

set up by President Truman in the 1940's and reiterated over and over by both him and the Congress of the United States and by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy—that whenever a country being attacked by a Communist aggressor nation seeks our help, we will give it, militarily or otherwise.

There was nothing in the advertisement to bring out that we have reached the days for a final issue in this world; either freedom is to survive and exist where it wishes to, or communism is to control wherever it wishes to.

The ministers who signed the original advertisement are the same type who furthered the Nazi cause by encouragement for the organization and flourishing of Nazi fronts in this country in the 1930's. In some instances they are the same identical men—youngsters with no real intelligence then and apparently having gained little in the years that have passed.

They are the same type that, in the years immediately following World War II, again furthered the Communist cause; and in some instances they are the same men. In all of these activities they were ably assisted from college faculty ranks; more so now than in the past.

Some of them are the same men, who, mingling with college professors, took part in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which was a Castro Communist propaganda agency in this country and which became the haven of Lee Harvey Oswald, accused assassin of President Kennedy.

Around the country one finds the same college professors—or the same type—that were in the past engaged in furthering pacifist or similar leftist-liberal organizations now seeking to break down American opposition to its only real enemy in the world—communism.

In the lists of members of the clergy, members of college faculties, members of so-called intellectual and educated groups denouncing President Johnson for his South Vietnam course also are found many who lead in defiance of law in a manner to bring bloody violence and horrible murder as a result of civil rights demonstrations. And in their own advocacy of defiance of law, and sometimes defiance on their own, who can question that they encourage—perhaps without any intent at all—the widespread violence and lawbreaking and even terror that spreads over the Nation today from teenage groups on the beaches through college campuses and into the streets of the cities? Those who proclaim “In the name of God get us out of Vietnam”—through surrender or the equivalent if need be—would do better to say:

“So long as we have a President who will fight against communism and not back down, in Vietnam or anywhere else, in the name of God support him.”

SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the President of the United States for his swift and forceful action in the Dominican Republic crisis. Only this bold move prevented yet another nation from falling into the grasp of communism, with the consequence that the United States would have been faced with another Cuba.

The fast-moving events of the past few days saw a revolt begin in that strife-

torn nation which had as its avowed purpose a democratic government. This revolt was quickly taken over by Communist conspirators and drastic action was necessary to prevent another Castro-type government in this hemisphere.

Many of these Communist conspirators, who took control of the revolt, had been trained in these very methods in Cuba. It is the type of situation which concerns us greatly, and one which I spoke to the House about nearly 2 years ago, when I pointed to the growing menace of Communists trained in Cuba who seek to infest every land in South America.

As President Johnson expressed so ably to the Nation, we cannot and will not allow another Castro-type government to further infest this hemisphere. Every beachhead they establish means that they will redouble their efforts to establish others, spreading violence and discord in their wake—destroying every vestige of freedom when they are in control.

I support the swift and dramatic action of the President in sending American forces to protect American lives, and then when it became obvious that a Communist takeover was possible, taking forceful action to prevent such eventuality.

This action on the part of the President is part of the new policy of these United States as we seek to halt aggression and the spread of communism through violence, subversion, and deceit. The Communist aggressors understand only force and this Nation must not waver in its determination to halt the spread of this dictatorial plague which seeks to engulf all mankind. This course of action we have embarked upon is a dangerous one, we know, but one which all those who love freedom must be willing to assume.

I support the President in this firm action.

We seek not to dominate our neighbors, but by the same token, we cannot and must not allow them to fall victims to trained conspirators who seek to place another land under the Communist doctrine, which stifles freedom in all its forms.

I feel that such determined and forceful action on the part of these United States make it crystal clear our determination to preserve freedom, and is the only course of action open to us if we are to ultimately preserve our own democracy.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE VOTING AGE

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which proposes a constitutional amendment granting American citizens who have attained the age 18 the right to vote.

For many years now, such action has been proposed, discussed, put aside, pro-

posed again, discussed again, and put aside again. I think we ought to understand fully the present factors which make it proper and necessary for citizens of 18 to be entitled to vote.

In the past several years, this country has witnessed a significant growth in the maturity of our younger citizens. Many of these young Americans are actively involved furthering the goals of the Great Society: in civil rights, in the war on poverty, in the Peace Corps, and in the armed services. In the Peace Corps and the VISTA program of the war on poverty, such young citizens are largely responsible for unprecedented successes.

Young men under 21 are spread all over the world as members of our Armed Forces, ready to give their lives to further what we believe to be the rights of all freemen, regardless of nationality. At this very moment, many such young men are dying in southeast Asia.

During this past campaign, an unprecedented number of young citizens offered, without reward, their time and energy to political campaigns all over the country. All of us in this Chamber, I think, realize the extent and, indeed, the importance of this commitment.

Almost every day, I receive intelligent, informed, and well-reasoned letters from young constituents of mine, expressing a wide range of political views. I am constantly impressed by the authority and sophistication of such letters. I also encounter this intelligence and interest when I return to my district to meet with and talk to my constituents in person.

The conclusion seems to me inescapable. Young men and women are already taking part in the American political process, offering their resources and, in many cases, their lives for democratic ideals we all seek to promote. That they should be doing this without the most basic of all political rights—the right to vote—seems to me a serious inconsistency. We are asking our young soldiers to die for our democracy; yet we deny them an electoral voice in the operation of that democracy. We are reaping the benefit of the efforts of young Americans in the war against poverty, and the Peace Corps; yet we refuse them basic participation in the system they seek to support and improve. Many of us, regardless of party, find such young people of enormous help in our campaigns, or in summer jobs in our offices. Yet all these young Americans, and all their contemporaries are denied the right to vote.

I strongly urge the adoption of a constitutional amendment to grant the right to citizens above the age of 18.

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE CONDUCT OF OUR INTERNATIONAL BEHAVIOR

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, over the years many of us have been con-

Pledges U.S. Prevention Of Second Communist Regime in Hemisphere

Announces That 4500 More Troops Bound for Island

By Laurence Stern
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Johnson declared last night that "Communist conspirators" had seized control of the Dominican rebellion and said that the United States would not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

At the same time he announced in a late-evening television address to the Nation that he was dispatching an additional 4500 troops to the troubled Caribbean republic. This brings to 14,000 the U.S. troop presence on Dominican soil.

The President's statement went further than any previous official declaration in labeling the Dominican rebellion as Communist-controlled.

'Tragic Turn'

While the revolution was originally committed to "democracy and social justice," he said, it took "a tragic turn" and "moved into the hands of Communist conspirators." He said many of the Communists were trained in Cuba.

Mr. Johnson made a dramatic, personal appeal to rebel forces to lay down their arms and assured them that "the road is open to build a new Dominican democracy."

He assured the Dominican people, and in a larger sense all of Latin America, that the United States is not backing "any one man, or group of men" in the current crisis.

Before making his telecast the President met privately with a bipartisan group of Congressional leaders to review developments in the Dominican crisis. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara took part in the briefing for legislative leaders.

Cable From Envoy

In his impromptu television address, his third this week, the President gave a day-by-day review of Dominican developments that led to the U.S. intervention.

He said the decision to send in troops was prompted by a cable from Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett in Santo Domingo reporting that Dominican officials could no longer guarantee the safety of American nationals.

"Ambassador Bennett went on to say that only the immediate landing of American forces could safeguard and protect the lives of thousands of Americans and the citizens of 30 other countries."

Works for Cease-fire

On receiving the cable, Mr. Johnson said, "I thought we could not and we did not hesitate . . ." American forces were immediately ordered in.

After reviewing the history of events that led to the decision to dispatch the troops last Wednesday, Mr. Johnson said:

"They have attacked no one, and although some of our servicemen have lost their lives, not a single civilian as a re-

See POLICY, A12, Col. 1

POLICY—
From AI

LBJ Says Reds Control Revolt

sult of this protection has lost their lives."

From the very beginning, he repeated, the United States has worked for a cease-fire.

The request was before the Organization of American States on Wednesday when he made his announcement, Mr. Johnson said.

But when the entire U.S. team in the Dominican Republic said unanimously that if he didn't send forces immediately "men and women . . . will die in the streets, I knew it was no time to talk or delay," Mr. Johnson said.

"It's not a light decision or matter to send our boys to another country," he said. But one shouldn't "vacillate or hesitate" when lives are in peril.

He added:

"I don't think the American people expect their President to hesitate—or vacillate—in the face of danger just because the decision is hard."

Mr. Johnson said the revolutionary movement took a tragic turn when he Communist leaders seized a chance to create disorder and get a foothold and took increasing control of the revolution.

Requests Ignored

Many of the leaders of the original revolution took refuge in foreign embassies, he said, "because they had been superceded by evil forces."

Because of this, Mr. Johnson said, all requests for a cease-fire were ignored.

The OAS then "responded wisely and decisively." A five-man team was sent to the Dominican Republic "to restore normal conditions and restore the Democratic process. This is the situation now."

Mr. Johnson said "I plead, therefore, with every person and every country in this Hemisphere" to contact their ambassadors in the Dominican Republic and get a firsthand report of the "violence and terror and international conspiracy" which had gripped the country.

Explaining the sending of the additional troops, the President cited as reasons the need for distribution of food, medicine and the health requirement to avoid an epidemic because there are "hundreds in the streets who have been dead for days."

He added that U.S. troops already had evacuated 3000 persons.

Besides Rusk and McNamara other high Federal officials who have been closely involved in the Dominican operation joined the evening conference. They included Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance; Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States; Central Intelligence Director William F. Raborn; Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann; U.S. Information director Carl Rowan, and McGeorge Bundy, Special presidential assistant for Foreign Affairs.

House Speaker John W. McCormack led a delegation of ranking House Democrats to the White House. The Repub-

lican House leadership was represented by Party Leader Gerald R. Ford and Assistant Leader Leslie C. Arends, and Mrs. Frances Bolton, ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Democratic Senate Leader Mike Mansfield and Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were present.

Ranking Republicans included Sen. Thomas Kuchel of California, Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Bourke B. Mickenlooper of Iowa and George Aiken of Vermont.

Envoys Sent

Even as the President spoke, two top American diplomats were busy in Latin America explaining what the United

States was doing in the Dominican civil war.

Roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman flew to Bogota, Columbia, to talk with President Guillermo Leon Valencia in what he later called "long and useful" and "most cordial" talks. He said he had come at President Johnson's orders. Harriman later flew on to Lima, Peru. From there he goes to Rio de Janeiro.

Teodoro Moscoso, former coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, was sent to Mexico and Venezuela.

In Washington, the OAS announced that the general committee of the organ of consultation will meet at 11 a.m. today to give further consideration to the Dominican problem.

"But more than 5000 people—1500 of whom are Americans—are tonight awaiting evacuation . . . We just must get on with that job immediately," he said.

'Motives Misused'

Mr. Johnson said "we know many who are now in revolt do not seek a Communist tyranny. We think it is tragic their high motives have been misused by a small band of conspirators who receive their direction from abroad."

The President said for those who fight only for justice, he wanted to join the OAS in an appeal to "lay down your arms."

"The road is open for you to share in building a Dominican democracy, and we in America are anxious and willing to help you," Mr. Johnson said.

"You are needed to help shape that future," he said, "and no nation should ever take it upon itself to interfere with the affairs of your country or any other country."

Earlier Mr. Johnson met with 15 congressional leaders of both parties and, according to Press Secretary George E. Reedy, "recapitulated the events of the week and discussed the latest developments with them as well as the goals and objectives of this country's activity in the Dominican Republic."

DOMINICAN SITUATION

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our country faces a grave challenge in the Domin-

DR

May 3, 1965

8809

ican Republic—a challenge to safeguard the lives of our fellow citizens and other foreign nationals in the tragic breakdown of law and order in that country; a challenge also to assure—in cooperation with the other American Republics—that the Dominican people are free to work out their own destiny and are not enslaved by international communism which is busily at work trying to control the course of the uprising.

Our President made this abundantly clear last night; we all owe his strong leadership our support in this national crisis. We do not want in any way to interfere with the Dominican people's destiny, and we wish them well in their search for a stable and democratic government. We do want to protect American lives and the lives of other foreigners. We have evacuated over 3,000 and there are thousands more to come. We want to be sure that international communism does not seize and stifle the legitimate desires of the Dominicans for freedom and progress. We know that there are scores of foreign trained Communist agitators at work. We hope that Dominicans of all factions will repudiate them and work peacefully for their country. That is our aim. That is the aim of all the American Republics.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to subscribe to the statement just made by the majority leader. I think this Nation and the free world owe a debt of gratitude to President Johnson for acting with dispatch. The word came last week about the utter chaos then prevailing in the Dominican Republic. President Johnson moved expeditiously, and I think we can say today that there are several thousand Americans alive who may not have been alive had he and our Armed Forces not acted. It is the hope of everybody in this country that a repetition of what happened in Cuba has been prevented by the dispatch with which the President acted.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his comments, and I now yield to the distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to what the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, has said. All of us in the Congress forget partisanship in these all-important matters and we wholeheartedly support the President of the United States in the firm position that he has taken and which he continues to take not only in the situation in Vietnam but in the speedy and direct action he took last week relative to the Dominican Republic. I trust the President will understand and know that we, too, are as interested in the national welfare as he is and we wholeheartedly support him in his endeavors and purposes in these two trouble spots in our world. I feel that I can say for our minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB], and other Members of this side of the political aisle, that we applaud the President for his firm stands already taken.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois whose cooperation and support of American foreign policy as against any partisan foreign policy has been evident throughout this entire crisis. Of course, that has also been true of the distinguished Republican leader of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB], and of the overwhelming majority of Members on both sides of the aisle. The action of the minority leadership in connection with this matter has manifested constructive statesmanship of the highest order.

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in seeking to restore order in the Dominican Republic is commendable. This forthright approach to the threat to democracy in Latin America will, in my judgment, prove to be one of the most fruitful decisions by our Government in this generation in international relations.

We have seen the tragedy of the establishment of a Communist beachhead in Cuba. The same Communist conspiracy was at work in the Dominican Republic. The situation demanded immediate action if our Nation was to meet its obligation to repel further Communist expansion in our hemisphere.

All thoughtful Americans deplore the necessity for the action that our Government has so wisely taken. We all regret the necessary exposure of our military personnel to the snipers' bullets. As much as we regret the necessity for these happenings, we can take pride in the fact that our military people under the direction of firm civilian leadership were ready, willing, and able to fulfill their assigned role in this crisis.

There will be those in the United States who disagree with the action taken by our Government. Some of them will be sincere in their disagreement as is true in virtually every situation where such positive action is necessarily carried out. There will be many in the United States who will disagree with this policy because of their disapproval of our overall philosophy of democratic government. This latter group will make themselves heard in the usual disorderly fashion. We must be able to identify the actions and the sources of this latter element and warn our people of the rationale of the insincere adversaries of our American system.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the President will have the support of the American people in this great undertaking for humanity. If all of us support him in his aggressive leadership in meeting the problems confronting free people in the Dominican Republic, I am sure that the cause of mankind will have been well served.

In this time of travail, let us all pray that the right solution to the grave problems of the Dominican people will be forthcoming without further bloodshed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from speaking engagements in Charleston, S.C., Fort Pulaski in Savan-

nah, Ga., and from a visit—with my distinguished friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the House Armed Services Committee—to the Marine base at Parris Island.

I want to report to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that the people approve of the prompt and decisive action of the President in Santo Domingo. Our people are holding up their heads and are proud to be Americans. They are backing the President in his efforts to forestall Communist aggression in the form of infiltration, sabotage, and violence.

Santo Domingo is of worldwide strategic importance, it controls the windward passages—these great sealanes which are so vital to the Western World. We cannot afford and we cannot tolerate another Castro Cuba. Make no mistake about it, Castro's agents are in Santo Domingo and all of the Republics of South and Central America. These Red agents of aggression are exploiting any situation to seize power and establish a base of aggression. Violence and bloodshed in Santo Domingo is a cold calculated move by the Castro Communist to capture another strategic base in the Western Hemisphere. The President acted in the nick of time. He acted in the interest of freedom and the security of the West. The President's swift and determined reaction to this grave threat further serves notice to the Kremlin, to Hanoi, and to Peking, that the United States will stand firm for freedom throughout this world.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a House concurrent resolution today commending the President for his timely and forthright action.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on line 6 from the bottom in the second column on page 8551 of the RECORD for April 29, 1965, I am reported to have said that the second supplemental bill then under consideration contained \$227 billion in supplemental appropriations. What I said was that the bill contained \$2.227 billion in supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

BENEFITS FOR DISABILITY IN LINE OF DUTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3413) to amend section 106 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that individuals who incur a disability in line of duty during certain service shall be entitled to certain veterans' benefits.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there was colloquy on this floor April 26, 1965, concerning this proposed legislation and it was at that time put over without prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman who requested this legislation, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], is on the floor today and is very much interested in this bill and would like to make a statement with reference thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be concerned because of the precedent established by this single legislative action concerning an individual, on the Veterans' Preference Act insofar as preference in future like cases, is concerned, despite the unfortunate circumstances involved in this particular case. He is getting veterans care—although he is not in fact a veteran—since he has never been inducted and he has received no type of discharge.

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

Mr. HALL. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to share his concern with reference to the protection of the Veterans' Preference Act. I do feel however that there are mitigating circumstances here that justify—as a matter of fact that require—special dispensation.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri that in the first place I would not consider this as a precedent. I would hope it would not be considered as such. I believe that as a matter of fact that equity and justice sometimes should be the prevailing and motivating reasons behind our actions and not be considered as precedent for general legislation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri and to the Members of the House that this would affect a constituent of mine, a distinguished gentleman who lives in my district, and a lifelong friend of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He is a former State senator of our State, served as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He moved to California where he lived for several years, during which time he served in the position of postmaster in California. He came back to our State and recently there was a vacancy in the position of postmaster in the city of Mena, Ark. I designated him as the acting postmaster.

During the war he was about to be inducted, and on his way in a Government vehicle with a number of other boys who were going to be inducted. Unfortunately, there was an accident that occurred to this vehicle. This party was permanently injured in that accident.

Under the veterans law he was awarded service-connected disability, and he has been drawing service-connected disability since. However, in view of the fact he had not served 90 days, or had actual service of 90 days,

though he was entitled to disability, and received it, he is prevented from receiving the veterans preference in the examination for this position.

It is a well-known fact that several other veterans who have taken the examination perhaps would have an advantage, and we think it is just an inequity under the present situation that could not be helped. It is just one of those things, and we seek to correct the inequity. I believe the inequity overrides the matter of it being considered as a precedent. For that reason we are trying to give him the same preference only, to do justice and equity under the circumstances, and I believe it is right.

Mr. HALL. I want to thank the gentleman, especially for delving into the matter of equity and justice being regarded as a precedent. There is not the slightest question but what this might be a place where a particular incident or a particularly deserving individual, even though actually inducted under one code, would receive veterans benefits. He has been receiving hospitalization when needed.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. HALL. And also he deservedly receives VA medical assistance. That might well be and is properly considered by this Government, but it does not have anything to do with the question of precedent in the case. I have never had the privilege of appointing a postmaster or recommending one. That does not bother me a bit as sometimes I think it is a blessing. But the fact remains we have two different rules and regulations, two different opinions. The Veterans' Administration has more or less washed its hands in this case, and defers to the Veterans' Preference Act as administered by the Civil Service Commission.

For the benefit of the record, the Commission says:

We believe that this should continue to be the primary criterion.

Namely, preference under that act being contingent upon separation from the armed services of the United States.

Continuing:

To accord preference for reasons other than that would be contrary to the intent of the Veterans' Preference Act and would weaken the original benefit granted by Congress.

And, parenthetically, these veterans benefits are a gratuity of a grateful nature. They are not a right under the law.

Continuing:

Moreover, this legislation is inequitable. It would have the effect of granting persons who never saw active duty in the Armed Forces an advantage over most of those who did. This is because persons coming under the purview of this legislation would be considered service-connected disabled ex-servicemen, and would thus be accorded five more points than nondisabled ex-servicemen on earned ratings—

Who had served—
and late-filing privileges for examinations.

Therefore the Commission does not favor enactment of this legislation, and it comes back to my fear of a precedent.

Then I would like to ask one other question. In addition to that, would it

not be better to allow this man to have just a 5-point preference, if we are going to "bridge the gap" rather than a full 10 points? Or would this upset the appointing mechanism?

Mr. HARRIS. It would make some difference because if, for example, there are three other disabled applicants who are receiving service-connected disability as this man is receiving service-connected disability, then they would go to the top of the list even though they made the lowest score.

Mr. HALL. But the fact of the matter is, if the chairman will bear with me just a little further on this reservation of objection, there are not three with service-connected disability—there are three who have taken the same examination and are on the civil service registry with non-service-connected disabilities. Therefore, they have 5 points of preference and this would automatically put the man over them when he is given 10 points of preference but no induction or military service. Is that true or is it not?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not know how many have taken the examination. It has already been called for but I do not believe it has actually been held. Just how many will show up to take the examination I do not know, but there will be several who will be taking the examination.

Mr. HALL. I was under the impression that the registry had already been established in this particular instance.

Mr. HARRIS. I do believe that the Civil Service Commission's position should be prevailing. They are talking about the general application, and I would agree that if there is going to be a general application from the best information we have, this just happens to be a particular situation. It would be a very rare thing if anyone else would come under this kind of situation.

Mr. HALL. But last week the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' affairs and this week the gentleman who is now in the well of the House admits that it might well be used as a precedent. Because of the fact that it does establish a precedent objected to by the Civil Service Commission and also provide for 10 points of preference instead of 5 points, even though it may be a most deserving case, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice once again.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF ROBERT V. FLEMING AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 324) to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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

May 3, 1965

8835

Both outside disciplines are strongly affected by the size of Government borrowings (the Federal debt). They also are affected by the amount of private borrowings against assets and future earning power, and the maintenance of money as a stable measure of the value of services, goods, and savings.

EFFECT REPLACES CAUSE

It is argued by some that easy credit and cheap money are necessary to promote maximum employment and economic growth. This is putting the effect in place of the cause. Maximum employment and economic growth will produce easy credit and cheap money but not vice versa. By trying to use the effect to produce the cause, we may damage both.

Maximum employment and economic growth are basically produced by intelligent spending. We must always be able to distinguish the real from the sham. The expenditure of the savings of people to create new wealth and to increase purchasing power is, of course, stimulated by consumer spending in the first place.

However, if here is insufficient incentive to save and then to invest at a risk, the cycle is broken. Here is where the interference of Government to produce artificially low rates of return for investment or to produce cheaper money defeats its objectives.

GOVERNMENT FAILURE

In recent years, the Federal Government has failed to use monetary and debt policy to preserve an interest rate necessary to channel the risking of savings into wise expenditure policies. Indeed, Government through its own expenditure policies has contributed to a further deterioration of good expenditure judgments.

The result is we have had a constant deterioration in our international balance of payments. This has led to a flow of gold outside our society. This, in turn, is a threat to the maintenance of the value of the dollar as a medium of exchange domestically and internationally. In other words, we have not preserved the value of the dollar.

Only by the exercise of self-discipline can we maintain correct monetary and fiscal policy. That discipline is to balance our Federal budget and our international payments over the life of the business cycle.

THE TWO FACES OF CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's Washington Post, entitled "The Two Faces of Civil Rights," indicates the militant and unreasonable attitude being taken by elements of the civil rights movement.

The article by Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak, which follows, points out that SCLC leadership in Demopolis, Ala., is seeking national publicity rather than their professed aim of better jobs for Negro citizens:

THE TWO FACES OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

DEMOPOLIS, ALA.—Although the newspaper headlines from here last week told of clashes between Negro demonstrators and tear-gassing police, the more important struggle in Demopolis was waged between moderates and radicals inside the civil rights movement.

In this Black Belt city of 8,500 (where whites outnumber Negroes by less than 50 persons) the two faces of civil rights glare at each other with increasing hostility, as elsewhere in the Deep South.

One face is conciliatory, seeking to reach an accommodation with the white power

structure. The other face is revolutionary, skeptical that "Mr. Charlie" (the white man) will concede anything.

This conflict has ironic overtones in Demopolis. Mayor Ed Bailey, a segregationist who realizes a new day has come to the South, has made more concessions than any other mayor in rural Alabama. Yet the civil rights radicals—not the moderates—control events here and have turned Demopolis into the South's current trouble spot.

Doubly ironic is the fact there is only one civil rights organization active here—the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). But the SCLC itself is split between radicals and moderates, its own fieldmen here traveling separate paths.

This was graphically illustrated at a civil rights mass meeting one recent Sunday in the Morning Star Baptist Church.

Directing the meeting was the Reverend Samuel Wells of Albany, Ga., a stout, worried-looking SCLC organizer. Under his supervision, young middle-class Demopolis Negroes, dressed in their Sunday best, softly revealed results of negotiations they and Wells had conducted with Mayor Bailey.

The results were impressive, indeed. SCLC has won more in Demopolis during 6 days than in Selma (45 miles to the west) during 6 weeks. Bailey had agreed to multiple demands by the Demopolis Civil Club (an SCLC-sponsored group organized by Mr. Wells) aimed mainly at better jobs for Negroes.

But as the Civil Club officers recounted their negotiations, a dozen young men and women (both white and Negro) seated on the church altar seethed in anger.

Dressed in disheveled work and sport clothes, these were the field workers of SCLC's militant youth branch. Supposedly, they got orders not from Mr. Wells in Demopolis, but from the Reverend James Bevel—most militant of Dr. King's lieutenants—by telephone from Selma.

Mr. Bevel's field commander in Demopolis, a northern Negro named Gerald Turley, moved to the pulpit. Dressed in sweaty T-shirt and blue jeans, Turley stirred the crowd for the first time with his gravel-voiced eloquence.

Though Mr. Wells and the Voters League wanted a halt to demonstrations, Turley shouted, "We're going to be on the streets. We're going to die in the street if need be."

Henry Wershaw, a young white SCLC worker from New York, was even more explosive. "If the white man won't let you have your freedom, you're going to have to take it," he yelled.

The upshot came the next morning. In negotiations at city hall Bailey agreed to much more than Selma's officials have gotten—city government supervisory positions for Negroes and guaranteed sales jobs in Demopolis stores. Nevertheless, Turley sent Demopolis teenagers (kept out of school against the wishes of the Civil Club) marching through the streets.

Bailey would have issued a parade permit, but Turley refused to ask for it. To maintain the principle of law and order, Bailey told police to stop the marchers. The result: Tear gas and national publicity.

Indeed, national publicity—not jobs in Demopolis stores—was what Turley was seeking. Believing that the white man is unworthy of trust, the civil rights movement's revolutionary wing believes in agitation, agitation, and still more agitation to bring out the worst in the white man. Such is the rationale of the Gerald Turleys.

But Gerald Turley will leave Demopolis sometime soon. When he does, the Demopolis Negroes will be left to reach permanent understanding with the white establishment. That's why many of them feel today that Turley's radical tactics, coming after—not before—the whites had been forced to the bar-

gaining table, have done more harm than good.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today on May 3 we commemorate the 174th anniversary of an event which in itself was joyous and momentous but short-lived. On May 3, 1791 the Polish Parliament decisively adopted a constitution which transformed Poland's limited autocracy into a constitutional democracy. Unfortunately, the enlightened government established by the Constitution of 1791 survived little more than 2 years, for not surprisingly, the government was not to the liking of autocratic tsarist Russia. Russian troops invaded Poland and finally succeeded in overthrowing the government. The Polish people struggled valiantly against the foreign oppressor, but their brave battle was in vain. In 1793 their country was partitioned between Russia and Prussia, and in 1795 Poland disappeared from the map of Europe until the end of World War I.

Because the Constitution of 1791 was so quickly and forcibly shelved and because Poland's history since then has been a tragic saga of foreign occupation interspersed only by a brief period of freedom between the First and Second World Wars, the significance of this document and of Poland's constitutional traditions are frequently overlooked. Poland was a great empire by the late 16th and early 17th centuries, with lands extending far in the east into what is today the Soviet Union and in the south to the Black Sea and the Carpathian Mountains. Even at this time, when most of Europe was under the iron rule of autocratic kings whose powers were unlimited, Poland, though far from a democracy, had already taken some initial steps toward constitutional government. From medieval times the respective roles of the church, the clergy, and the gentry had been carefully defined. The king ruled, not as unlimited autocrat but more accurately as cosharer of power with the gentry and high officials who sat in a bicameral parliament vested with legislative and executive powers equal to those of the king. By the middle of the 16th century the king had become an elective monarch, chosen for life by parliament and obliged to sign a written agreement enumerating his powers.

In a sense it is surprising that the democratic Constitution of 1791 was drafted when it was and not either sooner or later, for Poland's earlier progression toward constitutional government had been interrupted during the 18th century by the dynastic struggles of Austria, Prussia, and Russia over Polish territory. It may be recalled that in 1772 Poland was partitioned among these three dynasties and despoiled of one-fourth of her territory. The moment looked dark for constitutional reform which would be bound to antagonize Poland's stronger neighbors, but when a rift developed between Russia and Prussia after the death of Frederick the Great in 1786, Poland

May 3, 1965

seized its opportunity. In 1788 the Polish Diet, or parliament, was convened to revise the constitution, and by 1791 its work was finished.

The adoption of the new constitution by Parliament and its acceptance by the King, who took an oath to support and implement it, was a unique step forward in eastern Europe, a major advance in man's history of governing himself, and the beginning of what was expected to be a peaceful social revolution in Poland. Poland became a limited monarchy with a cabinet government responsible to Parliament. Parliamentary representation and certain other prerogatives of the nobility such as the privilege of office-holding, were extended to townsmen. The cities were given greater administrative and judicial autonomy, and the peasants were placed under the protection of the law, laying the basis for the abolition of serfdom.

The unique significance of the Polish Constitution of 1791 is not merely that democratic government replaced limited autocracy but rather than an event of such magnitude was accomplished with little or no bloodshed. In one sense it is not surprising that Poland should have chosen the 18th century for a monumental revision of its constitution, for the fever of liberalism was spreading through the Western world in the 18th century. It was the century of Montesquieu and Locke, of the U.S. Constitution, and the French declaration of the rights of man and of the citizen. The concept of popular sovereignty—that all authority emanates from the will of the people—was being expounded far and wide.

But, I repeat, the Polish experience is still unique. Whereas the Americans fought a war to gain independence and the French succumbed to a reign of terror in the name of democracy, the Polish people accomplished the momentous transition peacefully. Commenting upon the Polish Constitution, Baron d'Escare wrote:

In France to gain liberty, they began with anarchy; in Poland, the nation was given liberty and independence, the respect for the law, for person and property was assured, and all this without violence, without murder solely through the virtue of the courage of the nation, which, realizing her misfortune and her error, knew how to heal her wounds.

Because of the important place Poland's Constitution of 1791 holds in the history of constitutional democracy, the sequel of Poland's own history seems particularly tragic. To be swallowed up completely by three greedy neighbors and erased out of existence as an independent nation for over a century is a particularly bitter lot for a people as fiercely individualistic, courageous, and freedom-loving as the Poles. The history of the Polish people in our own country provides numerous examples of the traits which gave inspiration to the Constitution of 1791. Polish Generals Pulaski and Kosciuszko fought valiantly beside George Washington in the Revolutionary War. Polish Americans fearlessly helped to open up the American West, gradually pushing the American frontier ever farther across our country until the wilder-

ness was gone and the Pacific Ocean had been reached. In every community where there are Polish Americans their influence has been felt: in street names, in the cultural heritage of Polish songs and dances, in Polish-American contributions to civic office and community development.

The tragedy of Poland itself has not yet ended. After its brief interwar interlude of freedom, Poland was overrun first by the Nazis from Germany and then by Soviet troops from the East. Many Poles fought courageously and to their very death at the side of the Allies in World War II, but for them victory did not mean a renewal of freedom. As we only too well know, Poland was turned into a Communist satellite where the individual liberties fought for so long and hard were brutally repressed by a ruthless police state. Yet, even the repressive techniques of Communism have been unable to crush the ideal of freedom and democracy which still burns brightly in the hearts of the Polish people. The Poznan uprising in 1956 and lesser signs of uneasiness constantly recurring in Poland are proof positive that the Polish people are still willing to suffer severe hardships for the right to speak out against a government they abhor and to die for the cause of freedom.

On this important anniversary, Mr. Speaker, we commend from the bottom of our hearts the unswerving courage of the Polish people and encourage them in the hope that they may yet one day secure the ideals represented by the constitution of 1791.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I support the action of President Johnson in sending U.S. marines and paratroopers into the Dominican Republic 100 percent.

I commend him for the decisive and appropriate action he has taken the past several days to protect the lives of American citizens and other foreign nationals in that tragically strife-torn country.

It was only after the local Dominican police and military authorities informed our government that they could no longer guarantee the safety of foreign nationals that Mr. Johnson initiated action for their protection.

As the President has said repeatedly, our only motive has been humanitarian, not just for the territory of a small, sister republic. We crave not the land of others, but the continued freedom and security of the Inter-American systems. We seek not domination over the brave peoples of the Dominican Republic, but the certainty that they will have the right to determine their own destiny free from the chains of an alien system.

It has become increasingly clear over the past weekend that Communist agitators have seized control of the revolt in the country in an effort to drag yet another free people behind the Iron Curtain in the Western Hemisphere. We

are pledged to the prevention of another Communist dictatorship as exists on the island of Cuba, just 90 miles off the shores of my own State of Florida.

If, in addition to protection of the lives of foreigners in the Dominican Republic, the presence of American troops dramatizes our continuing commitment to the freedom and independence of our sister republics, we are equally justified in our course of action.

For the Communists, the world over, understand only determination, force and decisive action. They thrive upon lack of resolve, weakness, and vacillation.

I share the hope of our President that an effective multinational Organization of American States police force can be formed to replace the bulk of our troops on the island. By our willingness to cooperate with such a mission, we will further demonstrate to the whole world our lasting commitment to the Inter-American system and close cooperation among its members in preserving freedom in our hemisphere and defeating an alien system which seeks to destroy it.

DEATH TOLL ON THE HIGHWAYS

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have not only been interested, but very concerned over the terrible slaughter on the Nation's highways.

When the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety was first created in 1956, I became a member of that committee which immediately set to work to learn what it could about traffic safety and to do something about it.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have continued my interest in this field.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, which has taken over the responsibility for highway safety, among its multiple duties, it is my plan to exert every effort to reduce the terrible carnage on our highways.

The increasing concern of the Congress over the ever increasing death toll has been indicated by the enactment into law of legislation requiring seat belt standards, brake fluid standards and in the past Congress, safe car standards.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that we must continue to strive to make our highways safe. When one considers the financial burden, the loss of productivity and the hardship placed upon the families of victims of highway accidents which now cause the death of over 45,000 annually, as well as some four million injured, bearing in mind that many of those injured are totally and permanently disabled, it is time that we step up our pace in the traffic safety area.

At the time that the special subcommittee was established in 1956, we found that the public health service budgeted only \$150,000 for all accident prevention research. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, as a result of congressional interest, the budget of the Public Health

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8837

Service for this problem has been increased to over \$4 million. We still have a long way to go, however, when you compare the death and injury statistics to the statistics on fatalities as a result of heart disease, in which field over \$135 million is expended in research by the National Heart Institute and where over \$140 million is expended for cancer research by the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I well realize that in the last analysis, the man behind the wheel is the controlling factor. Should his vision be impaired, should he have had too much to drink or have other defects, accidents, many times fatal, will occur. However, we can and we must reduce this possibility to a minimum and I am hopeful that through driver education and through the various States taking the initiative to adopt the uniform code, we can reduce the number of incompetent drivers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also our responsibility to see that the purchasers of automobiles and accessories are provided with as safe a vehicle as possible to reduce the possibility of malfunctioning of equipment which is the cause of many of our accidents.

As I previously indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has taken the initiative to provide standards for seat belts, brake fluid, and safe cars. However, there is still a glaring omission in safety standards—tire standards.

I do not believe that today there is a Member of this House who, desiring to purchase new tires for his automobile, that transports his family, would know the type, size, or quality of the tires he would ultimately purchase.

Mr. Speaker, today we can purchase a second line tire from a manufacturer that will be labeled a first line tire under another brand label. We are advised of tire sizes by the manufacturers, yet when the General Services Administration purchased tires for the purpose of comparison, there were many variations in sizes and quality.

Mr. Speaker, we also see ads in the papers where one may purchase tires for as low as \$9. It is not false advertising, as the manufacturers indicate these tires are for city or slow speed driving. Unfortunately, the teenagers, who have a minimum to spend, purchase this type of tire and then use them on highways at excessive speeds causing the tires to blow and we, in many instances, have another statistic.

In line with the thinking of the Congress, as expressed in the passage of the bills previously mentioned, I am today introducing a bill to require safe standards for tires for motor vehicles. I believe such a bill is essential for the motoring public and I hope that the committee will move for early and expeditious action on the legislation.

I might go one step further, Mr. Speaker, and say that I had hoped that the manufacturers would take it upon themselves, for the safety of the public to provide set standards. However, after the New York State Legislature had considered legislation to establish standards, the manufacturers came out with a hodgepodge of specifications. This still

leaves the public in the dark. Therefore, I believe it to be imperative that the Congress take action now.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the bill which I am introducing at this point in the RECORD:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register minimum standards for tires for use on motor vehicles other than those of carriers subject to safety regulations under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. Such standards shall be designated to provide the public with safe tires so that motor vehicle accidents caused by tire failure can be kept to a minimum. Standards first established under this section shall be prescribed and published not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation, or causing to be transported, in interstate commerce, or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale, in interstate commerce, of any tire manufactures on or after the date of this section takes effect shall be unlawful unless such tire meets the standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce as set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) Whoever knowingly and willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "interstate commerce" includes commerce between one State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and another State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(2) The term "motor vehicle" means any other vehicle or machine propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used on the highways principally in the transportation of passengers.

Sec. 4. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that section 2 shall take effect on such date as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, but such date shall not be less than one hundred and eighty days nor more than one year after the date of publication of standards first established under the first section of this Act. If such standards first established are thereafter changed, such standards as so changed shall take effect on such date as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, but such date shall be not less than one hundred and eighty days nor more than one year after the date of their publication in accordance with the provisions of the first section of this Act.

JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

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

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to take part in ceremonies honoring the SeRoCo Junior Achievement Co. of Columbus, Ga. Junior Achievement, as we all know, is an organization sponsored and supported by business and industry in the United States and Canada. Its aim is to educate youngsters in the principles and facts of free enterprise, and further, to educate through action.

Each year boys and girls in Junior Achievement groups gather in hundreds of American cities to plan, form, and run their own businesses. This year, the award for the first place Junior Achievement Co. in America went to SeRoCo, the company founded and run by 27 Columbus, Ga., teenagers.

Their efforts in SeRoCo surely gave these young citizens a first-hand knowledge of our great American free enterprise system. Yet in addition, Mr. Speaker, they have learned not only how the free enterprise system works, but also why it works—the greatness of free men ruling a free economy.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech that ably demonstrates the value of this lesson. It is a speech prepared by a young junior achiever, David Reddick, president of the award-winning SeRoCo Co.

I am proud today to salute the Junior Achievement program, its sponsors, and its fine young members like David. They have joined forces to learn the workings of freedom; and this, as the name implies, is truly achievement.

SPEECH GIVEN BY DAVID REDDICK, PRESIDENT OF SeRoCo, No. 1 JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT CO. NATIONALLY, 1964-65

"Communism will rule the world." This was a theory echoed around the world by Mr. Lenin way back in 1918.

During the past 3 years, I have had the opportunity of being a member of Junior Achievement. The experience and knowledge I have gained during this time has taught me that Mr. Lenin's theory was nothing more than hot air. Communism will never rule the world.

I have been taught the true meaning of the free enterprise system and the profit motive. During this period of time I have been in companies that have been very successful and in some not quite so successful. I have experienced the sweetness of success and also the bitterness of failure. I have learned the risks that must be taken and also the rewards at the end of the rainbow.

I have grown in knowledge and experience and have learned of the organization and procedure of business. It has given me the basic qualification for entering the business world. Not only have I gained in experience, but I have been taught the importance of initiative, the ability to work with others, but most important, the need for making a profit. It is my confirmed opinion that a business is as good as the people who run it. No better, no worse.

The training and experience to be gained by active participation in Junior Achievement is a must for all young people. It has made available to me vital knowledge which cannot be obtained in high school or college. I would like to make it clear here that this is certainly no reflection on our school system—we have one of the best, but the high schools are just not prepared to teach business because the curriculum is already overloaded.

Junior Achievement provides all young people with the necessary tools to construct a foundation for most any type business. The training received prepares us for the future of tomorrow, and what does the future of tomorrow hold?

I might answer that by saying—How high is up? Allow me to quote one of the Nation's leading insurance companies, and I quote, "The future belongs to those who prepare for it." As a result of the training received in Junior Achievement, I am convinced that I am better qualified to compete in tomorrow's business world where job competition is becoming greater and greater.

May 3, 1965

We have taken as our responsibility the preservation of the free enterprise system. The free, private enterprise system has been, and will continue to be, the one outstanding reason for America's phenomenal economic growth and secure position as leader of the free world. The free enterprise system and its amazing productivity was the key to America's victory in World War II. It has survived the test of time in a way that no other system has.

This is not to say, however, that the survival of our American economic way of life is guaranteed. On the contrary, the security of free enterprise is maintained only through hard work and faith, faith and belief that ours is the best way, the only way to secure the good life for our people.

Free enterprise and America, for they are one and the same, is being challenged by many people with many ideas. Because of this, we must dedicate ourselves, in our own way, to the preservation of free enterprise. Without free enterprise America would no longer exist. Our business system is the key to our freedom, and if it were to vanish, then history would say of us, "They had a good system, but neglected to appreciate and preserve it."

It is by the investment of our business leaders that more young people are being taught about the greatest heritage the world has ever known—the American free enterprise system—a system upon which America was founded, built, and upon which it will build its future.

The question has often been asked among young people, "How can one get a job that takes experience, if he has no experience?"

Our business and industrial leaders have made this experience available to over 100,000 young people this past year. It has been stated that a person who has received training in the Junior Achievement program makes a better business person than one who has graduated from high school without experience and training in Junior Achievement.

There are many in this room who are responsible for Junior Achievement and its success. I'm sure I speak for everyone in Junior Achievement when I say that we will forever be indebted to you and others like you for the opportunity you have given us.

May I leave you with this quote: A noted historian made this observation: "Most democracies last for about 200 years"—gentlemen, ours is 176 years old.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

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

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President of the United States for the firm, prompt, and thorough manner in which he seems to be handling the situation in the Dominican Republic.

His expressed determination to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in this hemisphere is the most encouraging announcement in America's foreign policy since January 1961.

In a spirit of constructive admonition, I should like to take this opportunity to state to my colleagues that until the Communist cancer, centered in Havana, Cuba, is torn out by the roots, more American boys will have to be sent into other Latin countries and too many will return home in flag-draped coffins.

The President did not hesitate to tell the Nation last night that many of the Communists active in the Dominican uprising were trained in Cuba.

The eruption in the Dominican Republic should be the last evidence required by this hemisphere for a decision to eliminate the Communist regime in Cuba.

I urge the President to quickly announce that the liquidation of Cuba's Communist government is a definite aim of American foreign policy, and that no pressures from any source, Communist or ally, will dissuade us from that goal.

GOVERNMENT STILL GOING IN THE RED

(Mr. MARTIN of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the optimism of the President who reports with great satisfaction that the expected deficit will be less than he anticipated, the fact is we are still piling up huge deficits which endanger our economy.

Federal spending continues to increase; shortly we will be asked to increase the debt limit; each year the Federal Government goes deeper into the red. We cannot continue following such fuzzy economic theories without being forced, one day, to pay the piper for the ball the big spenders have been having.

Let me remind you that the last balanced budget was in the last full fiscal year of the Republican administration under President Eisenhower. We have been told that spending has increased because of the increase in defense costs, but again let me remind you that the spending level increase has not been due to increased defense programs, but to increased social welfare programs.

I would also like to point out that the increase in dollar spending, serious as it is, does not reflect an even more serious danger to our Republic, the increase of Federal encroachment in areas which are rightfully the responsibility of the private sector, the States and individual citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is far past time for us to return to responsible fiscal policies. If our private enterprise system is to survive we must live within our income. We must call a halt to programs we cannot afford if we are to remain a strong and solvent nation.

How far we have gone along the road to irresponsibility in fiscal matters is clearly shown in the excellent editorial by David Lawrence in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report. I include the editorial, "Only \$30 Billion in the Red" as a part of these remarks.

ONLY \$30 BILLION IN THE RED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson, in a somewhat optimistic vein, the other day told the American people by television and radio and through the press that the deficit in the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, would be at least a billion dollars below

the \$6.3 billion which he had estimated last January.

This is supposed to be a sign of an improvement, if not a reversal, in the deficit spending which has now been going on year after year.

The sad truth is that in the 5 fiscal years beginning on July 1, 1960, the gross public debt will have increased by approximately \$30 billion. The total interest now costs more than \$11 billion a year.

Unfortunately, most persons in official life and also many others engaged in economic dialog are not disturbed by deficits totaling only \$30 billion in 5 years. The thesis of the new school of economists is that deficit spending is the way to keep business good and that it doesn't matter whether the Government, year after year, is spending more than it is taking in.

The official budget estimates are often misleading. In the past 10 years, the original forecasts of the budget made 18 months before the end of a fiscal year amounted cumulatively to a total of only \$200 million of deficit. But the revised estimates, made each time a year later, added up to an accumulated deficit of \$36.9 billion. In that same 10-year period, the actual figures showed a deficit total of \$40.8 billion.

The big fact is that the Government is running in the red year after year. Expenditures are kept down in some categories but go up in others.

The assumption is that, even with the large deficits, the United States will be able to pay its bills. But it can do so only with depreciated currency, and the risk to the average citizen is that prices will rise as the monetary unit dwindles in value. Many governments have had a tragic experience with such inflation.

Business conditions, of course, are regarded as good today, largely as a result of the recent cuts in tax rates. But how long will this last? For wages and prices as well as State taxes are continuing their upward trend. The mere size of the sales volume is not an indicator of a nation's ability to maintain its monetary unit on a stable basis.

The truth is that the Government is spending money for many things that it could well do without. This doesn't mean that the money is actually wasted, but it does mean that priority could be given to sound finance and the Nation would not suffer.

No administration, of course, can balance the budget at once. It must be a gradual process so that the economy can absorb the changes. But when year after year there is no sign that a balanced budget is even in sight, there is bound to be discouragement.

Meanwhile, the Nation will have to examine carefully all the official forecasts being made because experience has shown that, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, erroneous estimates have been offered. This is due to some extent to an inability to gauge correctly future trends in business, both in this country and overseas.

The Eisenhower administration in January 1958, for example, predicted a surplus of \$500 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. But, due to a downturn in business which, during that same period, developed into a real recession, receipts were \$6.1 billion less than anticipated. In an attempt to reverse the business curve, the spending went up by \$6.7 billion. So the final outcome was a budget deficit of \$12.4 billion.

Likewise in January 1962 the Kennedy administration forecast a surplus of \$500 million for the fiscal year ending June 30 1963 but the estimate proved to be wrong by nearly \$7 billion. This was because corporate profits had been estimated at \$56.5 billion and turned out to be only \$48.2 billion. Also taxes from individuals did not come up to the figures that had been predicted. Much of this was due to the uncertain-

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8839

ties in business occasioned by the unsettled conditions in the steel industry. The final result was a budget deficit of \$6.3 billion.

It would be much better if an incumbent Administration would make long-range appraisals and chart the budget trends for a given period of years rather than concentrating on a single year.

What America needs is a comprehensive program of expense cutting along with a stimulus to business which will produce more tax receipts. Such a plan cannot be confined to a single year. There ought to be at least a 5-year look ahead with a program for a balanced budget which would be accepted as the reasonable reflection of a sound trend in Government finance.

The American people would welcome an end to the deficit era—a total deficit of \$40.8 billion in the last 10 years with \$30 billion of this piling up in the last 5 years. The official figure for the public debt now is close to \$317 billion. It's the biggest debt that any nation has ever faced in the history of the world.

LOCATION OF JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORP. PLANT IN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT REPRESENTED BY REPRESENTATIVE MICHEL

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with respect to the location of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. plant in his congressional district.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., the fifth largest steel producer in the United States, made a very significant announcement with respect to the future of Jones-Laughlin and to my congressional district.

Mr. Charles M. Beeghly, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., told the annual meeting of shareholders on April 29:

The Middle West is one of the fastest growing markets for products made by your company. A location in that general area for a J. & L. steel plant is essential if we are to achieve our objective of selling an increasing share of the total steel used, as well as expanding our position as a supplier to the national market. Our opportunity for sharing in the growth of the Middle West appeared to be limited by new steel plants recently built or building by our competitors, chiefly in Metropolitan Chicago, as well as by the expansion of the longer established companies in that area. We concluded that to locate a new J. & L. plant next door to our Chicago-area competition would lack in imagination and economic sense. Accordingly, we conceived and developed a quite different approach to this competitive problem—an offensive, rather than a defensive posture.

Our objective became the identification of an extraordinarily large site, accessible to the Middle West and Southwest markets by means of modern highway systems, barge and rail, and with rail and water systems to accommodate economic delivery of raw materials and semifinished steel. Many months have been spent in the search for a site which met all of our criteria. These include a site of sufficient size to provide building room for steel-fabricating customers, who will find it advantageous to locate next door. Our search has ended. We have optioned almost 6,000 acres, more than 10 times the area of any existing J. & L. steel plant, approximately 100 miles west of the Chicago Loop, on the Illinois River near the town of Hennepin.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Hennepin, Ill., is the county seat of the smallest county in the State of Illinois, located in my congressional district, so you can see that this is a very significant announcement for our area, and I would surely draw special attention to the fact that as Mr. Beeghly pointed out, the site is, "of sufficient size to provide building room for fabricating customers who will find it advantageous to locate next door." We hope that in the coming months and years ahead many progressive, forward-looking concerns will look to the many advantages of this location and what we in central Illinois have to offer.

Mr. Beeghly went on to advise the shareholders as follows:

Long range, our plan includes an integrated steel plant, with iron-ore pellets or prerduced iron to come from our taconite lands to the north. Short range, our plan includes facilities to finish steel, which will be melted in our Pittsburgh, Aliquippa, Cleveland, and Detroit plants. From any of these four steel plants, we can reach our new site by rail or water. We have the option of the river system or rail from Pittsburgh and Aliquippa, or from Cleveland and Detroit by rail, or by lake boat with rail or barge transshipment.

The property is located close to the new East-West Interstate Route 80, which in an easterly direction will speed delivery of finished products into the network of new highways around the Chicago area. Connecting with this fine new high-speed interstate highway, are major highways and new ones planned which will permit us to reach north, west and south. This will mean good access into other important steel-consuming markets, which will continue to grow as the industrial trend continues to spread across our country.

Plans for the development of this new steel plant are in preparation. We expect to complete land acquisition and begin construction next year. Flat-rolled steel products are included in our plans and perhaps other steel shapes as well. No further details as to product lines will be announced at this time, nor can we state now when we will be in production. Announcements will be made from time to time as our plans progress.

Even in its initial stage this project will represent the largest single development ever undertaken by Jones & Laughlin. It will greatly increase our percentage of finishing capacity and service capability in products and markets of great future promise. Of importance also, is the finishing capacity this expansion will free-up in our existing J. & L. plants, providing us with an ever better ability to supply the markets closer to these well-established J. & L. producing points.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in conclusion for the RECORD that we feel very fortunate in J. & L.'s decision to locate in our congressional district. We welcome this industrial expansion in our area with open arms and we are sure that it will lead to a wide range of development for this very productive area—that part of my home State which we like to refer to as "The Heart of Illinois."

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN SAN FRANCISCO

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco. In connection with this anniversary, I think proper recognition should be given in California to one of the great early leaders of the United Nations—Dag Hammarskjöld. To that end, I have before you today, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a silent, timeless redwood forest in my district be designated the Dag Hammarskjöld Memorial Grove.

To fully explain this proposal, I will attempt to relate the real meaning of *Sequoia sempervirens*—the ever-living redwood. A book I have been reading tells the story of the life of one tree. I would like to attempt to summarize this story in a few words, if I may.

During the founding of the Babylonian empire 2,200 years ago, a sprout emerged from a seed no bigger than a match-head. It crept up, straight and true, a few inches a year toward a patch of sky between the cover of the huge trees surrounding it. Two hundred years later, about the time Jesus of Nazareth began to preach his parables, our tree was 100 feet tall and 3 feet thick at the base. Over the centuries it inched up, expanding a fraction of an inch in girth each year as empires rose and fell, as the dark ages came and disappeared into the Renaissance, as Columbus discovered the New World and a new nation with a new idea of government based on freedom and individual responsibility grew to maturity.

During these millenniums, monumental natural calamities struck. Floods of the centuries crept up the trunk of the tree, depositing several feet of new soil over its root system. Six times in its life, the tree grew a new set of roots closer to the surface to gather forest nutrients. Several major forest fires scared its skin and ate its flesh, but each time it healed its wounds with decades of new growth until 1849, the year of the great gold rush to California. That year, a forest fire burned a 17-foot-wide scar on its side, killing all the roots under the wounded area. The tree, over the next decades, started to lean. At the same time, it began growing a brace to shore up its wounded side. In 106 years, it grew a buttress projecting 4 feet to shore up its great weight. But the centuries needed to fully protect itself from natural disaster were not to come before the next natural onslaught.

Everyone recalls the 1955 floods in California when levees broke. Yuba City was flooded, and scores of people were drowned. This same flood made a bog around the tree and the buttress sank in as the tree leaned farther and farther. Finally, its 1,000 tons of redwood snapped its good roots and crashed to the ground along a 350-foot path. When its great trunk was cut, most of the history of modern civilization could be traced on its life rings.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why national interest has been aroused over preservation of a suitable grove of these stately

8840

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 3, 1965

trees, in commemoration of the respect people throughout the world hold for the great international leader, Dag Hammarskjöld.

The life of Dag Hammarskjöld was in concordance with the deep and pervading majesty of the redwoods among which we find spiritual refuge and gain a more profound realization of his own thought that "we each have within us a center of stillness surrounded by silence."

Dag Hammarskjöld, until his death in 1961, served 8 years as Secretary General of the United Nations, carrying on his widely significant and courageous search for world peace. By their very grandeur, the giant redwoods imbue us with a strong realization of human dignity, tolerance and stateliness, so characteristic of Dag Hammarskjöld's life.

This, Mr. Speaker, is largely the sentiment expressed in my concurrent resolution. I think it altogether fitting that a redwood grove in my district be selected by the State of California as a memorial to this world leader, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in this recognition.

EVENTS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC BRING HOME FORCEFULLY FOLLY OF ALLOWING COMMUNIST BASE IN CUBA

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events in the Dominican Republic have brought home forcefully the folly of allowing the Communist base in Cuba to continue in spreading its poison among its sister Republics of Latin America.

Several of us in the past have noted the school of Communist subversion and revolution which Castro has founded and which has been directed by Che Guevara. I pointed out this on the floor 2 years ago. It is obvious that Cuban-trained revolutionaries are at this moment planning to attempt revolts in other Central American countries. Perhaps the swift reaction of the United States in the Dominican Republic will retard their efforts.

Unfortunately we are continuing to pay for the fumbling defeat at the Bay of Pigs, which not only allowed Castro to remain in power but encouraged Communist subversives to believe they could proceed in Latin America without fear of U.S. action.

The President has courageously taken the correct step.

Today the Communist world should be on notice that they can no longer expect to romp in safety, for the United States will resist attempts to establish new Communist regimes by force in Latin America.

WILLIAM H. BOOK

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Indianapolis was saddened last week by the death of William H. Book, for many

years the director of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Few men have left a greater mark on Indianapolis. He was a citizen whom Indiana will miss, a man most difficult to replace.

Bill Book was a quiet and friendly man, but fervently and unselfishly dedicated to the principles which he believed were right. He had a host of friends in many walks of life. I took pride in being one of those friends.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point editorials by the three daily newspapers in Indianapolis in tribute to Mr. Book:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, May 1, 1965]

WILLIAM H. BOOK

Bill Book was a prime mover. Other men have formed committees. He formed committees and got things done.

Much lipservice is paid to business. Bill Book gave business—and the whole community—much more. He gave it true stewardship. In the depths of the depression, when morale and courage were low, he helped the unemployed find jobs. Then he helped rally the forces that had the power to rebuild, to attract new industry and get things going again. It was a time when jobs were the main concern of thousands of hard-hit working people.

The times called for imaginative leadership. Bill Book offered it. The community gained. Indianapolis became a key industrial center during an era that began in economic stagnation and could have ended in something far worse.

In the grim days when every dollar was a drop of economic blood, William H. Book, executive vice president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, fought to hold government spending to a minimum, to eliminate waste. Then in the days of expansion after World War II, as the city grew and faced new problems, Bill Book battled equally hard to sell business leadership on the spending necessary to solve these problems. This led to collisions with hardheads, but the cool, efficient Bill Book was the winner—and so was Indianapolis.

In time he won the nickname "Mr. Indianapolis." Few men have done more to deserve it.

He took pride in being a conservative. He warned of the dangers of centralized super-government and unrestrained Federal power. And he opposed turning to the Federal authority for financial aid. As the chamber often has pointed out, with Bookian logic, the "Federal" money came from local communities in the first place. So "Federal help" was a misnomer, and furthermore it jarred Federal strings.

Yet Indianapolis needed to rebuild much of its downtown district. It did, spectacularly, with private money and initiative, and von admiration from all over the country.

Bill Book's newspaper days taught him the value of facts and research, the soundness of gathering detailed, valid data before making decisions on complex problems. His forte was research, as he often said, and research is a pillar of the chamber's operation today. This thin, calm man, with his trim mustache, rare powers of persuasion and abounding energy which poured into dozens of constructive channels, gave his talents to Indianapolis and its chamber of commerce for four decades. He played a giant role in making our chamber one of the most effective organizations of its type in the land.

Bill Book helped lead Indianapolis to the threshold of new potentialities and challenges. He believed in preserving what was

best of the past and adapting imaginatively, intelligently to the changing world. "If we don't have a good vision for the future," he said, "we are not going to achieve very much in the future."

His vision was that of "a strong, virile, growing, dynamic community," energetically developing its cultural, social, business, educational, professional, research and scientific opportunities—making the most of its human resources.

This vision is Bill Book's heritage to the city that was his life.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Times, Apr. 30, 1965]

WILLIAM H. BOOK

The impact of William H. Book on this community and his contributions to it are not difficult to measure. Both were immense.

As head of the chamber of commerce for many, many years, he not only set the tone for industrial and business expansion here, but the political and philosophical tone of Indianapolis as well.

He had a rugged belief that the responsibility for problem solving lay primarily with local communities, and this was a belief which he pursued with unyielding vigor.

Many disagreed with some of the things which Bill Book stood for. But he earned universal respect for his sincerity and for his integrity.

Beyond his duties with the chamber, Mr. Book was an energetic volunteer in countless civic efforts.

He was closely identified over many years with the Red Cross, and was chairman of the Indianapolis chapter at the time of his death.

He served ably in a remarkable variety of other activities, ranging from the 500 festival to the annual fund drive for the United Negro Colleges.

For a man of his strong convictions and boundless energy, he was personally remarkably retiring. His voice always had that soft quality of his native Virginia, and his approach was quiet and always friendly.

The people of this community, in all economic stations, will miss Bill Book immensely, for he was a man whom they had known well and admired deeply.

Few men do so much to shape the current of any community as Bill Book did here in Indianapolis, and few work so tirelessly at what they so earnestly believe to be right.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, May 1, 1965]

WILLIAM H. BOOK

No one person will ever know all the good that William H. Book did in his life on this earth.

And no one—though many have tried—will be able to pay full tribute to his abilities or all of his accomplishments.

His interests and activities were innumerable and yet he found the time to give active, useful support and leadership to all of them—his church, his community, his family, his friends, his schools, his State, and his country. It was typical of him that he had been as busy in retirement as when he was full-time executive vice president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Throughout a career that involved newspaper work, public service, and his chamber career, he had a part, and always an important part, in every major civic enterprise in this city. Often little publicized, these pursuits included participation in business development, race relations, all kinds of legislation, government administration, social and welfare activity, State regulation, municipal planning, and a host of nongovernmental programs directed by citizens determined to bring about a better city, State, or Nation.

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8841

Bill Book believed firmly and fervently in free, private enterprise as it has developed under our unique form of government. He respected politics and government but he abhorred unnecessary government and its interference in private affairs. More than that, he personally was willing to do something about it. He spent all his waking hours—too many of them to the detriment of his health—trying to further those causes in which he believed.

Some of Bill Book's critics complained that he was too conservative, too opposed to changes, too much a servant of business. They didn't really know him and they didn't know his record.

He was a leader, not a follower. He was constructive, not obstructive. He could see someone else's point of view. And he wanted change, but he wanted change for the better, not change for the sake of change.

To get those changes, he wrote speeches and articles, raised money, buttonholed friends and strangers, prepared legislation, generated news stories—in short, did everything possible to accomplish his purpose.

His writing was an outgrowth of his early career as a newspaper reporter. He was both an excellent reporter and an excellent writer. He was proud of the record he made at the Indianapolis News and we at the News were proud to have him as a distinguished alumnus.

Above all else, Bill Book was a Christian gentleman who believed wholeheartedly in the principles of his religious faith and practiced those principles to the end of his days. His life and his work made this city and State much better places in which to live. And he set a rare and admirable example of Christian service to his fellow man.

TRACKING DOWN A LIFESAVER

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 3, which tells the amazing story of the development of a new wonder drug.

This new drug, which promises to be of major significance in combating several types of infection, was developed through a series of programs, but ultimately it was through the persistence of the researchers at the Eli Lilly Co. in Indianapolis that this drug was produced in a usable form.

This story demonstrates again the invaluable role which private drug companies play in the development of new medicines and medical techniques. Not infrequently these companies are subjected to attack from those who believe that all such activities should be conducted by the Federal Government. A few years ago, the Eli Lilly Co. was among five which were charged with price fixing concerning the Salk polio vaccine. At that time I spoke in defense of the great record these companies had in producing a tremendous amount of the vaccine in a short period of time. The great discovery of Dr. Jonas Salk had to be translated into efficient, inexpensive manufacture to make it useful to the millions who needed it.

The various private companies rose to meet that challenge in a truly remarkable manner. I am glad to say that the price-fixing charges were dropped, be-

cause the Government could produce no evidence to substantiate them.

The story which follows about cephalothin tells a similar tale, and there are many such in the annals of drug research.

Despite this record the private drug industry continues to know abuse at the hands of its own Government. Very unwisely, I believe, our Government has purchased drugs from sources outside of this country which operate in violation of the drug patents possessed by American manufacturers. This practice has been decried, and legislation is pending to try to remedy this situation.

Although originally conceived of by an Italian scientist, drug producers in that country were unable to effectively develop cephalothin. One reason is that they have little protection for drug discoveries, hence, it is not feasible to underwrite new research.

In any event, we again can see from the following article the debt that we do owe to private drug companies. They have done much to relieve suffering, and the facilities and brainpower they offer in their research programs which cost many millions of dollars annually offer great hope in the continuing battle against disease.

The article follows:

TRACKING DOWN A LIFESAVER

There's a new name among lifesaving "wonder drugs." It is cephalothin, one of a family of antibiotics called cephalosporin. It is the practical result of one of the longest laboratory hunts in the history of antibiotics.

The long trail began in 1945 in the Mediterranean Sea, off the coast of Sardinia. Prof. Giuseppe Brotzu of the Cagliari Institute of Hygiene was studying micro-organisms where the city's sewers discharge into the sea. He found a fungus which secreted a substance with the power to attack and destroy disease-causing bacteria.

Excited by the discovery, the professor spent 3 years pursuing it. He succeeded in growing his fungus in the laboratory and extracting a drug which was tested with some success. Most provocatively, it was effective against the dreaded "staph" infections, which resist penicillin and the sulfas. At the same time it was relatively free from the side effects and adverse reactions sometimes encountered with those drugs. The new substance produced improvement in patients with typhoid and undulant fevers.

Alas, Professor Brotzu's drug was too weak, and too costly to produce. He made a report of his findings, and there the matter seemed at an end. To go further would require the facilities of a large industrial research laboratory, and there was no such in Italy.

An alert British health officer in Sardinia passed the report to Sir Howard Florey at Oxford University, who had helped to rescue penicillin from the oblivion of a forgotten report. The Oxford laboratories explored it, almost abandoned it because of lack of significant new results. Then after 7 years the new antibiotic, dubbed cephalosporin C, was isolated and defined. It was still too weak, but now the work went on with new encouragement. The British National Research and Development Corporation patented the new substance, but efforts to develop it into a practical commercial medicine met failure after failure.

Ultimately the scene shifted to the laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co. in Indianapolis. There were more setbacks and more disap-

pointments. But there was also promise and the scale of work was multiplied. At last came the breakthrough, the discovery of a way to produce a cephalosporin derivative—cephalothin—of useful strength and in commercially practical quantities. The trail was 19 years long from the discovery off Sardinia to Lilly production of a marketable drug.

Along the way, the search also produced in other laboratories some new types of penicillin which went into commercial production. Still to be explored are other possible derivatives.

Many individuals and many institutions had a part in the development. There were various key elements—but one without which the others would not have been possible. That one key was the patent system. The overriding reason for lack of a major industrial drug laboratory in Italy is the fact that in Italy there is no patent protection for drug manufacturers. The hunt for cephalothin involved the commitment of large sums of money. The only practical source of such sums, to finance this kind of extended research, is the revenue to be recovered from sale of a patentable product when one is developed. That's why this work was accomplished in countries where that protection is available.

The story of the hunt for cephalothin is a story of perceptiveness, ingenuity, skill, determination, and risk taking—all thriving in the favorable climate of free enterprise economy.

A PACIFIC MEDICAL CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CONQUEST OF DISEASES

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which seeks to authorize the establishment in Hawaii of a Pacific Medical Center. The bill is a concrete and far-reaching effort to carry out in the field of the medical arts some of the laudatory ideas which were expressed by President Johnson in his April 7 address at the Johns Hopkins University.

You will recall that our President stated upon that occasion:

These countries of southeast Asia are homes for millions of impoverished people. Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle until the night to wrestle existence from the soil. They are often wracked by disease, plagued by hunger, and death comes at the early age of 40.

The American people have helped generously in times past * * *.

Now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in the conflict-torn corner of our world * * *.

And the President went on to say:

The wonders of modern medicine can be spread through villages where thousands die every year from lack of care. Schools can be established to train people in the skills that are needed to manage the process of development.

And these objectives, and more, are within the reach of a cooperative and determined effort.

Mr. Speaker, such a cooperative and determined effort is encompassed by the provisions of the bill I have introduced.

The bill would authorize the establishment of a medical center which would provide suitable administrative and physical facilities in order to enable teach-

ing and research of the medical arts so badly needed throughout southeast Asia, the trust territories, Okinawa, and the numerous island archipelagoes of the Pacific.

The United States has pioneered in the field of cultural and technical interchange between the East and the West through the East-West Center in Hawaii. We have already seen, with justifiable pride, the incalculable benefits which have flowed to the peoples of Asia and America from the East-West Center. It is with a deep conviction, therefore, that I state that our island State, with its people of heterogeneous racial backgrounds, is the most suitable site from which to launch this cooperative and determined effort in the field of the medical arts.

It seems that this view with regard to the suitability of Hawaii as the home of such a Pacific Medical Center is shared by many. For example, it has recently been announced that Hawaii will be the site of the first meeting of Japanese and American scientists who will commence in October 1965, to recommend ways in which their respective governments can aid in the fight against such diseases as cholera, tuberculosis, and leprosy in Asia.

Hawaii, Mr. Speaker, has the experience, the vision, and the enthusiasm to undertake this project.

Through scholarships and research grants, we can attract those with the best potential to the proposed medical center or direct them to more specialized institutions in the continental United States, in order to train Asians to help their fellow men.

We can hope to attract the very best medical minds of the more developed countries of Asia and the Pacific, as well as the United States, to impart their skills and knowledge to their counterparts from the less developed countries. Trained physicians and researchers from the technologically advanced countries of Japan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong will be invited to offer their services under the auspices of the United States in order to further develop the medical resources of their fellow Asian countries.

Universities and hospitals both in Hawaii and in the continental United States will be called upon to provide appropriate educational services through a program of fellowships, grants, and research stipends to be administered by the center.

Advanced medical scholars and researchers from the United States will not only be asked to offer their knowledge and skills, but also to learn from Asians and Pacific islanders who have long specialized in certain areas, such as tropical medicine and pathology.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that such a medical center and such a medical-sharing program will be immediately embraced by the countries of Asia and the Pacific. The medical center will be a lasting and living memorial of America's aid to medicine in the countries of Asia and the Pacific.

The Pacific Medical Center will be a Federal project in its entirety and will come under the cognizance of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have been informed that the cost of operating the Pacific Medical Center for a whole year should be much less than the expense for carrying on 1 month's effort in Vietnam. The comparison may not be entirely appropriate, but it is certainly graphic.

Mr. Speaker, a similar bill was introduced in the Senate on April 28, 1965, by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, DANIEL K. INOUE. Senator INOUE has requested the support of the President of the United States. He has also requested the support of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of State. He has already been assured of the support of many of his distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly solicit the support of the Members of this great body for the establishment of a Pacific Medical Center in Hawaii.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate for the balance of this week. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this has been cleared with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on the majority side and with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] on the minority side.

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

There was no objection.

ONE-PRICE COTTON

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of two-price cotton has been the greatest incentive for the American textile industry to expand, remodel, and employ more people than ever before in this history of the textile industry. The elimination of two-price cotton is aiding the American cotton grower. It is estimated that the American textile industry will use 1 million bales more of American-grown cotton this year than during the last year of the two-price cotton. Two-price cotton was unfair to the American cotton farmers. It was unfair to the American textile manufacturers. It was unfair to the American textile workers and employees in related industries.

Mr. Speaker, let us get rid of two-price cotton once and for all by appropriate legislation during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina Legislature in both houses unanimously adopted a concurrent resolution addressed to the Congress urging that we extend the one-price cotton program. This resolution was adopted on April 28 and follows:

H. CON. RES. —

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the one-price cotton program for the seasons of 1966 and 1967

Whereas the present one-price cotton program makes cotton competitive in price in the domestic market as well as the foreign; and

Whereas it ended the cost advantage to foreign mills which were rapidly taking over domestic markets; and

Whereas the two-price program would destroy many public opportunities and economic activities generated by the great cotton industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to extend the one-price cotton program for the seasons of 1966 and 1967; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress from South Carolina and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is May 3, but in Poland today there is no rejoicing, no celebration of that glorious Polish national holiday, May 3d Constitution Day. This Polish holiday, observed by the Poles for the last 174 years—since 1791—has been abolished by the Communist government imposed by Soviet Russia on the Polish nation. The Soviet puppets have created another national holiday for Poland, the date of the so-called liberation of Poland by Soviet armies. What bitter mockery of liberty this is.

But free Poles all over the world and Americans of Polish descent keep the faith, and celebrate May 3 as the true Polish national holiday. And Poles in Poland who cannot celebrate this glorious anniversary openly are celebrating it in their hearts, hoping always that the day will come when once more Poland will be free and the bells in all the churches in Poland will once more ring joyously the message of May 3, the message of freedom, justice and democracy.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, is a veritable landmark, not only in Polish history but in the political and constitutional history of all eastern Europe. For the first time, constitutional monarchy with limited powers and a responsible cabinet form of government was adopted in that part of Europe. By that Constitution, ancient class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the arm of the central government was strengthened by extending the protection of the law to the peasantry. Most significant, however, for those days and for that part of Europe, was the fact that this Constitution guaranteed abso-

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8905

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Apr. 30, 1965]

MINNEAPOLIS STAR-TRIBUNE AGREES TO PURCHASE TRIBUNE CO. ASSETS

The Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. has concluded an agreement to purchase the assets of the Tribune Co. of Great Falls.

Simultaneous announcement was made Saturday by Joyce A. Swan, executive vice president of the Minneapolis newspaper publishing company and by Alexander Warden, the Great Falls publisher.

The Great Falls firm publishes the Tribune, a morning and Sunday newspaper with circulation of 36,000 morning and 42,000 Sunday over the northern half of Montana, and the Leader with evening circulation of 9,000, primarily in Great Falls. The company also owns a printing firm and office supply store.

New publisher of the Great Falls newspapers will be William A. Cordingley, national advertising manager of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune, Swan announced. Cordingley and his family will move to Great Falls after April 30, when the purchase will be completed.

Principal owners of the Great Falls newspapers have been members of the Warden family. Publisher Alexander Warden and executive editor Robert D. Warden are both retiring from management of the newspapers as of April 30. Advertising director Scott A. Warden of the two newspapers and manager Jock F. Warden of the printing and office supply division will continue to be associated with the new ownership.

Purchase price of the Great Falls company was not disclosed.

Retiring publisher Alexander Warden made the following statement:

"After a lifetime of publishing in our native Great Falls, there are inevitable regrets by the retiring ownership. Our best consolation lies, however, in firm conviction that the new owners are seasoned and thoroughly competent newspaper people who will give our readers publications at least as good as have prevailed. In Minneapolis they have fine newspapers that rank high in the metropolitan field and there is every reason for confidence in their performance here."

"The Great Falls newspapers have a rich history of public service in Montana and we are proud and pleased to accept the responsibility for carrying on their heritage in western journalism," Swan said.

NEW OFFICERS

Swan will be president and Cordingley vice president of the Great Falls Tribune Co.; a newly organized subsidiary of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

"Bill Cordingley, as publisher, will be in charge of all aspects of the Great Falls operations," Swan said.

Cordingley, 47, was born in Des Moines, Iowa, and was graduated from Harvard College in 1940.

He joined the national advertising department of the Minneapolis newspapers shortly after his graduation. He enlisted as a private in the Army in 1941 and while serving in the North African and European campaigns for 34 months he rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Returning to the Star and Tribune in 1946, Cordingley worked in the retail and national advertising departments and was appointed national advertising manager in 1950.

Cordingley has been active in civic and educational affairs in Minneapolis, including service for the Sales Executives Association, chamber of commerce, and the Curative Workshop. He was a trustee of Breck School and is an officer and member of the board of governors of Hazeltine National Golf Club.

He captained the Harvard golf team his senior year and has continued a strong in-

terest in competitive golf, ranking as a semi-finalist in the Minnesota State amateur tournament four times.

Cordingley and his wife, Mary, have three children: William, Jr., 16; Thomas, 15; and Constance, 9.

START AS WEEKLIES

Both the Great Falls Tribune and the Great Falls Leader had humble origins as weeklies back in the eighties. The morning Tribune originated in Sun River, a pioneer town 20 miles west of Great Falls, in 1884. Several of the first copies were printed on silk and auctioned for as much as \$75. Moved to fledgling Great Falls in 1885, the weekly became a daily in 1887. The evening Leader was founded in the spring of 1888, blossoming into a daily later in the same year.

After varying ownership and fortunes, the Tribune was bought in January 1895 by two young New Englanders, O. S. Warden and William M. Bole. With a freshly acquired sheepskin from Dartmouth College, Warden had come west in 1889 to work for the Leader, arriving in Helena just as the constitutional convention for the new State of Montana was adjourning. Vermonter Bole was a printer by trade, having learned his trade setting type by hand in the famous Riverside Press in Boston. One of Riverside's jobs at this time was setting the current King James version of the Holy Bible. Blessed with that rare gift of total recall for the rest of his life and through years as an editor, Bole could pull any Biblical allusion verbatim out of his head, identifying book, chapter, and verse without ever picking up a Testament. An itching foot drifted him to St. Paul to become a rural mail carrier and, on the side, a hip-pocket real estate broker, capitalizing on the human yearning of the city dweller for the joys of rural living and the farmer for urban residence. One day he was worth \$60,000; the next day he was flat broke, as the panic of '93 hit. He then headed west as the panic of 1893 hit. He then headed west and landed in Great Falls, a printer again.

Drawn together because of their New England origins and because of Scottish forebears, Warden and Bole bided their time until the chance came to buy the Tribune for \$8,000. This they didn't have, but were able to close the deal with \$200 that Warden dug up and a like amount that Bole raised with a chattel mortgage on his library.

They were just getting their heads above water at the turn of the century, when the Clark-Daly Senate fight posed a threat of a new Clark paper in Great Falls. A fast look at their hole card, and they sold to Clark. Bole bought the Bozeman Chronicle, not finding out who really had owned it until a year and a half after his purchase. Warden stayed on as a business office manager for the Clark ownership.

BUY PAPER AGAIN

The shifting political scene gave Warden and Bole opportunity to buy the paper back again, which they did in 1905. They continued as owners and partners until Bole's retirement and death, at which time the controlling ownership passed to Warden. O. S. Warden died in 1951.

During these years the Leader had been stumbling through troublous times and was finally acquired by the Tribune, but except for joint mechanical facilities it was published by a separate staff and in its own location until recent years.

The present Tribune building was built in 1918, housing Tribune and allied operations which included a newly formed Tribune Printing & Supply Co., the bimonthly Montana Farmer-Stockman, sold in 1964 to the Cowles farm paper interests in Spokane; majority ownership in Great Falls radio station KMON from its inception in 1948 until disposal in 1958.

[From the Hungry Horse News, Apr. 16, 1965]

THE BIG INDEPENDENT

Noted with regret is the sale of the Great Falls Tribune and Leader, announced by the Warden family to the Cowles interests that own the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Long the largest daily in Montana, the Tribune has been the State's most influential newspaper. In recent years, the flashy and enterprising Billings Gazette passed the Tribune in circulation, but the Tribune remained the daily with best capitol and State-wide coverage and in its responsible way gave editorial leadership to Montana journalism.

The Tribune, with 36,686 morning circulation and 9,312 for the evening Leader, was also a daily that endorsed some top Democratic candidates in 1960 as well as in 1964. This is unique. Newspapers in the Main-Street pattern are more conservative politically than the majority of their readers.

Evolution of journalism in Montana follows a national pattern to chain ownership, and it is good economics.

Montana benefited when the Anaconda Co. sold its papers to the Lee chain—publishing is their business. This chain owns the Billings Gazette. The Montana Press Association directory is the source for these weekday circulation figures. The Gazette has 36,924 paid mornings and 11,202 evenings; next is the Montana Standard at Butte with 24,273, followed by the Daily Missoulian with 18,159 mornings and 2,500 for the evening Sentinel. The Lee chain also owns the Helena Independent-Record, 8,514, Anaconda Standard, 5,189, and the Livingston Enterprise, 2,901.

The Scripps League has three Montana papers, the Daily Inter Lake of Kallispell, 6,895; the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, 5,111, and the Havre Daily News, 4,066.

Largest Montana-owned daily newspaper now is the Miles City Star with 4,609. Ken Byerly, now a University of North Carolina teacher, is principal owner of the Lewistown Daily News, 3,749.

Evolution of Montana journalism has come to the point where the Hungry Horse News, published in Columbia Falls, has the largest audited paid circulation of any Montana-owned newspaper, weekly or daily. Last quarterly Audit Bureau of Circulation figure was 4,773.

At the same time, a weekly newspaper is never a substitute for a daily. The Hungry Horse News hopes that every subscriber also gets a daily, and Montana's have been getting better.

It is interesting to note that sale of the Tribune was to an organization new to Montana journalism; namely the Cowles interests of Minneapolis (associated with Des Moines but not Spokane). The sale could have been to one of the chains already in the State, and having a third chain ownership is some diversification.

There will be considerable interest in the Cowles operation of the Great Falls Tribune, and whether or not the paper will keep and develop its State image established by the late O. S. Warden and William M. Bole.

[From the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News, Apr. 13, 1965]

THE END OF AN ERA

It is with profound regret that we see the Great Falls Tribune leave the most capable and honored leadership of the Warden family.

On May 1 the grand old Great Falls Tribune will pass into the hands of out-of-State ownership.

Perhaps because of sentimentality more than anything else, many Montana journalists see this transfer of ownership as the end of the great era of Montana newspapering.

The Tribune, first under the guiding hand of the late O. S. Warden, and for the past

15 years under the very capable leadership of Alex Warden, has trained many of Montana's present-day newspaper publishers and produced several outstanding authors.

There was Joseph Kinsey Howard, of "Montana, High, Wide, and Handsome" fame; Dan Cushman, who has gained immortality with "Stay Away Joe"; popular columnist Chick Guthrie; Jack Travis, former publisher of the Havre Daily News; Sam Gilluly, former editor of the Glasgow Courier and now publications editor of the Montana Chamber of Commerce; Fred Martin, publisher of the Park County News.

Paul Verdon, publisher of the Libby Western News; Bob Gilluly, editor of the Ravalli Republican; Earl Mizen, publisher of the Belt Valley Times; George Brammer, publisher of Townsend Star; and countless others who have moved on to the New York Times, Milwaukee Journal, Denver Post, and a host of other great metropolitan newspapers.

As for myself, the Tribune was my home for fully a fifth of my life and nearly half of my newspaper career.

So we say hall and farewell to the Warden family, which has done such an outstanding job in Montana newspapering for so many, many years.

And we offer good wishes to the Cowles syndicate, which will assume the reins of Montana's great newspaper on May 1.

[From the Western News and Libby Times, Apr. 15, 1965]

THE END OF AN ERA

Without discounting the achievements of the 39th legislature, probably the most significant development in Montana this year is the sale of the Great Falls Tribune properties.

The acquisition of Montana's largest and most influential newspaper by a Minneapolis company may have far-reaching effects upon Montana and upon the Tribune which has always aimed at deserving the title "Montana's best newsgatherer." Through the years it has earned the name.

Founded more than 80 years ago at Sun River, the controlling interest in the Tribune ownership for many years has been vested in the family of O. S. Warden, whose sons have guided the paper since their father's death. Younger members of the Warden family will continue to be associated with the paper, but ownership after April 30 will go to the Minneapolis Star-Tribune Co.

Most of us who grew up or lived long periods in northern or eastern Montana consider the Tribune as a member of the family. For this writer, the Great Falls paper has a special meaning. My first reading practice was on its comic pages, and for most of my life the morning Tribune came before breakfast. For 17 years, beginning as a student at MSU journalism school, I have been almost continuously a Tribune correspondent, staff member, or contributor.

The factor that always distinguished the Tribune from the other major daily newspapers of the State was its local ownership. Every other paper large enough to be considered a competitor with the Tribune for Statewide prestige has been owned either by a large industrial corporation to whom publishing was an unprofitable sideline dictated by political purposes or by a large newspaper chain headquartered in the Midwest and with no true understanding of the Montana which we natives know and live.

The Tribune served the Treasure State well because it was of, by, and for Montanans.

This great service may continue if the new ownership recognizes the importance of preserving the Tribune image throughout the State.

We salute the Great Falls Tribune; we thank the Tribune for outstanding service to

Montana for more than three-quarters of a century; and we look forward to continued leadership in the future.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune] L'ENVOI

After more years than we care to count, the senior management of the Tribune companies steps down and out today as new ownership and direction take over the reins.

What will we do? Where will we go? How do we feel about retiring? Well, we'll do whatever we can find to do—here in Montana where our roots run deep and where our old friends live. We don't know how we feel. After years of punching the time clock, this is a new experience. We'll have to wait and see.

There's been one great reward for us. Many of our friends and associates here and all over Montana tell us now that it isn't true that we wear horns and that after all our newspapers haven't been so bad.

It's nice to listen to such encomiums, praises usually withheld until the recipients can't hear them because they have just shuffled off this mortal coil. In a box surrounded by lighted tapers and cloying posies, who can hear well?

We have no qualms—else we wouldn't have sold—about the papers deteriorating under the new regime, and we don't expect decisions to be delayed until Minneapolis speaks.

These newspapers were here before we came; they'll be here long after we've gone. We're just glad to have played a role on the stage of their history.

ALEXANDER WARDEN,
Publisher.
ROBERT D. WARDEN,
Executive Editor.

ARMY EQUIPMENT AND MATERIEL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have previously advised the Senate that the staff of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee has been making a comprehensive study of the equipment and materiel status of Army combat divisions and units. One of the more important aspects of this study is the impact which our operations in Vietnam, coupled with other unprogrammed requirements, have had upon the Army's overall equipment and materiel situation.

The staff inquiry, which commenced in January, has now been developed to the point that hearings can be held on this very important matter. These will commence tomorrow, Tuesday, May 4, at 10 a.m. At the first session we will receive a report from members of the subcommittee staff on the results of their 3-months inquiry into this matter. At subsequent sessions we will hear from representatives of the General Accounting Office, which has assisted us in this study, and the Department of Army.

This hearing deals directly with the combat readiness and preparedness of the Army. It is perhaps the most important hearing which the subcommittee will conduct in the field of preparedness this year. In these days of spiraling overseas involvement and mounting international tension, it is imperative that the Congress be fully informed of the quality and quantity of the Army's inventory of arms and equipment, and its ability to perform its assigned mission.

I have been concerned about this matter for several months. My concern has mounted with the constant increase in

the tempo of the fighting in Vietnam and the resultant increase in the requirements for men, equipment, arms and ordnance in that theater. The recent dispatch of our fighting men to the Dominican Republic has levied yet another requirement upon the Army. The total impact of these widely separated operations is yet to be felt.

These and other requirements have not yet been separately programed for and funded. For the time being they are being met by the withdrawal of funds, equipment, personnel and other assets from the Regular Army inventory. The impact which this has had and will have on the Army as a whole must be inquired into very thoroughly. We must be certain that we have the men, equipment, and materiel to fulfill our commitments in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and elsewhere. At the same time, we must be certain that the drain of these activities does not result in an unacceptable impairment of the readiness and combat effectiveness of other high priority combat units in the continental United States and elsewhere.

The subcommittee will inquire into this matter as exhaustively as is necessary. Because of the nature of the subject matter, it will be necessary that the testimony be taken in executive session. At the conclusion of the hearing an appropriate report will be made to the full Senate Committee on Armed Services and, through it, to the Senate. If the hearings show a need for additional funds for Army procurement, I am certain that they will be provided promptly by the Congress.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial that appeared in this morning's issue of the New York Times entitled "Dominican Troop Buildup," and also an article, under two headings, appearing in the Times for Sunday, May 3, "Bosch 'Surprised' by Johnson Charge of Red Leadership" and "Bosch Holds United States Responsible."

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

[From the New York Times]

DOMINICAN TROOP BUILDUP

In ordering several thousand more marines and paratroopers into Santo Domingo Saturday night, President Johnson reiterated that their sole mission was to protect and evacuate endangered Americans and other foreign nationals. Last night the President went on television to confirm what Congressmen and correspondents in Washington had been told privately from the start of the Dominican rebellion—that the primary aim of the U.S. military involvement is to prevent another Cuba.

Thus, the official explanation has finally caught up with the one consistently given by authoritative administrative briefings. The President now tells the Nation that the revolt began as an action dedicated to social justice but it took a sinister turn when Communists seized control.

What remains unexplained is why no slightest expression of sympathy for the revolt's aims came from Washington in the period when the massing of American troops

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8907

was decided upon. The clear effect of their influx was to strengthen the ruling military junta in its efforts to block the restoration of Juan Bosch as President. In a television interview taped on Saturday Professor Bosch, who is no Communist, said that the revolt had been won until Washington intervened. He vehemently denied that the Communists exercised any position of control.

The President's unwillingness to see another Communist state established in this hemisphere will command national support. But the question that need a much clearer answer is whether a rightwing dictatorship in Santo Domingo has not traded on U.S. fears of communism to preserve its power in a country still scarred by three decades of brutal repression under Generalissimo Trujillo.

Restoring political stability in the Dominican Republic is the rightful responsibility of the Organization of American States. This responsibility has been acknowledged by President Johnson; it is being exercised by the O.A.S. through its dispatch of a five-man mediation mission to Santo Domingo. If that delegation finds a need for an inter-American peace force to help maintain a cease-fire or to ward off subversion, the O.A.S. is the proper instrumentality for bringing the peace force into being.

The massing of American marines and paratroopers in ever-increasing numbers already has stirred bitter recollections throughout Latin America and the world of the excesses of "gunboat diplomacy." A unilateral decision to assign these troops an active role in helping the Dominican military junta put down the revolt would run counter to all the principles of "Progress, democracy and social justice," for which Mr. Johnson appealed in his televised remarks Friday evening.

Such an abuse of our strength would do more to spread communism in this hemisphere than the Castroite agents it was directed against. As the President repeatedly pointed out in the 1964 election campaign, the United States cannot bulldoze its way to security, nor should it try. The inter-American system, to which the President has pledged full support, is our best assurance—and the hemisphere's.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1965]
BOSCH "SURPRISED" BY JOHNSON CHARGE OF RED LEADERSHIP

SAN JUAN, P.R., May 3.—Former President Juan Bosch, of the Dominican Republic, was surprised tonight by President Johnson's remarks on television that Communists had taken over the Dominican revolt.

"If the President says so, then maybe I have been mistaken all my life," Mr. Bosch said. "How is it possible for the Communists to make a revolution with democratic soldiers and democratic people?"

"Who is the leader who made this happen so quickly in a few days?" Mr. Bosch asked.

The exiled former President, in whose name the revolt began a week ago said: "I am so surprised, I shall inspect President Johnson's statement tomorrow and then maybe have more to say."

Mr. Bosch added that he had talked "three or four times today with the military headquarters in the Dominican Republic and as far as I know the cease-fire is being observed. Nobody mentioned Communist takeover to me."

BOSCH HOLDS UNITED STATES RESPONSIBLE

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Mr. Bosch said today that the Dominican revolt had been won until the United States intervened, so that it was now Washington's responsibility to bring democracy to his country.

Asked if he proposed that the United States carry on the revolution begun 8 days ago by forces backing his return, Mr. Bosch replied: "The duty is to do that. The United States

must do in the Dominican Republic what the people in the Dominican Republic want and were fighting for."

He said he had abandoned hope of a military victory for his backers, saying that "this stage of the revolution is ended for now."

Mr. Bosch, interviewed on the Columbia Broadcasting System radio and television program, "Face the Nation," said the uprising was democratic, was not in any way under Communist control and had crushed the forces of Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin until American marines were brought in.

The program was taped in San Juan, P.R., yesterday and broadcast today.

Mr. Bosch said he thought President Johnson's order sending in the first troops last Wednesday had been based on a desire to protect American lives and to return peace to the Dominican Republic, but in the end changed the course of the fighting.

"When they landed they found Wessin y Wessin was defeated * * * 24 hours more and the Dominicans would have solved their own problems," he said.

Mr. Bosch also said U.S. forces had broken the cease-fire that was arranged at one stage of the fighting.

Commenting on reports that Communists had become quite active in the continuing fighting in Santo Domingo, Mr. Bosch said: "The revolutionary forces are not Communists; they had no control."

Mr. MORSE. Last Friday, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I said that, in response to a notification by the military government of the Dominican Republic that they could not protect Americans and nationals of other nations, the President had a right to send in marines for the limited purpose of evacuating those nationals.

At that time I also warned that if the evidence should disclose that the United States went beyond the protection of nations and became a party to the revolt in the Dominican Republic by supporting one side, it would be acting outside its treaty obligations under the Organization of American States Charter. It would be acting outside the Act of Bogotá, the Act of Punta del Este, and the Washington Act of a year ago. I stated that I would wait final information before making any further comment on the subject.

Today I have called for a meeting of the full Committee on Foreign Relations. In the absence of such a meeting, I shall call a meeting of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I have been assured by the acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that a briefing is being called for this afternoon.

I shall withhold further comment until that briefing is over, except to say now that I am greatly disturbed about allegations that have appeared in the press over the weekend that we have gone beyond the evacuation of Americans in the Dominican Republic, and that it may be that we are acting unilaterally by taking sides in this matter. If we are, we are once again clearly outside another treaty obligation of the United States, which I hope will not continue to be a foreign policy practice of the Johnson administration.

However, it is highly important that the Organization of American States and

the members thereof live up to their obligations under the charter and under the various acts to which I referred on Friday and have briefly mentioned again today.

I regret that the Johnson administration recognized the military junta, for I appeared with other Members of the Senate at the White House with the lone voice dissenting from the proposed recognition recommended by the Department of State after it had played its cracked record again that the only way to achieve stability in the Dominican Republic would be to recognize the military junta. I warned then that to recognize the junta would create serious problems for the United States in Latin America and for the distinguished leaders of the free nations in Latin America.

I said to the President, "If you would call in those free leaders—if you would call in Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of Puerto Rico; the President of Costa Rica; the President of Colombia; the President of Venezuela; the President of Chile; and other friends in Latin America—they would give you advice directly opposite to the advice being given by the State Department. I do not think you can justify recognizing a military junta that has destroyed constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic."

I said, "I hold no brief for Bosch, because I do not know what led to his overthrow; but I do hold a brief for the constitution of the Dominican Republic, and that constitution calls for an order of succession in case there is a vacancy in the Presidency; it does not call for a military takeover."

There is no question that General Wessin y Wessin is the military dictator who has destroyed the constitution of the Dominican Republic, and we should not recognize him and should not continue to recognize his new government. We should recognize the fact that now the Organization of American States, not the United States of America, has the primary responsibility of restoring constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will recall the meeting at the White House to which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has just referred again on the floor of the Senate. I am delighted to know that he is calling together the subcommittee of which he is the chairman and which has performed so outstandingly in the affairs of Latin America, with respect to which that subcommittee has a responsibility.

Mr. President, in view of the situation which has developed in the Dominican Republic, I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words at this time. I support the humanitarian purposes of the President in dispatching marines to Santo Domingo to evacuate our nationals and those of other countries who desire to leave. It is my hope that once this is accomplished and a responsible Dominican Government assumes office that American forces can be withdrawn. I am sure that the President would like nothing better. However, we must keep in mind that there is a very confused situation in Santo Domingo and that at

present and for some days past, there has been no government in control. In the meantime, confusion and chaos range in certain parts of the city of Santo Domingo and many hundreds of lives have been lost and many hundreds of people have been wounded.

I think it wise that a protective zone has been set up for refugees within and on the outskirts of the city. I approve of what the papal nuncio has done to bring about a cease-fire and I am happy that the Secretary General of the OAS, Jose Mora, is in Santo Domingo and that subsequent to his arrival a five-man delegation representing the OAS has landed on the island, in order to assist in the process of making the cease-fire effective and in bringing some degree of order out of the chaos and disorder which exist.

I would hope that the OAS would take an even stronger stand and would consider the possibility of organizing an inter-American police force for the purpose of handling not only this situation but situations of this kind in the future.

I would suggest that the 20 states comprising the membership of the OAS could well consider the possibility of a contribution of 1 company of men numbering 300 under the direction of the OAS and to be under the command of an officer or officers from countries in the OAS other than the United States. This sort of unified OAS command could serve to inter-Americanize the present unilateral humanitarian role of the United States. The role of this unified command would be to protect noncombatants but not to engage on one side or the other in this struggle pending an OAS decision.

The President has indicated that we support no faction and no individual but that we are in Santo Domingo primarily for humanitarian purposes.

I realize, as well as does the President, that the landing of the marines awakened slumbering memories. That is understandable and is seen in some of the reactions which have followed the action. But I am glad to note that our Government is in contact with former President Juan Bosch in Puerto Rico as well as with Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela and Jose Figueres in Costa Rica. I also approve the action of the President in dispatching Ambassador Averill Harriman to Latin America for the purpose of explaining our position and former Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso for the same reason. It is well that these actions have been undertaken so that the governments and the people of Latin America can be as well informed of what we are doing as are our own people and aware of the reasons for the undertaking.

It is my belief that unless and until order is restored in Santo Domingo, the present difficulty may spread elsewhere and the situation in the Caribbean will take a turn for the worse.

It is my hope that the prompt action taken by President Johnson will help to hasten the day when order is restored, when free elections will be held which I would hope would be within the period of 30 to 90 days, and which will bring about, on the basis of a return to stability,

a withdrawal of American forces and a return to the Dominicans of a government of their own choosing to chart their own future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the President's address to the Nation.

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

JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON ISLAND CRISIS

(NOTE.—The following is a text of President Johnson's statement last night on the revolt in the Dominican Republic.)

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I have just come from a meeting with the leaders of both parties in the Congress, which was held in the Cabinet room of the White House. I briefed them on the facts of the situation in the Dominican Republic. I want to make those same facts known to all the American people and to all the world.

There are times in the affairs of nations when great principles are tested in an ordeal of conflict and danger. This is such a time for the American nations.

At stake are the lives of thousands, the liberty of a nation, and the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

That is why the hopes and the concern of this entire hemisphere are on this Sabbath of Sunday focused on the Dominican Republic.

In the dark mist of conflict and violence, revolution and confusion, it is not easy to find clear and unclouded truths.

But certain things are clear. And they require equally clear action. To understand, I think it is necessary to begin with the events of 8 or 9 days ago.

Last week our observers warned of an approaching political storm in the Dominican Republic. I immediately asked our Ambassador to return to Washington at once so that we might discuss the situation and might plan a course of conduct. But events soon outran our hopes for peace.

REVOLT ERUPTS

Saturday, April 24—8 days ago—while Ambassador Bennett was conferring with the highest officials of your government, revolution erupted in the Dominican Republic. Elements of the military forces of that country overthrew their government. However, the rebels themselves were divided. Some wanted to restore former President Juan Bosch. Others opposed his restoration. President Bosch, elected after the fall of Trujillo and his assassination, had been driven from office by an earlier revolution in the Dominican Republic.

Those who opposed Mr. Bosch's return formed a military committee in an effort to control that country. The others took to the street and they began to lead a revolt on behalf of President Bosch. Control and effective government dissolved in conflict and confusion.

Meanwhile, the United States was making a constant effort to restore peace. From Saturday afternoon onward, our Embassy urged a cease-fire, and I and all the officials of the American Government worked with every weapon at our command to achieve it.

On Tuesday, the situation of turmoil was presented to the Peace Committee of the Organization of American States.

On Wednesday, the entire Council of the Organization of American States received a full report from the Dominican Ambassador.

Meanwhile, all this time, from Saturday to Wednesday, the danger was mounting. Even though we were deeply saddened by bloodshed and violence in a close and friendly neighbor, we had no desire to interfere in the affairs of a sister republic.

DANGER CITED

On Wednesday afternoon, there was no longer any choice for the man who is your President. I was sitting in my little office reviewing the world situation with Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, and Mr. McGeorge Bundy. Shortly after 3 o'clock I received a cable from our Ambassador and he said that things were in danger, he had been informed the chief of police and governmental authorities could no longer protect us. We immediately started the necessary conference calls to be prepared.

At 5:14, almost 2 hours later, we received a cable that was labeled "critic," a word that is reserved for only the most urgent and immediate matters of national security.

The cable reported that Dominican law enforcement and military officials had informed our Embassy that the situation was completely out of control and that the police and the government could no longer give any guarantee concerning the safety of Americans or any foreign nationals.

Ambassador Bennett, who is one of our most experienced Foreign Service officers, went on in that cable to say that only an immediate landing of American forces could safeguard and protect the lives of thousands of Americans and thousands of other citizens of some 30 other countries. Ambassador Bennett urged your President to order an immediate landing.

In this situation, hesitation and vacillation could mean death for many of our people, as well as many of the citizens of other lands.

LANDINGS ORDERED

I thought that we could not and we did not hesitate. Our forces, American forces, were ordered in immediately to protect American lives. They have done that. They have attacked no one, and although some of our servicemen gave their lives, not a single American civilian and the civilian of any other nation, as a result of this protection, lost their lives.

There may be those in our own country who say that such action was good but we should have waited or we should have delayed, or we should have consulted further, or we should have called a meeting. But from the very beginning, the United States, at my instructions, had worked for a cease-fire beginning the Saturday the revolution took place. The matter was before the OAS Peace Committee on Tuesday, at our suggestion. It was before the full Council on Wednesday and when I made my announcement to the American people that evening, I announced then I was notifying the Council.

When that cable arrived, when our entire country's team in the Dominican Republic, made up of nine men—one from the Army, Navy, and Air Force, our Ambassador, our AID man, and others—said to your President unanimously: Mr. President, if you do not send forces immediately, men and women—Americans and those of other lands—will die in the streets. Well, I knew there was no time to talk, to consult, or to delay. For in this situation delay itself would be decision—the decision to risk and to lose the lives of thousands of Americans and thousands of innocent people from all lands.

I want you to know that it is not a light or an easy matter to send our American boys to another country, but I do not think that the American people expect their President to hesitate or to vacillate in the face of danger just because the decision is hard when life is in peril.

TRAGIC TURN

The revolutionary movement took a tragic turn. Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba, seeing a chance to increase disorder, to gain a foothold, joined the revolution. They took increasing control. And

May 8, 1965

what began as a popular democratic revolution, committed to democracy and social justice, very shortly moved and was taken over and really seized and placed into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators.

Many of the original leaders of the rebellion, the followers of President Bosch, took refuge in foreign embassies because they has been superseded by other evil forces, and the secretary general of the rebel government, Martinez Francisco, appealed for a cease-fire. But he was ignored. The revolution was now in other and dangerous hands.

When these new and ominous developments emerged the OAS met again and it met at the request of the United States. I am glad to say they responded wisely and decisively. A five-nation OAS team is now in the Dominican Republic acting to achieve a cease-fire to insure the safety of innocent people, to restore normal conditions, and to open a path to democratic progress.

This is the situation now.

I plead, therefore, with every person and every country in this hemisphere that would choose to do so, to contact their ambassador and the Dominican Republic directly and to get firsthand evidence of the horrors and the hardship, the violence and the terror and the international conspiracy from which U.S. servicemen have rescued the people of more than 30 nations from that war-torn land.

Earlier today I ordered two additional battalions—2,000 extra men—to proceed immediately to the Dominican Republic. In the meeting that I have just concluded with the congressional leaders—following that meeting—I directed the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to issue instructions to land an additional 4,500 men at the earliest possible moment. The distribution of food to people who have not eaten for days, the need of medical supplies and attention for the sick and wounded, the health requirements to avoid an epidemic because there are hundreds that have been dead for days that are now in the streets, and other protection and security of each individual that is caught on that island require the attention of the additional forces which I have ordered to proceed to the Dominican Republic.

EVACUATED 3,000

In addition, our servicemen have already, since they landed on Wednesday night, evacuated 3,000 persons from 30 countries in the world from this little island. But more than 5,000 people, 1,500 of whom are Americans—the others are foreign nationals—are tonight awaiting evacuation as I speak. We just must get on with that job immediately.

The evidence that we have on the revolutionary movement indicates that it took a very tragic turn. Many of them trained in Cuba, seeing a chance to increase disorder and to gain a foothold, joined the revolution. They took increasing control. What began as a popular democratic revolution that was committed to democracy and social justice moved into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators. Many of the original leaders of the rebellion, the followers of President Bosch, took refuge in foreign embassies and they are there tonight.

The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere. This was the unanimous view of all the American nations when, in January, 1962, they declared, and I quote: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system."

This is what our beloved President John F. Kennedy meant when, less than a week before his death, he told us: "We in this hemisphere must also use every resource at

our command to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere."

This is and this will be the common action and the common purpose of the democratic forces of the hemisphere. For the danger is also a common danger, and the principles are common principles.

AMBASSADORS SENT

So we have acted to summon the resources of this entire hemisphere to this task. We have sent, on my instructions the night before last, special emissaries such as Ambassador Moscoco of Puerto Rico, our very able Ambassador Averell Harriman and others to Latin America to explain the situation, to tell them the truth, and to warn them that joint action is necessary. We are in contact with such distinguished Latin American statesmen as Romulo Betancourt and Jose Figueres. We are seeking their wisdom and their counsel and their advice. We have also maintained communication with President Bosch, who has chosen to remain in Puerto Rico.

We have been consulting with the Organization of American States and our distinguished Ambassador, than whom there is no better; Ambassador Bunker has been reporting to them at great length all the actions of this Government and we have been acting in conformity with their decisions.

We know that many who are now in revolt do not seek a Communist tyranny. We think it is tragic indeed that their high motives have been misused by a small band of conspirators who receive their directions from abroad. To those who fight only for liberty and justice and progress I want to join with the Organization of American States in saying, in appealing to you tonight, to lay down your arms, and to assure you there is nothing to fear.

The road is open for you to share in building a Dominican democracy and we in America are ready and anxious and willing to help you. Your courage and your dedication are qualities which your country and all the hemisphere need for the future. You are needed to help shape that future. And neither we nor any other nation in this hemisphere can or should take it upon itself to ever interfere with the affairs of your country or any other country. We believe that change comes and we are glad it does, and it should come through peaceful process. But revolution in any country is a matter for that country to deal with. It becomes a matter calling for hemispheric action only—repeat only—when the object is the establishment of a Communist dictatorship.

SUPPORT NO FACTION

Let me also make clear tonight that we support no single man or any single group of men in the Dominican Republic. Our goal is a simple one. We are there to save the lives of our citizens and to save the lives of all people. Our goal in keeping with the great principles of the inter-American system, is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere. And we would like to do this without bloodshed or without large-scale fighting.

The form and the nature of the free Dominican Government, I assure you, is solely a matter for the Dominican people, but we do know what kind of government we hope to see in the Dominican Republic. For that is carefully spelled out in the treaties and the agreements which make up the fabric of the inter-American system. It is expressed, time and time again, in the words of our statesmen and the values and hopes which bind us all together.

We hope to see a government freely chosen by the will of all the people.

We hope to see a government dedicated to social justice for every citizen.

We hope to see a government working, every hour of every day, to feeding the hungry, to educating the ignorant, to healing

the sick—a government whose only concern is the progress and the elevation and the welfare of all the people.

For more than three decades the people of that tragic little island suffered under the weight of one of the most brutal and despotic dictatorships of the Americas. We enthusiastically supported condemnation of that government by the Organization of American States. We joined in applying sanctions, and when Trujillo was assassinated by his fellow citizens we immediately acted to protect freedom and to prevent a new tyranny; and since that time we have taken the resources from all of our people at some sacrifice to many, and we have helped them with food and with other resources, with the Peace Corps volunteers, with the AID technicians; we have helped them in the effort to build a new order of progress.

EXPRESSES SYMPATHY

How sad it is tonight that a people so long oppressed should once again be the targets of the forces of tyranny. Their long misery must weigh heavily on the heart of every citizen of this hemisphere. So I think it is our mutual responsibility to help the people of the Dominican Republic toward the day when they can freely choose the path of liberty and justice and progress. This is required of us by the agreements that we are party to and that we have signed. This is required of us by the values which bind us together.

Simon Bolivar once wrote from exile: "The veil has been torn asunder. We have already seen the light and it is not our desire to be thrust back into darkness."

Well, after decades of night the Dominican people have seen a more hopeful light and I know that the nations of this hemisphere will not let them be thrust back into the darkness.

And before I leave you, my fellow Americans, I want to say this personal word: I know that no American serviceman wants to kill anyone. I know that no American President wants to give an order which brings shooting and casualties and death. I want you to know and I want the world to know that as long as I am President of this country, we are going to defend ourselves. We will defend our soldiers against attackers. We will honor our treaties. We will keep our commitments. We will defend our Nation against all those who seek to destroy not only the United States but every free country of this hemisphere. We do not want to bury anyone as I have said so many times before. But we do not intend to be buried.

Thank you. God bless you. Good night.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Montana says he is in full accord with what the President has done. Does the Senator believe that as many as 14,000 to 15,000 soldiers are required to remove the few Americans who are in Santo Domingo now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand there are more than a few Americans remaining. It is my understanding that at the present time there are 5,000 nationals of other countries in the Dominican Republic, and that of these approximately 1,500 are Americans.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should we protect the others?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Someone should protect them. We are the only power, evidently, that is capable of doing so. I think this is a good humanitarian purpose.

May 3, 1965

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt of that so far as American personnel are concerned; but I do not know how we shall be able to explain this action to the world in view of what we are doing in South Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President has done his best to explain the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I heard him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think he had a right to undertake the action he took on his own responsibility to evacuate Americans who were in peril and who may well be in peril, because a certain part of the city of Santo Domingo is still very unsafe.

There is a question of taking care of not only nationals other than Dominicans but of Dominicans as well, because I understand that disease is rampant, and that there is a need for medical and Red Cross facilities, for food, and for other items which are very badly needed at the present time.

I think anyone would approve of the humanitarian aspects of what the President of the United States has done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have we been given assurance that our forces in the Dominican Republic are not taking sides?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have been given that assurance by the President. They have taken no sides so far as any group is concerned, nor have they taken any sides so far as any individual is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. The group that is in control there now, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has just stated, is a junta that was installed 2 or 3 years ago. I understand it is consulting with Mr. Bosch, who was thrown out by the present junta.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The 3 minutes allotted to the Senator from Montana have expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Montana would give his view on that aspect, since we are consulting with Mr. Bosch, and, doubtless with the junta that is there now, and since the present junta and Bosch are aligned one against the other.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we shall probably be accused of taking sides. However, we can accept the word of the President of the United States that we will not take sides with any individual or group, and that includes General Wessin y Wessin, who is the man in charge of the Army tank corps, I believe, in Santo Domingo, and who participated in the revolt—in what way, I am not at all clear at the moment. However, so far as I am concerned and know, he is not the government in Santo Domingo because there is no government in existence at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that our marines will be out of Santo Domingo at an early date. Anytime anything occurs in the world, we seem to be the only country that does

the job of protecting the lives of people. Also, I presume, we shall be called upon to feed the people of that area.

It would seem to me that the quicker the OAS can get to work and send in their own resources instead of letting us carry the ball, the better off we shall be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with that statement. I wish that the OAS would take a greater responsibility. I wish we in this hemisphere could react in a cooperative manner when such incidents occur in the Latin American States. The primary responsibility is not ours. It is the responsibility of the Organization of American States. However, if they do not act, we do not have much choice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Montana find it strange that one of the chief critics of the position we are now taking in Santo Domingo is the Government of Venezuela. If I am to judge from what is reported in the newspapers, the Government of Venezuela says that we should not have gone in there. Yet, as I understand, one of the reasons which caused the overthrow of Trujillo was the pressure brought to bear by the Government of Venezuela. There was never any love lost between Betancourt and Trujillo.

I do not say we aided in bringing it about, but Trujillo was thrown out and later assassinated. There was a promise, as I remember, that the Government of Venezuela would exert its efforts in trying to throw Castro out. We delivered on our promise, but they did not. Of all people, the Government of Venezuela should be the last to find fault with what we are now doing in Santo Domingo.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have noted the reaction of Venezuela and other Latin American nations as well. I can well understand, at least in part, how they feel. What has been done in Santo Domingo, despite the fact that it was being done for humanitarian purposes, has revived memories of American intervention over the decades stretching back to 40 or 50 years ago.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Montana for the statement he just made.

It is my understanding that the President has sent the Marines and other troops into Santo Domingo to protect American lives primarily. It is our responsibility to protect American lives. The Organization of American States, as I understand it, is set up under terms which make it difficult for it to act quickly. It is also my understanding that we certainly will share the responsibility with the Organization of American States as soon as the Organization of American States is capable or willing to take its share of the responsibility.

It is also my understanding that we are taking no part at the present time in Santo Domingo affairs because there is really no government down there with which we can take part. However, the Senator from Louisiana has brought up the issue of the lives of other national-

ities. These individuals are human beings, and if we have the resources to go down there and protect our American citizens and save their lives, which is our obligation, then if we can also save the lives of other human beings, I am in favor of doing so.

I commend the Senator from Montana for his statement. I believe his statement accurately reflects the policy of our Government at the present time, with which policy I am in full accord.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any further comments, but the colloquy which has taken place causes me to say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that we had better keep in mind that two issues are involved. One is the right of the United States to protect the lives of Americans in the Dominican Republic.

When I spoke on Friday afternoon, I said that there was no question about the right of the President to take that action. I made it perfectly clear that the exercise of that right did not give the United States any right to take sides in the revolution that was taking place. However, I shall wait, before making a final commitment, for the briefing this afternoon. There seems to be a strong indication that we have, in effect, stopped the revolution, on the ground that some Communists may be involved in it. As former President Bosch said, it may be that some Communists are involved. Communists will be involved in every uprising in the world—let us face up to that. However, President Bosch also made clear that the Communists are not in control of the situation.

I am particularly worried that the facts may support the charge that we put down the revolt by aiding the tyrannical military junta which we should never have recognized in the first place. From the very beginning we have given our aid and assistance to that military junta. We have strengthened the military control over the people in Santo Domingo. To that extent, we have suppressed freedom in another Latin American country. Once again, we have played into their hands by proving that whenever the chips are down in Latin America, with a junta involved, the United States always ends up on the side of the junta.

That is the warning that I gave at the White House many months ago. That warning has proved to be true, as has been the case for too long a time in Latin America.

I say to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], that the Organization of American States is not as impotent as the remarks of the Senator would lead one to believe.

The Organization of American States can move quickly in regard to a political issue. It should try to move quickly in regard to humanitarian issues. I do not want at this time to be associated with the approval of announcements which have been coming from the White House over the weekend, to the effect that we are going to stand guard in cooperation with a revolt such as this on the ground that it is thought that some 58 Communists are associated with the revolt.

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8911

I would be surprised if there were not more than 58 individuals who have Communist leanings. However, the fact is that the revolt is being conducted by a segment of the army that was in revolt against the military junta in the Dominican Republic.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was a substantial amount of the Dominican Republic that was behind Bosch when he was President. They had no objection to the carrying out of the policy of Bosch that the military should be under the control of the civilian government. The tyrant General Wessin ran the show and finally got the support of the United States. It was a sad day when the Johnson administration recognized that military tyranny in the Dominican Republic.

I agree with the Senator from Montana. I completely support his recommendation that there ought to be an Organization of American States takeover so far as jurisdiction is concerned in respect to the political issue that is involved.

Mr. President, are we really going to announce to the world now that, in the Western Hemisphere, or elsewhere, whenever we think there is going to be a revolution, American military forces are going to be sent in? Have we lost our minds? Have we become militarily power drunk? Do we really think we can use our military might for regulating the world? If that is our policy, I say to the American people, "You had better take stock of the policy of the American Government." That is why I said on Friday, and I repeat today, that the Foreign Relations Committee had better get busy and start to exercise its responsibility to the people by exercising the responsibility of the checks which are placed in the Congress as contained in the Constitution. Last Friday that it was an "iffy" question. It still is, so far as the facts are concerned. But if we seek to intervene in the Western Hemisphere, or elsewhere, whenever we think the issue of Communists has been raised, in connection with refugees, that is not the way to beat the Communists. The way to beat the Communists and to hold them in check is to take our case to the other nations likewise bound by their treaty obligations, and obtain joint action, instead of American unilateral action, because that is where we are headed. The signatories to the Organization of American States Charter have already signed three agreements to stand together to prevent the spread of communism. That is the way to get appropriate action.

So far as the remarks of the Senator from Montana and the broad outline he has stated are concerned, I associate myself with him in wanting to get the OAS into the picture, and quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it may be that we are talking ahead of time because the facts of the situation are not yet fully known. But I cannot help recalling that prior to this occurrence we have spent in excess of \$103 million in order to assist the people of that area, since the fall of the Trujillo regime. This year we are in the process of spending more money. There must be something wrong with our intelligence that the Dominican danger could not be detected before it occurred so we could have obtained assistance from other nations or made recommendations to the OAS.

As the Senator from Oregon has stated, whenever there is trouble in South or Central America, it seems necessary for us to send marines to protect our own people; and here we have sent as many as 14,000 to take care of 1,500 Americans. There is something highly suspect about that. The situation did not arise in the past 7 or 8 days. It must have been going on for quite a time. The danger should have been foreseen by our intelligence.

We took it on ourselves to recognize a government which was not a democratic government by far. I would not even begin to compare it with the government of Trujillo. The government of Trujillo was far superior to that of Bosch or any of his predecessors.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, prior to sending the Marines to Santo Domingo the President consulted with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, both the leaders and the whips of both Houses, Democratic as well as Republican Members. He explained the situation as he saw it. He asked us if there were any questions or what our suggestions would be.

As one Member of this body, I would say that if the President had sat idly by while the Communists took over another nation, the American people would have been slow to forgive him.

Any time this Nation must resort to force in its foreign policy, it does so with reluctance.

Had a previous President, several years ago, recognized the possibility of a takeover in Cuba by a Communist power and put 15,000 men there, including a high percentage of Marines, Castro would not now be holding Cuba in his control and we would not have a Communist dagger pointed against the heart of America.

The President has used the best judgment available to him. In the view of this Senator, he has made the right decision. In my opinion, the President has acted on the best advice available to him, and has acted to protect America's interest.

So far as this Senator is concerned, I could have advised no differently. If the President believed that American lives were in danger; that there was no real government in the country involved, and that the Communists were about to take over, it is my judgment that it became his duty to the American people to see that the interests of our hemisphere, and particularly of our own Nation, were protected. This Senator is

one who advised the President to take the action he did; and I do not regret it.

POLAND: IN TRIBUTE TO A GREAT NATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, today we commemorate the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution. For Poland, this was a joyous occasion. It gave the Polish people an instrument through which constitutional government and national stability could be achieved. It held the promise of a great national destiny.

On the morning of May 3, 1791, the Polish Diet convened, and King Stanislas produced the draft of the new Constitution which he had been in the process of drafting since September 1789. The document was read aloud and submitted to the Diet. By an overwhelming vote the Constitution was accepted. Only a small number of reactionaries dissented. Immediately, Stanislas, rising on his throne, took an oath to the new Constitution. Then, with the assembled legislators, dignitaries, and people he marched in a procession to the nearby Church of St. John where a *te deum* was sung. That evening all Warsaw celebrated. This was a joyous occasion for all Poles, and for the next week celebrations were staged throughout the cities and towns of Poland. According to one historian, all Poland "seemed intoxicated with joy."

News of the May 3 Constitution was praised abroad as a solid achievement. Edmund Burke called it "a great work."

Humanity must rejoice and glory—

He wrote—
when it considers the change in Poland.

In America, President Washington hailed these "unexpected strides toward liberty" in Poland as reflecting "great honor" on the Polish King.

The great significance of the May 3 Constitution lies in the fact that Poland now had within its possession the essential instruments that could mean the flowering of constitutional democracy. The principle of ministerial responsibility, undoubtedly the most important key to democratic constitutionalism, was a prominent feature of this document. Political representation was extended, and the peasantry, long subjected to the arbitrary will of masters, was brought under the protection of the law. According to Burke, the Polish Constitution "contained seeds of continuous improvement, being built on the same principles which make our British Constitution so excellent."

The promise of this Constitution was not, however, fulfilled. The fault lay not in the Constitution; it lay not in the Polish people; it lay in the greed of Russia. For the Russians, eager for expansion westward, intervened militarily, destroyed the Constitution, and partitioned a defeated Poland. The Russians could not tolerate a strong and independent Poland. But, more important, was the fact that the Russians could not tolerate a Poland whose Gov-

ernment was founded on the principles of democracy.

Russia destroyed Poland's chance for freedom then, and it has ever since sought the reduction of Poland to the status of a vassal state. In the opening phase of World War II, the Russians joined Nazi Germany in an invasion of Poland which ended in the total destruction and partition of the Polish State. Not content to destroy the institutional structure of government, the Russians destroyed the flower of Polish leadership in the forests of Katyn. There, in the spring of 1940, 25 years ago, the Soviets murdered thousands of young Polish officers. Many thousands more have never been accounted for. By destroying these young men, the Russians were eliminating one substantial obstacle to their eventual conquest of Poland.

As World War II came to an end, Poland, along with the other nations of Eastern Europe, had been virtually consumed by the conquering Soviet armies. The United States, then carrying the brunt of the fighting in Western Europe, had never been able to extend its power beyond Central Europe. Unfortunately for all Eastern Europeans, the Russian armies got there before the Allies; and it is a significant fact that Soviet political conquests had never exceeded the boundaries of their military conquest. It was the Red Army that established the Iron Curtain. Moreover, the United States had also been burdened with the great task of defeating Japan in the Pacific, a war which by the best military judgment was expected to extend into 1947. Circumscribed by the harsh realities of this situation, the American people could do only what was in their power; namely, to formulate an international agreement insuring free and unfettered elections in the liberated areas of Europe. However, the Soviets were not prepared to permit freedom in Poland or anywhere else in Eastern Europe where their military power had been asserted and established. That the Soviets were prepared to resort to the most ruthless devices in order to achieve their goals was demonstrated by the massacre at Katyn, the Warsaw uprising of 1944 in which the Russians permitted the destruction of the Polish underground by Nazi forces, and finally the seizure of the Polish underground government.

Since those dismal and tragic days of 1945, Poland has been a nation imprisoned. Her people continue to suffer from an oppression that bears down upon the whole land. Will the Polish people survive this new ordeal that history has thrust upon them? Perhaps, our best answer to this question is to cite the historical reality that Poland this year is now celebrating its 1000th anniversary as a formally established nation-state. In those years the Polish people have known glory and tragedy, freedom and tyranny; but they have survived and lived to flourish again as a nation. And this they shall do again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on May 3, 1791, 174 years ago today, a new constitution was adopted by the Polish nation. It established, for the first time in that country, the principle

of the responsibility of the ruler to the representatives of the people. That was a momentous occasion for the Polish people; and it is remembered today by all people of Polish extraction, many of whom reside in their native land without the freedoms which their countrymen had so valiantly worked to obtain in 1791.

The constitution of 1791 not only established a constitutional monarchy and a responsible cabinet, but also erased class distinctions and extended the protection of the laws and the guarantee of civil liberties to all the people. It embodied the basic philosophy of the inherent dignity of the individual and his alienable right to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which was the philosophic cornerstone of our own Constitution, adopted 2 years earlier. The constitution gave promise to the Poles of a new and better life.

But the freedom gained under the new constitution was of short duration. At the direction of Catherine the Great, Poland was invaded by Russian armies on April 8, 1792. The ensuing war ended in her defeat and subsequent partition.

The Poles have made many significant contributions to the enrichment of life here in the United States. It has been my privilege to know and to work with many of them who have settled in Massachusetts.

Today, we join with the more than 7 million Polish-Americans and people of Polish ancestry throughout the world in observing this 174th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. We hope the time is not far off when freedom and independence will again be restored to that nation.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today is Constitution Day for citizens of Polish origin throughout the world. Wherever Americans of Polish descent live, this Polish national holiday is observed with appropriate exercises, to pay tribute to the Polish nation. On this day, I remind my Senate colleagues that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

As we look at a world in continuing revolutionary disorder today, it is amazing to note that on May 3, 1791, Poland succeeded in reforming her public life and in erasing her internal decline, without bloodshed.

But, as history tells us, this great rebirth and assertion of liberal view and social enhancement came to the Poles, only to be blighted in 1795 by the third partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. That partition set the stage of Poland's history to this day.

Nevertheless, the light of liberalism shed in 1791 has continued through the years, and remains today a threat to tyranny and despotism in Russia and Germany. The words of the Polish 3d of May constitution which lit the torch of European liberalism still echo, along with the words of our American Founding Fathers in the halls of liberty. They are worthy of repetition today in the Senate Chamber.

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, within 2 years after the adoption of the American Constitution by its Constitutional Convention, Poland wrote its own charter of freedom affirming its commitment to "the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society." Today is the anniversary of that historic May 3, 1791, when a liberal democracy was established in Poland without bloodshed or disorder. Born of the same recognition of individual uniqueness, the importance of personal freedom, and the necessity for united endeavors, the Constitutions of the young American nation and the historical Polish state have joined and sustained both our countries in the long fight to guarantee and preserve these liberties for our citizens.

The ideals which animated the Polish Constitution of 1791 have withstood and survived the numerous onslaughts upon her governments. It is fitting that today, we also commemorate three historical incidents which are milestones in the Polish effort to implement their ideals. Twenty-five years ago it was discovered that thousands of courageous scientists, professors, chaplains, and civilians had given their lives during the Katyn massacre in an effort to preserve the integrity of the state against the demoralizing forces of the Soviet Union. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the imprisonment of 16 members of free Poland's underground government who were willing to sacrifice personal freedom as a consequence of determined efforts to assure civil liberty to their countrymen. Poland is now approaching the anniversary of the date when, 1,000 years ago, it adopted Christianity and thereby joined its civilization to that of the West. During the ensuing millennium this nation has, through the creative force of its good and ordered society, contributed to the cultural development and defense of the European nations.

The commitment to individual freedom in a united democratic society is very much alive today. When I was in Poland in 1962, I was most impressed by the spiritual strength and progressive outlook of the people—especially evident in the churches and schools where a nation looks for guidance. When I spoke to the university students who will be leading their country to a dynamic future, I was encouraged by their strong belief in the Catholic faith and by their deep interest in achieving professional competence.

Here, in the United States, we should be proud and grateful not only for the great deeds of Polish heroes such as Casimir Pulaski who gave his life for us during the American Revolution, but also for the fine work being done by Americans of Polish ancestry in councils and as individuals throughout the country as they continue the effort to keep the world aware of the sacrifice a nation is

May 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8937

We were ready to applaud President Johnson when he said he would not allow himself to be "blackjacked" into taking hasty action in the organized disorders at Selma, Ala. Yet in his broadcast speech, he recited the refrain of the demonstrators' theme song. Then he sent to Congress a bill that met practically all the demands made by Martin Luther King in an article in the New York Times a week before.

We do not quarrel with the necessity for Government action, although both the 14th amendment and the existing Civil Rights Act provide plenty of channels for enforcement of voting rights. We agree with the President that there is no constitutional issue insofar as national elections are concerned, although we seriously question the jurisdiction over State and local elections.

But there is an issue which he did not even mention, which is vital to the stability of our American governmental system. This is the issue we stated at the beginning—government by intimidation and the same kind of double standard being applied by the Federal Government against certain States that it accuses the States of using against some of its citizens.

Martin Luther King knows very well that voters registration is governed by State laws. He knew that Dallas County had no power to change the laws of Alabama. Yet he organized marches even after they had led to rioting, bloodshed, and even murder. He called on the National Council of Churches for nationwide demonstrations by the clergy to make his case a religious issue. We cannot honestly believe that the purpose was anything other than to bully the Congress into enacting a national law on registration.

He defied a legitimate Federal court injunction not to proceed with the Montgomery march, while expecting others to obey such injunctions when they agree with his goals.

Why did he not do as the Negro leaders did in Louisiana? They challenged the registration law in the courts and won their case without spilling a drop of blood.

It is not enough to say that it was in a good cause that one small city was made the scapegoat of a national emotional binge. Government by street demonstration is divided by only a thin line from mob rule. If it keeps on, there won't be any civil rights left to argue over.

Mr. President, if there is a Member of this body who wishes to defend Martin Luther King for violating the Federal court order in Alabama, I wish him to take the floor during this debate and try to defend him in this action.

Those who oppose the pending bill have the right to hear from those who are proposing the bill in defense of Martin Luther King. It was Martin Luther King's action in Alabama in creating there a volatile situation, in causing the wheels to be set in motion which resulted in violence, which in turn resulted in emotionalism all over this Nation, and which brought the demand for the so-called voting rights law of 1965.

If they wish to defend Martin Luther King for violating that court order, we wish to hear them. The law they are trying to have enacted by Congress originated in violence, originated with a man who has intentionally and willfully and maliciously violated a Federal court order at Selma, Ala.

The U.S. News & World Report on March 29, 1965, presented an editorial entitled "Bowing to the New Extremists," written by David Lawrence. The editorial reads as follows:

BOWING TO THE NEW EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States appears to have bowed to a new set of extremists.

The President, in an emotional address to a joint session of both Houses of Congress, described in general terms an unprecedented piece of legislation on voting rights and demanded that it be promptly passed. The text of the bill, however, wasn't even made public until later in the week. Members of the Supreme Court, attired in their judicial robes, sat in the front row in the House Chamber during the proceedings and joined in the applause for the President's speech.

The sweeping proposals which the President virtually ordered Congress to pass were pressured by street demonstrations, violent and nonviolent, sit-ins and lie-ins in many parts of the country and even inside the White House, as well as the Capitol and other Federal buildings. All this was designed to stampede the Chief Executive and Congress to brush aside the Constitution and to accept the extremist doctrine that "the end justifies the means." The tactics of the demonstrators triumphed.

The Constitution explicitly gives to each State the power to determine the qualifications of voters in National, State and local elections. The Constitution also declares that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color.

The new proposal arbitrarily singles out those States in the Union which, on November 1, 1964, happened to have registered less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the State or in any political subdivision, or in which less than 50 percent of such residents voted in the presidential election last November.

This is a statistical yardstick which would automatically adjudge as guilty of discrimination a State which had used any literacy test if in such a State less than half of the population of voting age had been registered to vote or if "any person acting under color of law" had in the previous 10 years engaged in any act denying the right to vote because of race or color.

An appeal to a three-judge court—only in Washington—would be allowed. Instead of the usual presumption of innocence for a defendant, the bill would establish a presumption of guilt for the suspected State or county. The governmental body not only would have to prove that it was not guilty of an act of discrimination on a specific date but also of any other such act on any other date in the preceding 10 years.

The bill, moreover, would strike down in those States any "test or device" that may have been used in the past years, even though State laws may have sought to establish whether or not an applicant had the ability to read and write, or may have prescribed some other standard test of literacy such as the Supreme Court of the United States itself upheld as recently as 1959.

To select certain States or areas and apply one kind of law to them while permitting other States and subdivisions to be immune from such interference is a conspicuous violation of the Constitution.

The whole controversy has revealed a disregard of basic constitutionalism. It is motivated by the reasoning of those who have argued that two wrongs make a right. It grows out of the rationalization, which so many people are making today, that, because injustices have been committed and discrimination has once been practiced on a wide scale in certain areas of the country, it is permissible now to diminish the rights of the States themselves.

Have we come to the point where the Congress of the United States may decide on whether a State will be permitted to re-

main in the Union? Have we reached a position where the national legislative body will do again what it did 100 years ago after the War Between the States had ended? The same State legislatures which had ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, were suddenly declared illegal by Congress when they rejected the 14th amendment. New legislatures were ordered to assemble and in some instances Federal troops were sent into the legislative chambers to compel "ratification" of the 14th and later the 15th amendment.

This was what happened in the Reconstruction period in American history. Are we to go through another such tragic era because of the submissiveness of both a Congress and a President to the dictates of pressure groups whose emotional demonstrations cause friction and disorder?

It is a sad story. Organized incitement to violence has swept many areas of the country. To yield to such demonstrations is to weaken the whole fabric of democracy and to encourage mobocracy.

It is a time for the processes of reason to supersede the hysteria of impassioned groups of citizens. For, granting that they have been unjustly treated, are there no ways to accomplish effective reforms except by violent demonstrations and a distortion of the basic provisions of the Constitution? Or must we continue to bow to the new extremists?

These articles point out what is occurring in some of the demonstrations. Again I wish to tell my colleagues in the Senate that although they call these demonstrations nonviolent, nonviolent they should be, but provocative they must be. They must be provocative for the purpose of creating, originating, and generating resistance and thereby, violence. Violence for what purpose? Violence to attract attention for the purpose of raising money for Negro leaders throughout the Nation to carry on their nefarious work; and for the second purpose of creating emotionalism throughout the country, to arouse some people sufficiently to demand that Congress enact a law which will bring more power to Washington and take it away from the States and the people, where the Constitution put it.

Those are the purposes of the demonstrations. These tactics have, unfortunately, been highly successful and they will continue to be so until the American public realizes the true nature and purpose of the demonstrations and demands an end to them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

OK
THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the United Nations Security Council meets today to patiently listen to the Soviet Union's denunciation of President Johnson's action in sending troops into the Dominican Republic.

Out of this meeting will come the charges of "aggression" by the United

May 3, 1965

8938

States. And there will be many, in this country and abroad, who will echo them.

There will be those who will choose to ignore the wisdom of President Johnson's action in moving promptly to prevent another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere—an action, incidentally, which I support.

There will be those who will choose to ignore President Johnson's words that some of the Communist conspirators in the Dominican Republic revolt were trained in Cuba.

In light of these expectations, I believe it is imperative that the American people, and others, be reminded of what has gone on before. And there is no better way than to put on the table again official findings.

A report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee of May 9, 1963, asserted:

The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas.

On June 4, 1963, the Council of the Organization of American States pointed out that—

Communism has found subversion to be the most effective means of winning peoples and territory, without the tremendous risks it might run in a world war.

It then remarked:

This subversion, with techniques that extend from insidious infiltration to violent intervention, is conceived, developed, and perfected constantly in the world and regional centers of communism, in accordance with the particular circumstances. Its purpose, however, is one: to replace the political, economic, and social order existing in a country by a new order that presupposes the total physical and moral control of the people.

Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America. This is true not only with regard to the spread of the Communist ideology, but also, and what is more dangerous, because it constitutes a nearby center for training agents of every kind whose function it is to carry on subversion in the countries of this hemisphere.

It is an obvious fact that as the Communist regime became consolidated in Cuba, a number of schools and centers for training in the techniques of subversion were organized. A large number of Latin Americans attend these centers, where they receive instruction not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on, in order to apply them later on in their respective countries. The cadres of instructors in these schools are made up not only of Cubans and other Latin Americans, but also of Russians, Czechoslovakians, Chinese, and others.

Lest there be a tendency to disregard these statements, I wish to underscore what Premier Castro had to say of his designs and purposes as dictator of Cuba. Any student of history—and of communism—will know that the words Castro spoke on January 16, 1963, at the closing session of the Congress of Women of the Americas, amounted to a declaration of

war against other nations in the Western Hemisphere. Here is what he said:

We must think about how to change that situation—

That is, social and economic conditions in Latin America.

There are persons who are experts on figures, but what is needed are experts on changing the situation, experts on leading peoples in revolutions. That is the art of the revolutionaries, the art that must be learned and developed. How to bring the masses to the struggle.

It is the masses who make history, but for them to make history, the masses must be taken to the battle. That is the duty of leaders and the revolutionary organizations: to make the masses march, to launch the masses into battle. That is what they did in Algeria. And that is what the patriots are doing in South Vietnam. They have sent the masses into battle with correct methods, correct tactics, and they have brought the greatest amount of the masses into the battle.

But if we tell the masses what the situation is, they must also be told what the road is. We must bring them to the struggle, because that road is much easier in many Latin American countries than it was in Cuba.

Finally, I should like to draw upon a resolution adopted by the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States in late July of 1964. They warned:

The Government of Cuba that if it should persist in carrying out acts that possess characteristics of aggression and intervention against one or more of the member states of the organization, these states shall maintain their essential rights as sovereign nations by means of the use of individual or collective self-defense, which could go so far as resort to armed force, until such time as the origin of consultation takes measures to insure the peace and security of the continent.

To those who would say that Castro's regime holds no threat to the Western Hemisphere, I would say: Read the concern of the officials of other hemisphere nations.

To those who would say that Castro's regime is failing, I would say: You had better realize that we have never seen a Communist government overturned under the same situations that Cuba has today.

I, for one, am pleased that the Monroe Doctrine appears to have undergone a new rebirth as the result of President Johnson's affirmative action. This policy of firmness of action has long been overdue.

And I would hasten to add: My support for President Johnson will continue so long as this policy of firmness continues.

I think the time is appropriate to review the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine. It is an expression of the right of self-defense by the United States. It was announced by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823. He said that we would regard any attempt on the part of any foreign power to extend its system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

On December 17, 1895, President Cleveland said that the Monroe Doctrine upon

which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions.

There is little doubt that Castro's movements are being directed from the Soviet Union and other Communist headquarters.

There is little doubt that Cuba is a source of weapons, provocateurs, saboteurs, agents of revolution, and of chaos, as one report described that nation only 90 miles from our shores.

There is little doubt that international communism now has a firm foothold in this hemisphere and, if we permit it to remain this way, it is here to stay. For as the Preparedness Subcommittee pointed out, by a process of erosion our neighbors to the south may fall, nation by nation, until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Despite the objections it knew would be forthcoming, the administration had to face up to a course of action in the Dominican Republic: It could not ignore the plight of the Americans there, and it could not ignore the potential of another Cuba.

I know that the United States will be criticized for acting unilaterally. But under the circumstances and considering the need for promptness, there was not much else to do; and the United States did call the Organization of American States, and the United States did notify the United Nations. But had we failed to act promptly, the possibility existed that American lives would be lost and the Western Hemisphere would have a second Cuba.

I know there will be criticism for allegedly intervening in the affairs of a sovereign nation. But the facts here override the fiction of a sovereign government, for under the revolutionaries and the Communists, the Dominican Republic had none.

American policy must rest on certain premises and certain objectives:

First. A policy of firmness.
Second. A need to halt the inroads of communism, through subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare.

Third. The necessity of preventing other Cubas in the Western Hemisphere.

The decisive action in the Dominican Republic is in line with this policy.

But I would warn that the American people must have the facts at all times. There must be no reluctance to provide these facts.

Also, there must be no abuse of our power because of imagined fears. The American people will rally behind our President when the use of this power is just. But if they are told one thing, when another is true, distaste will set in.

The New York Times, in an editorial published today, takes note of this question:

In ordering several thousand more marines and paratroopers into Santo Domingo Saturday night, President Johnson reiterated that the sole mission was to protect and evacuate endangered Americans and other foreign nationals. Last night the President went on

May 3, 1965

television to confirm what Congressmen and correspondents in Washington had been told privately from the start of the Dominican rebellion—that the primary aim of the U.S. military involvement is to prevent "another Cuba."

Thus, the official explanation has finally caught up with the one consistently given by authoritative administration briefings. The President now tells the Nation that the revolt began as "An action dedicated to social justice" but it took a sinister turn when Communists seized control.

What remains unexplained is why no slightest expression of sympathy for the revolt's aims came from Washington in the period when the massing of American troops was decided upon. The clear effect of their influx was to strengthen the ruling military junta in its efforts to block the restoration of Juan Bosch as President.

The President's unwillingness to see another Communist state established in this hemisphere will command national support. But the question that needs a much clearer answer is whether a rightwing dictatorship in Santo Domingo has not traded on U.S. fears of communism to preserve its power in a country still scarred by three decades of brutal regression under Generalissimo Trujillo.

Mr. President, this is a question which should be answered. In view of what has occurred, I would suggest that the time is ripe for the President to take some action on Cuba.

I believe the first step should be the recognition of a government in exile. It should be representative of all the various elements now in exile from their homeland. I feel that this would serve notice on Premier Castro that, in fact, we no longer recognize his regime and that we are going to put a stop to what he has been doing to subvert Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD:

First. From the U.S. News & World Report of May 10, 1965: Articles entitled, "War Steps Up—Where It's Headed"; "Full Story of Caribbean War: How Reds Plotted a Takeover"; and "Communist Strategy for Latin America."

Second. A list of Castro's top priorities in Latin America, as reported in the March 3, 1965, issue of "The Vision Letter," an authoritative newsletter analysis of Latin American affairs.

Third. An editorial entitled "Dominican Troop Buildup," published in the New York Times of May 3, 1965.

Fourth. An editorial entitled "From Saigon to Santo Domingo," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 3, 1965.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report]

WAR STEPS UP—WHERE IT'S HEADED

(NOTE.—A Red threat, and U.S. marines moved in fast in the Caribbean—as they had gone into action in South Vietnam. Meaning: United States is making it clear to the Communists that their days of easy conquest are at an end.)

The U.S. marines were back in action again on recent days in two widely separated parts of the world.

In Vietnam, marines began for the first time to operate as units against a Communist enemy, not merely as advisers to South Vietnamese armed forces.

Then, on April 28, President Johnson sent marines into the Dominican Republic. There the lives of 1,300 U.S. citizens were endangered. Civilians, including organized Communists, had been given arms and roamed the streets.

On April 29, several snipers opened fire on U.S. marines who were guarding Americans. They were driven off by marine return fire which killed at least two. By April 30, one marine had been killed and six wounded fighting beside Dominican troops against ragtag gangs of armed toughs.

Communists backed by Castro's Reds in Havana were out to take over the country in the confusion if they could. By week's end there were over 4,200 U.S. marines and U.S. Army paratroopers in the Dominican Republic.

U.S. marines were making their first landing in the Caribbean area since 1926—nearly 40 years ago—when they landed in Nicaragua. U.S. occupation of the Dominican Republic, begun in 1916, had ended in 1924.

No U.S. troops had remained in any Latin-American country as combat troops since the Franklin D. Roosevelt Good Neighbor policy of 1934.

U.S. POLICY HARDENS

This time U.S. troops were moved into a position to block another Communist try for a take-over of a Latin-American government, as in Cuba.

The United States today is the possessor of immense military strength. That strength had been applied but rarely in recent years. There had been concern in the White House and in Congress over what might be said at home and abroad about the wider use of such power.

A Communist dictator, Fidel Castro, took over the island of Cuba, 90 miles from the United States, and remained there after defeating one U.S.-sponsored invasion effort. Powerful U.S. military forces were kept offshore on that occasion.

Mr. Johnson, his advisers indicate, now is determined to make it clear to the world that the withholding of U.S. power in key crises can no longer be counted upon by the enemies of the United States. This attitude in the White House has been brought about by growing concern over Communist aggression and Communist preparations for more subversion.

Of late, officials say, Communists have been growing bolder in Latin America. Assassination plots, apparently financed by Russian Communists using Italian Reds as their agents, were uncovered recently in Venezuela. Similar plots have been blocked in Colombia and Chile.

BIGGER RED ATTACKS AHEAD?

In Vietnam, as the month of May began, there was no real sign of a Communist willingness to talk peace on any terms other than a U.S. withdrawal—a virtual surrender of South Vietnam to the Communists. Communist forces in South Vietnam were reported gathering for large-scale attacks.

President Johnson already had met Communist attacks on American advisers in Vietnam by taking the tag of privileged sanctuary off Communist North Vietnam. Since February, U.S. bombers have been striking at carefully selected military objectives in the Communist-ruled country which is keeping the war in South Vietnam going.

As April ended, the highest officials in Washington set out to explain once again why Americans are fighting a war in far-off Vietnam. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, on April 23 made a major address designed to clarify issues and explain American actions. On April 22 and 23 there had been background conferences, with officials not publicly identified, reporting on the war's progress.

It was in these conferences that officials made clear a readiness to use nuclear weapons if the Vietnamese war expanded to a point where such weapons were required. At present and in the immediate future, it was said, nuclear weapons were not needed nor was there any plan to use them. However, such weapons are near the battle areas.

M'NAMARA AND LBJ ON THE AIR

On April 26, Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, went on the air to give the American people an account of what has been happening in Vietnam. President Johnson, in a televised news conference on April 27, restated the U.S. position in Vietnam and reiterated the U.S. desire to talk peace. But the President also reported that he knew of no change in the Communist position. Mr. Johnson indicated he had drawn nothing but abuse from the Reds for his offer of negotiations and of a billion-dollar contribution to a peaceful development of southeast Asia.

All U.S. high officials made it plain that attacks may be carried deeper into Communist territory if North Vietnam and Red China throw more forces directly into this war.

It is in Vietnam, as the highest U.S. officials see it, that the U.S. now has determined to stand up to the first real test of a form of aggression which the Communists have given a new propaganda label: "wars of national liberation."

Wars so named by Communists are those conflicts or potential conflicts in countries where Communist elements are strong enough to dominate the groups standing in open opposition to a non-Communist government. This is a purely propaganda term—the revolt of Hungarians in 1956, for example, could not have been designated a "war of national liberation" by Communists because Communists were in control of the country which the rebels sought to liberate.

Fidel Castro's successful war to take over Cuba is called by Communists—in retrospect—a "war of national liberation" because, soon after his victory, Castro admitted he was a Marxist and placed Communists in positions of power.

PERFECT FOR LIBERATION

The conflict in Vietnam is regarded by the Communists as a perfect "war of liberation." The country is divided and guerrillas in the south are reinforced, supplied, and led by Communists from North Vietnam, backed by Red China. Since 1954, the U.S. has been advising and aiding the South Vietnamese while Communist North Vietnam and Red China have been mounting an attack on South Vietnam through support for the guerrillas there.

It is in Vietnam that the U.S. is taking a firm stand. It refused to halt bombing or withdraw U.S. troops so long as the Communists continued their aggression. Why is Vietnam chosen for such a stand?

Answer given by U.S. officials is that the U.S. has commitments to defend many countries of the world—commitments such as those the U.S. entered into in Vietnam 10 years ago. If Communists were allowed to win in Vietnam by a U.S. default, then Communist "wars of liberation" would be certain to follow in Thailand, the Philippines, in the Congo, in Venezuela—step by step, in many other countries of the world that look to the United States as an ally.

THE TIME IS NOW

Sooner or later, as Mr. Johnson sees it, such Communist tactics must be met and halted. Bigger war will certainly be a risk wherever this is done. For Mr. Johnson the time to put an end to such Communist wars is now, and the place is in Vietnam, in the Caribbean, or in any area where Communists try to take over new territory by military aggression or subversion.

May 3, 1965

[From U.S. News & World Report]

FULL STORY OF CARIBBEAN WAR: HOW REDS PLOTTED A TAKEOVER

(When U.S. marines landed in Santo Domingo, Howard Handelman, of the staff of U.S. News & World Report, went in with them. But he'd been on the story long before that. Here, from the scene, is his inside report of events that led to crisis.)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This is the story of a Communist plot that turned into America's war in the Caribbean.

It started 6 months ago when mimeographed handbills began to appear, telling people how to make Molotov cocktails, how to build street barricades, plant bombs, how to seize arms. It advanced carefully, step by step.

And by April 28 the Dominican Republic was in chaos, Communist plotters were on the verge of seizing power. The first of thousands of American marines and paratroopers arrived to protect Americans and prevent this country from becoming a "second Cuba."

Two days later—on April 30—marines found themselves in a firefight with rebels in Santo Domingo. One marine was killed, at least six others wounded.

SUGAR PRICES A BIG FACTOR

The plotting began against a background of discontent on the part of the workers. Sugar prices have been low, and sugar is the base of the island economy.

This forced upon the President, Donald Reid Cabral, the need to impose a program of austerity. He acted to break a strike of sugarworkers. Businessmen were forced to deposit with the Government 40 percent of the cost of goods they imported.

At the same time, some high-ranking officers were fired from the army out of fear that there might be plotting against the regime.

The result is that businessmen, workers and key elements of the military all had become disgruntled.

Complicating the situation was the fact that the President was not a good speaker—he did not have the ability to go on television and radio and make a convincing argument in favor of the austerity he was trying to impose.

Communist leaders, aware of the discontent, speeded their plans.

Two weeks ago 52 trained Communist agents slipped into the country—32 of them from Castro's Cuba where they had been trained in guerrilla-warfare schools. The rest were from similar training schools in Russia, China, and other Communist countries.

Some came on forged passports. Others slipped in by boat at night.

IN TOUCH WITH BOSCH

Month before, the leaders of the plot had been working with Juan Bosch, former President who had been overthrown in September 1963, and had taken refuge in San Juan, P.R.

Bosch was not known as a Communist, but he knew that Communists were in on the plot to restore him to power, and he worked with them. All details for the revolt were being worked out in secrecy. Timing became the key element. Everything was in readiness.

On Saturday morning, April 24, action was taken to crack down on three colonels in the Army whom the Government suspected of disloyalty.

The colonels were ordered fired. Instead of accepting the order, the three officers seized and disarmed the Army Chief of Staff.

Communists found out about this half an hour after it happened. They managed to broadcast a report that the military was in revolt.

By some means, the plotters then got hold of the Government radio and television for 35 minutes and broadcast a false report that the regime of President Reid Cabral had fallen.

The broadcasters who appeared on the TV screen wore the beards and berets that are standard equipment of Castro Communists. They exhorted their listeners to take to the streets.

Every possible device was used to capitalize on the growing unpopularity of the Government. People started dancing in the streets. They were inspired, and led, by known Communists.

The President went on the air Saturday night to show that he still was in power. He told the people that loyal troops were surrounding the two camps in which there were disloyal colonels.

He announced that unless the disloyal elements surrendered by 5 o'clock Sunday morning, April 25, they would be attacked by Government forces.

It seems, however, that Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, a friend of the President's, had been convinced by the Communist-led mobs in the streets that this was a true uprising of the people. He failed to carry out the attack the President had ordered.

When the attack did not come, the Reds moved out in the open. Their months of careful plotting was triggered into action with split-second timing.

Arms began to be passed out to civilian toughs on Sunday. The three colonels, working with the Reds, had access to military equipment.

WHAT SOLDIERS DID

Lower echelons in the Army had been thoroughly infiltrated by the plotters, and they went over with the colonels to the Communist side.

Juan Bosch, in Puerto Rico, packed his bags on that Sunday and prepared to move back to Santo Domingo. Rebel forces, by then, had chased President Reid into the Israeli Embassy and were in control of parts of the city.

Before Mr. Bosch could make his move, dissension developed in the ranks of his supporters.

Mr. Bosch claimed the right to move back and serve out the unfilled portion of the term from which he had been ejected. Others in the group insisted that new elections be held.

WHEN REDS MOVED IN

While the squabbling went on, the Communists took over the uprising. Something close to panic spread through the ranks of the non-Communists among the plotters.

The Air Force, most of the Navy and some elements of the Army—as well as Santo Domingo's 10,000 armed police—remained loyal to the Government.

Gen. Wessin y Wessin had led the move that overthrew Bosch in 1963 and was not ready to accept his return.

Fighting between the loyal troops and the rebels became intense. Casualties were high on both sides.

By Monday, some followers of Juan Bosch were seeking asylum in foreign embassies. The open takeover of the rebel movement by Castro-type Communists proved more than they were willing to accept.

There were defections from the Communist cause, too, by some of the Army officers when they discovered that what they had thought to be a true uprising against an unpopular Government was, in fact, a Red move to take power.

By this time rebel leaders and Communists had fanned out through the city, distributing rifles, Molotov cocktails, other weapons to aroused civilians.

Many thus armed were known Communists.

As for the others, the armed, trigger-happy populace offered the sort of civilian unrest that Communists always hope to capitalize on.

Those in the rebellion ranged all the way from known Communist agents—carbon copies of Castro's revolutionaries—to bands of criminals intent on looting. Many wore the green fatigue uniforms popular with Castro Communists.

The violence that spread through Santo Domingo gave the appearance of utter chaos. Actually, it was cut to a standard Communist pattern.

Bands of young toughs—called "tigers"—roamed the streets, carrying burp guns and other weapons. Others sat on rooftops, sniping.

TO THE WALL

Victims were dragged from their homes and shot down while angry mobs shouted, "To the wall!"—the same cry that marked the mass executions in Cuba in the early days of Fidel Castro. The assassinated Dominicans were dumped into crude graves right at the execution spots.

Anti-Communist pilots of the Dominican Air Force added to the toll with their strafing and bombing attacks on rebel strongholds in the capital. The rebels tried to stop the air attacks by putting the families of the pilots out in the streets where they became targets.

Much of the gunfire appeared to be for no other purpose than to terrorize the city. There were reports of bands of young rebels dashing through the streets spraying shots wildly from their machine guns and rifles. The result was chaos.

On Tuesday, April 27, there seemed to be a lull in the fighting. But it was misleading.

That day, the U.S. Ambassador, W. Tapley Bennett, visited the Presidential Palace. He found it largely deserted. The rooms were strewn with wreckage.

The island now was without any effective Government. Anarchy prevailed in Santo Domingo.

American citizens, in this period, began to be in real danger.

On Wednesday, April 28, civil order broke down completely.

Two to three hundred armed rebels stormed into the Ambassador Hotel, where 1,100 Americans and some other foreigners were awaiting evacuation.

The rebels seized many of the Americans, separated the men from the women and children, marched them off out of sight of their families, fired shots over their heads. The purpose was terror. Ambassador Bennett asked for marines to protect the lives of U.S. citizens, after Dominican military leaders had told him they could no longer guarantee the safety of Americans.

Among the Americans on the island at the time were many tourists, a University of Michigan jazz band, and delegates to a brewers' convention.

ADVANCE WARNING

Two weeks before the Ambassador called for protective troops, the U.S. had learned through intelligence sources that trouble was impending in the Dominican Republic. The United States had moved the aircraft carrier *Boxer*, with a contingent of 1,100 marines, to a point within easy reach of the island.

On Thursday, April 29, the marines—first of thousands of U.S. troops—came in by helicopter.

The announced purpose of the landing was to protect American lives and to help with the evacuation of foreigners.

Actually, the United States seemed to have made up its mind that it would not permit another Cuba on its doorstep.

On Thursday the fighting had become heavy. The U.S. Embassy was fired upon.

May 3, 1965

8941

Marine guards returned the fire. Several rebel snipers were killed.

The war, itself, became more intense in the city, but the countryside outside Santo Domingo seemed quiet.

In the capital, the well-armed rebels had concentrated their attack on the 10,000-man police force. One estimate was that hundreds of police were killed in the first 3 days of fighting.

The Communists captured Radio Patrola, the police network station. That made it almost impossible for officers to direct police reinforcements to areas where they were needed most.

The rebels fought in small, roving bands, but they were well armed.

At the time they attacked the American Embassy they also shot up five other embassies—those of Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Peru, and Ecuador.

There was no mistaking the Communist pattern of the revolution. One worried diplomat told me:

"All types of Communists are in this thing—Peiping Communists, Moscow Communists, and Castro Communists."

By Thursday night most of downtown Santo Domingo was in the hands of the rebel forces. By then, they had seized the international telephone exchange. Estimates of the dead and wounded passed the 2,000 mark. United States flew in 15,000 pounds of medical supplies.

By Friday, April 30, the United States had built up to a total of 4,200 American fighting men—1,700 marines and 2,500 paratroopers of the Army's 82d Airborne Division.

There was no slowing in the fighting. At noon on Friday a marine armored column drove into the heart of the city to seal off a zone around the American Embassy, and drew rebel fire. The marines had their first casualties.

The State Department announced that "law and order has ceased to exist" and it was clear now that the United States was prepared to take any action necessary.

Said a high-ranking U.S. naval officer: "It is our intention to prevent a Communist takeover."

[From U.S. News & World Report]

COMMUNIST STRATEGY FOR LATIN AMERICA

SAN JUAN, P.R.—What follows is based on top intelligence reports:

The speed with which the Communists moved in on the Dominican revolt is added evidence of a new and major subversion campaign by the Reds in Latin America.

Chief Communist targets in the hemisphere are Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala.

Second priority, according to analysts, goes to such countries as Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Haiti.

While the Reds are making less-concentrated efforts in other countries, they hope to capitalize on any opportunity presented by recurrent political upheavals.

The new campaign of subversion is pointed up by two recent events—a Communist-backed assassination plot in Venezuela, and increasing influence of Castro Communists among back-country bandits in Colombia.

MONEY FROM MOSCOW

Venezuelan police, on April 10, arrested an Italian man and two women and accused them of trying to smuggle \$330,000 into the country to finance a revolt and of attempting to kill President Raúl Leoni.

Investigation showed the money traveled a circuitous route—reaching Caracas by way of Rome, Prague, and Moscow, where it had originated. The Italian Communist Party, acting as intermediary, supplied the couriers.

Inside Venezuela, the conspiracy involved local Reds, foreign Communists, some members of the armed forces and some conservative businessmen who opposed the social and

economic changes being pushed by the Leoni government.

Though the plot involved both Rightists and Reds, investigators say the Communists clearly were the masterminds.

In Colombia, Castro Communists have joined up with bandits who have been plaguing the country for years.

Until recent months, the sporadic violence was annoying, but not a dangerous challenge to the Bogotá government. Now things have taken a new turn. Violence is on the increase, and is linked to a wave of kidnappings that appear to be any effort to raise funds for Communist subversion. There has been an average of one kidnapping every 3 days this year. The latest took place on April 27 with seizure of a prominent industrialist from his ranch 240 miles from Bogotá.

Colombia authorities say that, for the first time, the backlands guerrillas appear to be getting arms and money from outside the country. Also, the guerrillas have been organized into units by agents who claim to represent the liberation forces of Castro Communists.

A U.S. Central Intelligence Agency report to Congress in mid-April stressed the continuing danger of Communist efforts to overthrow Latin-American governments. The CIA report said Cuba spent more than a million dollars supporting subversion in Venezuela from 1960 to 1964. Other sizable sums were sent to Guatemala, Panama and El Salvador.

At the time of the Dominican upheaval, intelligence authorities say, special groups from at least 10 other Latin American nations were in Cuba for training in subversion and guerrilla tactics.

[From the Vision Letter, Mar. 3, 1965]

Here is the outlook as seen from Havana: Venezuela: This is still considered target No. 1. Venezuela's guerrillas are the largest and best organized in the hemisphere, calling themselves Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional. The FALN has the two ingredients that carried Castro to power in Cuba—an enduring guerrilla force in the mountains and a terrorist machine in the cities. Early this week, as an example, uniformed guerrillas toting machineguns took over the town of Turugual, in the state of Falcón, destroyed all government documents, held a revolutionary songfest in the streets, then faded away before federal troops could arrive.

Colombia: Next in order of possibilities is Colombia, which has a long history of guerrilla activity and backland chaos, rugged topography which makes pursuit and communications difficult, and proximity to Venezuela. Backland violence in the past was at first politically motivated, then later degenerated into simple banditry. Recently, however, a Castro-style band of more than 50 youths mounted an armed attack on the town of Simacota, in Santander (the Vision Letter, January 13), and promised more of the same. Colombian officials, who in recent years had made considerable headway in knocking out banditry, are nervously awaiting developments.

Guatemala: The next most likely prospect, Guatemala also has a long history of guerrilla activity. The rebels are led in the countryside by former army Lieutenant Marco A. Yon Sosa, who operates in the woods and hills of the north, where population is poor and sparse. Last month the rebels threatened to carry the fight to the capital, and there were two incidents in a matter of days—an attempt to kill a U.S. military attaché and a grenade thrown under an army truck. A state of siege was declared and the lid clamped tightly on Guatemala City, but the game is not over. The night before the state of siege went into effect pamphlets were distributed in the capital warning that

the "movement of reprisals" against the military was beginning.

Honduras, Haiti, and Paraguay are also thought ripe for "wars of liberation." These nations all have dictatorial regimes and fairly recent incidents of armed antigovernment activity. If local leftist firebrands can get something rolling, they will receive heavy propaganda support and leadership training from Havana, but few arms. According to the teachings of Che Guevara, guerrillas should not become accustomed to outside arms. Above all, Castro will only help those subversives who help themselves.

What chance do the Castro followers really have of taking over any of these countries? For the time being, it is felt, almost none. Colombia and Venezuela both have democratic governments and, despite difficulties, are attempting to cope with national problems. The guerrillas so far lack the one essential component for success—the support of the masses. What they can do is to stay alive and active, waiting for the time when democratic government may turn sour. Then, they assume, the popular support will swing their way.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1965]

DOMINICAN TROOP BUILDUP

In ordering several thousand more marines and paratroopers into Santo Domingo Saturday night, President Johnson reiterated that their sole mission was to protect and evacuate endangered Americans and other foreign nationals. Last night the President went on television to confirm what Congressmen and correspondents in Washington had been told privately from the start of the Dominican rebellion—that the primary aim of the United States military involvement is to prevent "another Cuba."

Thus, the official explanation has finally caught up with the one consistently given by authoritative administration briefings. The President now tells the Nation that the revolt began as "an action dedicated to social justice" but it took a sinister turn when Communists seized control.

What remains unexplained is why no slightest expression of sympathy for the revolt's aims came from Washington in the period when the massing of American troops was decided upon. The clear effect of their influx was to strengthen the ruling military junta in its efforts to block the restoration of Juan Bosch as President. In a television interview taped on Saturday, Professor Bosch, who is no Communist, said that the revolt had been won until Washington intervened. He vehemently denied that the Communists exercised any position of control.

The President's unwillingness to see another Communist state established in this hemisphere will command national support. But the question that needs a much clearer answer is whether a right-wing dictatorship in Santo Domingo has not traded on United States fears of Communism to preserve its power in a country still scarred by three decades of brutal repression under Generalissimo Trujillo.

Restoring political stability in the Dominican Republic is the rightful responsibility of the Organization of American States. This responsibility has been acknowledged by President Johnson; it is being exercised by the OAS through its dispatch of a five-man mediation mission to Santo Domingo. If that delegation finds a need for an inter-American peace force to help maintain a cease-fire or to ward off subversion, the OAS is the proper instrumentality for bringing the peace force into being.

The massing of American marines and paratroopers in ever-increasing numbers already has stirred bitter recollections throughout Latin America and the world of the excesses of "gunboat diplomacy." A unilateral decision to assign these troops an active role

in helping the Dominican military junta put down the revolt would run counter to all the principles of "progress, democracy, and social justice," for which Mr. Johnson appealed in his televised remarks Friday evening.

Such an abuse of our strength would do more to spread Communism in this hemisphere than the Castroite agents it was directed against. As the President repeatedly pointed out in the 1964 election campaign, the United States cannot bulldoze its way to security, nor should it try. The inter-American system, to which the President has pledged full support, is our best assurance—and the hemisphere's.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 3, 1965]
FROM SAIGON TO SANTO DOMINGO

Naturally the United States is being excoriated in many parts of the world, including some quarters in the United States, for its intervention in the Dominican Republic, and in many ways the outcry is interestingly similar to that raised over present American policies in Vietnam.

It's true enough that it has been a long time since the United States actually landed troops in a Latin American nation in an apparent effort to help shape its governmental form as well as protect U.S. citizens. It's true that the Dominican situation is not, shall we say, exactly crystal-clear, even after a week of fighting and various kinds of diplomatic activity. For all anyone positively knows, the savage civil war may be merely one more episode in the long Latin tradition of gory grabs for personal power.

What nonetheless seems plain is that the supporters of former President Juan Bosch—those who started the revolution—include many Communists, perhaps mostly of the Cuban persuasion, and that Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who had been trying to put down the revolution, is strongly antiCommunist. In other words, the U.S. Government last week faced not only a threat to the safety of Americans in the Dominican Republic but also the evident threat of another Cuba in the hemisphere. This consideration, it seems to us, overrides the numerous and sometimes hysterical objections.

One objection is that, if the United States should have done anything at all, it should not have done it unilaterally. Washington of course, did turn immediately to the Organization of American States, which yesterday dispatched an investigating committee to the island. And the United States did inform the United Nations, where the Security Council is supposed to meet today. Unfortunately, events do not always permit waiting the outcome of diplomatic deliberations, even if it could have been realistically assumed that the upshot would be concerted action.

Another objection is that intervention in the affairs of a sovereign nation infringes treaties or understandings among the hemispheric nations. This complaint also squares but imperfectly with the realities.

The Dominican Republic has had an unhappy history, including decades of misrule by the dictator Trujillo. It is sad but true it has had scant acquaintance with self-government or the meaning of nationhood. In the post-Trujillo period the United States has tried hard to help the nation not only along the paths of democracy but toward true sovereignty; now the Dominican Republic is the victim of what certainly seems, at least in part, indirect aggression from without. We for one do not believe the United States should stand idly by in the face of such a threat.

But the case for intervention in such situations goes deeper, and it covers some points the querulous critics—those, that is, who are not outright Communists—never seem to get.

Though the Communist world is indeed in disarray these days, its components haven't lost interest in fomenting Communist revolutions. Neither the Sino-Soviet split nor resurgent nationalism in the European satellites prevented Khrushchev from planting missiles in Cuba. Neither the Sino-Soviet split nor any of Red China's other troubles prevents that belligerent regime from sponsoring aggression against South Vietnam.

Indeed, if there is one thing the world's Communists still are united on, it is on old Khrushchev's double-talk about supporting "just wars of liberation." That means that the Soviets, for their part, seemingly feel themselves blocked by the United States from major conquests such as taking over Europe; consequently they turn considerable attention to warmaking wherever it seems profitable in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Anyone who thinks the other Communist movements don't agree with the Soviets on that proposition is not seeing what is actually happening in the world.

That is the condition confronting the United States from Saigon to Santo Domingo, and probably for a long time to come—a host of more or less little wars aimed at conquest for the banner of communism and troublemaking for the West. To the extent feasible, and always reversing the freedom not to engage our forces in hopeless military circumstances, the United States should discourage this activity and endeavor thus eventually to tame the Communists. In ultimately restraining Communist belligerence, not in appeasement, lies by far the best hope of genuine peace.

The United States is pursuing that purpose in Vietnam, no matter how many mistakes it has made or yet may make. It most emphatically must be its purpose in its own neighborhood, the Western Hemisphere, even if its efforts in the Dominican Republic fail to bring good government there.

The United States should not have allowed a Communist Cuba to happen, and communism's victory in that nation remains unfinished business for the United States. It should not allow, insofar as it can act effectively, through diplomacy if possible but not excluding force if necessary, communism to be exported elsewhere, whether to Brazil, British Guiana, or the Dominican Republic.

What, we may ask the complainers, is the alternative? Whatever they or much of the world may think, we believe most Americans at any rate consider it right and proper to seek to keep the United States from Communist encroachment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Rhode Island.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk out of order a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 105) submitted by Mr. PASTORE, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy eight hundred additional copies of Part 1 of the hearings held by that Committee on Atomic Energy Commission authorizing legislation, fiscal year 1966.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I discussed this resolution with the distin-

guished majority leader and the assistant to the minority leader, and it has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE VETERANS BENEFITS AND INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

AMENDMENT NO. 139

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 6675, now pending before the Committee on Finance, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 266, after line 22, add a new section 328 to title III of said Act as follows:

"INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VETERANS' BENEFITS AND INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

"Sec. 328. (a) Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '503', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), in the case of any individual—

"(1) who, for the first month after the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is enacted, is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit payable under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act,

"(2) who, for such month, is entitled to a monthly benefit payable under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and

"(3) whose insurance benefit referred to in clause (1) for any subsequent month is increased by reason of the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965,

there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, so much of the insurance benefit referred to in clause (1) for any subsequent month as is equal to the amount by which such insurance benefit is increased by reason of the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to take care of a defect which is present in the bill. The defect is that social security pension increases are being provided for, but the result is that that it will cause a diminution in some veterans pensions because of the present law.

We encountered a similar problem last year when similar legislation was pending before us.

My amendment is patterned after an amendment which the Senate saw fit to agree to last year to prevent this inequity from occurring.

AMENDMENT NO. 140

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment to H.R. 6675, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.