

that the Senator for New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mrs. EDWARDS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) are necessarily absent. I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is paired with the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND).

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senators from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER and Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) are paired with the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS). If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware would each vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 571 Leg.]
 YEAS—52

- | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|----------|
| Alken | Fulbright | Mathias |
| Beall | Gambrell | McGovern |
| Bible | Gravel | McIntyre |
| Brooke | Griffin | Mondale |
| Buckley | Hart | Moss |
| Burdick | Humphrey | Muskie |
| Byrd, Robert C. | Inouye | Nelson |
| Case | Jackson | Packwood |
| Chiles | Javits | Pastore |
| Church | Jordan, N.C. | Pell |
| Cooper | Kennedy | Percy |
| Cranston | Long | Proxmire |
| Dominick | Magnuson | Randolph |
| Eagleton | Mansfield | Ribicoff |

- | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Roth | Stevens | Tunney |
| Schwelker | Stevenson | Williams |
| Smith | Symington | |
| Stafford | Taft | |

NAYS—12

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------|
| Allen | Ervin | Scott |
| Bennett | Fannin | Stennis |
| Byrd | Hansen | Young |
| Harry F., Jr. | Hruska | |
| Cotton | Jordan, Idaho | |

NOT VOTING—36

- | | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Allott | Eastland | Metcalf |
| Anderson | Edwards | Miller |
| Baker | Fong | Moutoya |
| Bayh | Goldwater | Mundt |
| Bellmon | Gurney | Pearson |
| Bentsen | Harris | Saxbe |
| Boggs | Hartke | Sparkman |
| Brock | Hatfield | Spong |
| Cannon | Hollings | Talmadge |
| Cook | Hughes | Thurmond |
| Curtis | McClellan | Tower |
| Dole | McGee | Weicker |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, and the nays are 12. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

EMERGENCY HEALTH PERSONNEL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3858, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the program of medical assistance to areas with health manpower shortages, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message:

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the bill (S. 3858) entitled "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the program of medical assistance to areas with health manpower shortages, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House insists on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4 to the aforesaid bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its position on amendments 3 and 4.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE MYTH OF THE "BLOODBATH"

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, with all that has been written about the Vietnam war it is not often that we are able to be moved by yet another piece of writing. Yet this must be the effect on anyone who objectively reads the recently released report by D. Gareth Porter of Cornell University entitled, "The Myth of the Bloodbath: North Vietnam's Land Reform Reconsidered." Toward this end I ask that the report be reprinted in its entirety at the conclusion of my short remarks.

Its findings are contained in the title—it exposes as myth the notion made popular by the Nixon administration that the land reform period of 1953 to 1956 was characterized by a deliberate reign of terror against former foes of the North Vietnamese leaders. Who can deny the monstrous mischief—indeed the disas-

ter—this misplaced belief has visited on us through our tortured rationalization for continuing the war?

It is of course only a short step from swallowing the story of the "earlier bloodbath" to imagining the "slaughter" of the vanquished South Vietnamese or the full-scale attack on American troops on the beaches as they finally quit the country. Such a view fits nearly with the common tendency to picture all enemies as bloodthirsty, fanatical, irrational, broadly unpopular with their own people and ready to wreak their vengeance on them at the slightest whim. How tragic our misguidance.

The reason this Cornell study is so important, of course, is that the bloodbath story is as we all know, one of the principal arguments the administration has used for remaining in Vietnam—or, if you do not believe we are remaining, for doing what we have been doing there these last 4 years. Some of us attacked the thesis on the grounds that the bloodbaths are daily bringing to that sad country and region through our campaign of massive air strikes surely exceeds any likely killing of Vietnamese by other victorious Vietnamese. Now we find in the Porter report that there is very convincing evidence that even the earlier "bloodbath" was in fact a hoax in numbers and extent. What a cruel way to play with American public opinion to gain support for this perversion of policy of destroying life in order to save it.

It is nearly inconceivable to me that an administration would base so much of its conduct of the war on a thesis so scantily researched, so little thought out, and so highly speculative. With such vast resources in the administration devoted to foreign affairs—or at least military ones—why was so little research done to support or refute the bloodbath story? Where is the scholarship on the administration's side or was it in fact a matter of extrapolating the experience of a few villages plus a mountain of hearsay from others?

If there has been sloppy scholarship on this crucial point the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the National Security Council must share a major portion of the blame. And if there were darker motives behind the perpetuation of this myth—if myth it be—then we should hold the administration fully accountable. We are constantly reminded of how quick the administration is to play fast and loose with statistics, as for example, the President's assertion last July when justifying his POW stand that 15,000 French prisoners were never accounted for after France quit Indochina. The French Veterans Ministry subsequently stated that the figure was 6,200 and that the last French prisoners were returned less than 3 months after the Geneva agreements were concluded.

I commend the reading of the Cornell report to each and every colleague for its implications are powerful and strip away still another "reason" for doing what our country is doing in and to Vietnam, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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