacular and lasts several hours. These Blue Light programs have become so popular that people in the villages dress up on Saturday evening as if they were going out and go to the community television rooms to watch the programs." He made "The Blue Light" sound like an amateur hour version of the "Ed Sullivan Show."

Our Britannica Films people felt that the Moscow programmers are slightly chagrined at the fact that Leningrad has moved ahead of them on educational programing; a new third channel in Leningrad, devoted entirely to education, opened in the autumn of 1964. This channel is integrated entirely with the curriculums of the higher educational institutions. It went on the air for the first time with courses in higher mathematics,