

18156

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8

I am writing to thank you for your public announcements on South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. NANCY D. SPAULDING.

New Milford, N.J.,
August 5, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on your firm stand with regard to Vietnam.

Apparently our administration has not heard the plea of the 5,000 educators who signed a petition urging an end to the war in Vietnam and a move toward neutralization.

Word has just come through that the Chinese Government (Red) will not stand by while "aggression" takes place in North Vietnam.

Your warnings regarding our complete and utter disregard of the 1954 Geneva Treaty have gone unheeded.

It is incomprehensible to me and probably to yourself how a country like the United States could allow itself to be caught in such a meat grinder.

I suggest that you immediately take to the mass media and tell the American people what is happening.

We are now reaching a point where we are trying to save face and where the endless bloodletting leads nowhere.

Again I congratulate you for such integrity in an area where your colleagues generally will go along without seemingly to know the consequences.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT GARRITY.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to say thank you for your courageous vote against American policy in southeast Asia.

It is painful to admit to oneself that one's own country can be so wrong in a matter of foreign policy. Yet, it must be said.

I hope that more people will support your stand in the interests of peace and justice.

Respectfully,

CHARLES ECKSTAT.

WEISMAN, MANDEL & KUPPER

ATTORNEYS AT LAW,

Chicago, Ill., August 6, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in this morning's New York Times your remarks concerning the new crisis in the "McNamara war." I want to congratulate you on your forthrightness and the fact that at least one Senator is willing to stand up to be counted and fight for a new foreign policy that is so needed.

If it were not for the newsworthiness of your statements, I doubt if any newspaper or any person could ever realize that there is another side to the question. The administration, Defense Department, military leaders, and the newspapers all present only one side of an issue, and it is refreshing to find your remarks.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. MANDEL.

THOMAS LIOCARDI,

REAL ESTATE AND INSURANCE,

Berkeley Heights, N.J., August 6, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend strongly the action you took today in the Senate in regard to President Johnson's resolution, which you aptly termed, "a predated declaration of war." This action keeps pace with the great and honest service you have always rendered our country.

I feel as you do, that a new approach is needed in our growing involvement in southeast Asia. We seem to be prisoners of a bankrupt policy whose inevitable end is war.

In the words of Negro ministers walking the streets of Jersey City during the recent rioting, now is the time to "cool it."

If ever there is anything I can do for you in the nature of support in your future political career, please call on me.

Very truly yours,

Therome Shaw
THEROME SHAW.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380 to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1180.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 6, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"CHAPTER 7—MILITARY EXPENDITURES OF RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

"SEC. 108. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 7—MILITARY EXPENDITURES OF RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

"SEC. 471. MILITARY EXPENDITURES OF RECIPIENT COUNTRIES.—In furnishing assistance under this part, the President shall give special consideration to a country's allocation of its own resources as between military and developmental purposes. Priority in furnishing assistance shall be given to those countries whose military budgets do not exceed their legitimate and reasonable needs for internal security and self-defense and for meeting their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations or under any regional defense organization."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the pending amendment, which adds a new concluding section to the economic assistance portion of the foreign aid act, may seem a modest one at first sight. It merely asks that more consideration should be given to the provision of economic assistance to those countries which do not burden their own people and our taxpayers with the support of an unnecessarily large military establishment. On the other hand, if the policy guidance provided by this amendment is taken seriously and followed conscientiously, this provision could have a highly salutary impact—not only in terms of our aid program but on the development of the independent nations of the free world.

After more than a dozen years of experience with a swollen and mismanaged aid program, I scarcely need cite chapter and verse to illustrate the fact that year after year we have poured money into countries which seduce us with the argument that they have to be placed in a posture to repel threatened Communist expansion. But every time that we look

at the record we find that swollen military establishments in less developed countries are of little or no use against the kinds of threats which are posed by Russian or Chinese imperialism. The utility of such establishments, on the contrary, seems mainly in the field of permitting authoritarian regimes to control their countries more tightly at the expense of making sound progress toward economic development. Yet, at least in theory, the United States proclaims that such development is the best defense against communism available to any of the less developed countries. If we are to be consistent and truthful about the aims of our foreign aid program, we should forthrightly pursue a policy of giving priority to those countries which concentrate on the welfare rather than the regimentation of their people.

The plain fact is that, in case after case, we find ourselves directly or indirectly supporting unduly large military establishments in countries which could not retard a Communist attack for even 1 day without our military assistance. For example, surely no one can be under any illusion that the huge South Korean army could successfully withstand invasion from the north without immediate U.S. military help.

But I need not take the time of the Senate to cite each of the many cases in this category. Who, for instance, can take seriously the thought that Taiwan could either attack or defend itself against mainland China in a full-scale action without massive American military support?

In these circumstances, I do not see that anyone can marshal a successful argument against the amendment I am proposing here. The only rational argument against it is that it may not prove much more than a pious exhortation after its inclusion in the act, but this is true of any policy guidance which is given by the Congress to the executive branch.

The foreign aid bill needs many amendments by way of policy guidelines for its administration, if we really want to clean up the foreign aid program.

If the policy guidelines which we set forth are deliberately ignored by the Chief Executive, then we have a duty either to make such policies more clearly mandatory or to refuse to give the administration the funds it seeks from us. Obviously we cannot know whether the policy guidance provided by this amendment will be satisfactorily implemented until it is tried. If it is tried and proves inadequate, we can then undertake to provide more stringent guidance. But it is no argument to say that the amendment cannot be effective before we have even tried to put it into effect.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to accept this new section in the foreign aid legislation as a potentially vital contribution to the improvement of our foreign aid program.

My amendment sets forth the policy that we so frequently profess we want to develop in foreign aid. We are say-

ing that we want to develop the economic strength of underdeveloped countries. We shall never develop the economic strength of underdeveloped countries if we continue to pour millions of dollars of aid money into them for the building of strong, colossal military machines, that so frequently get in to the hands of military oligarchies, which in turn use the military power to suppress freedom, not to develop it.

Just before I entered the Chamber, one Senator said to me that he had read my amendment and would like to have me, in my explanation of it, cite a few countries that I thought the amendment ought to be applied to as a matter of policy. I have already mentioned Taiwan and South Korea. I suppose the country to which the amendment ought to be applied by way of a new policy, as much as any other country to which we are giving huge sums of military aid, if not more so, is Turkey. We are not building up the economic power of Turkey.

In my major speech against the bill the other day, and without repeating it, except to recapitulate this part in capsule form, I said that what we were doing in Turkey by way of military aid—and the interesting thing is that we have been alibiing for it throughout the years—was supplying great sums for military assistance in Turkey because, supposedly, it would be of help to them in defending themselves against communism and to help them to defend us against communism in case a war broke out over there.

Nonsense. If war broke out with Russia in that part of the world, all the military aid we have poured into Turkey would be absolutely useless, because that war would quickly—almost immediately—involve an exchange of nuclear bombs. We would help Turkey defend herself against communism much more effectively if we developed some economic strength and economic freedom in Turkey down to the level of the mass of the Turkish people. But that is not what we have done in Turkey. Turkey has a totalitarian government. The Turkish Government operates a large percentage of Turkey's industry as government industry. It uses that industry as a form of employment. The reports of the Comptroller General and the reports of independent investigators who have gone to Turkey are all consistent concerning the kind of existing socialism in industry, which ought to be private industry, that the American taxpayers are supporting in Turkey. Turkey's industry is not producing. It is characterized by inefficiency, waste, and corruption. That kind of aid is a good example of what I am pointing out when I say that our aid program has become honeycombed with corruption abroad. Turkey is a good example.

What I seek to do is to help the Turkish people. I want to help the Turkish people by providing a better and reformed economic aid program. We ought to change our policy. That is why I advocate in my amendment a guideline policy change if we are to give

preferential treatment to countries that seek foreign aid in respect to meeting their economic needs.

If they are maintaining military establishments that they could not maintain alone, their economies cannot be maintained alone. I am not an "overnighter" in proposing this change. I do not propose that the change be made all at once. That would also produce economic disruptions and disjunctures. But we ought to start now to cut back on military aid for Turkey as one example and do more for Turkey on the economic level. We should do more on the economic level to sow the seeds of economic freedom and not the seeds of economic socialism.

There are some areas of economic activity as to which I do not question that much can be said for some government programs, although as a general rule I am against government operation of industries that can operate on a private enterprise basis. Someone may ask, "What about power?" I have always supported a program under which a major part of the power development in this country would be by private power industries; but I have also maintained that when it comes to multiple-purpose dams built by the money of the taxpayers, those power resources ought to be owned by all the taxpayers of the country, and used only as a competitive public power yardstick to hold private utilities in line and to prevent them from gouging the American taxpayers by way of profiteering, which they would do if there were not a public power yardstick that could be used as a competitive standard.

But that is not what we are doing in Turkey. What is being done with American taxpayers' dollars in Turkey is to develop a Government-owned and controlled industry in segment after segment. In my judgment, that cannot be reconciled with our professed belief in economic freedom, for that is not bringing economic freedom to Turkey.

Mr. President, I am almost through. For the benefit of the Senator who asked me to cite a few more examples, I cite Pakistan. The Pakistanian economy could not possibly support its military establishment alone. I cite India. The Indian economy could not possibly support its military establishment. The United States is supporting those establishments. The American taxpayers are supporting those establishments. The paradox is that we are preparing Pakistan and India to be in a position so that they can make war against each other.

If they make war against each other, they will make war against each other fully equipped on each side with American military equipment.

What kind of morality is that?

If we start to talk about morality in connection with the foreign aid program, people believe that we are a little "queer." Apparently, we are supposed to keep separate the principles of morality from the administration of a foreign aid program. Let us be frank about it. Those who would have us do that are trying to sell the American peo-

ple a shocking program of political expediency which is basically immoral.

Mr. President (Mr. SALINGER in the chair), we cannot compromise American ideals. We cannot sacrifice them at the altar of political expediency in international politics and keep faith with our professions about our moral standards. The buildup of the military might of Pakistan and India, in my judgment, is immoral and unconscionable.

In the first place, military might in Pakistan and India would not be worth one whit to us in the event of a war with Russia.

Pakistan and India, too, have to rely for their ultimate security upon American nuclear power. They live and move and have their being under the canopy of America's military might, not their own.

I wonder what more the Senate should have to hear than the foreign minister of Pakistan. At a noon luncheon before the National Press Club, a question was put to him as to whether Pakistan would come in and be of any aid to the United States in South Vietnam. The answer was no—that they had no intention of doing so, although they, too, are members of SEATO. In my judgment, every country in SEATO has an obligation in regard to South Vietnam—not just the United States. Pakistan does, too. We do not find the other countries in SEATO sending boys to South Vietnam to die. They are careful when they send any token manpower, such as the 60 men from Australia. The Secretary of State—I believe to his everlasting discredit—tried to make something of it, without giving the American people the facts, when he said not so long ago that Australia was doubling its manpower contribution in the SEATO crisis.

The doubling meant that they were adding 30 additional men to the 30 already there. A checkup disclosed that the 30 men they had there were not going to be put in the frontline.

No, Mr. President, we are not going to get any help from Pakistan. They have told us so already. I do not know how we believe that we are helping the cause of peace in the world by building up the military might of Pakistan and India so that they can make war on each other over Kashmir.

In 1957, as chairman of the American delegation to the Parliamentary Conference of Commonwealth Nations in New Delhi, with the Prime Minister of India, then Mr. Nehru, present, I asked in a speech if I could raise the delicate question, in New Delhi, about the application of the rule of law to the settlement of international disputes. At that time, the United States was under attack because of the Formosa resolution. The Formosa resolution was not liked by our Asiatic friends. It was not liked by many of the delegates at that Conference from the Asiatic countries.

We pointed out what our position was. I was in a position to do that, because I had opposed the Formosa resolution. I stated what we should do, namely, substitute the rule of law for the rule of

military force in the settlement of these disputes.

There was great approval. They were all for that.

After I made the suggestion, I said, "Could I raise, here in New Delhi, the most delicate question, because there is such approval of the general principle of substituting the rule of law for the rule of military force in the settlement of disputes which threaten the peace of the world: What about Kashmir—why not apply it to Kashmir?"

There was enthusiastic response from all the delegates except India. Mr. Nehru had a sense of humor. Many people did not seem to realize that. A few days later, Ambassador Bunker, who was then our Ambassador at New Delhi, advised me that the Prime Minister of India wished to see the two of us. We had a conference with the Prime Minister, the parliamentary conference having adjourned. The Prime Minister goodnaturedly said to me, "Senator, you did a lawyer's job on me in the debate in the conference when you asked the question about Kashmir."

Ambassador Bunker, said "But, Mr. Prime Minister, you did not answer it."

The Prime Minister's reply was to the effect that of course there are some things better not discussed. He took the position that Kashmir was a domestic and not an international problem.

Kashmir is an international problem, because any problem that threatens the peace of the world is an international problem.

In this bill, we are providing great sums of money once again for a military buildup in Pakistan and in India that could not be of the slightest value to us in the way of a war with Russia, but could be of value to Pakistan and India if they went to war over Kashmir.

Mr. President, my amendment would lay down the policy guidelines that in our amounts of foreign aid we are going to give preference to countries which do not maintain a military establishment greater than their own economy can maintain.

If we did that, we would do two things, in my judgment—if the administration would follow it. We would lessen the chances of a regional war. We would lessen the chances of a war between Pakistan and India. We would lessen the chances of war between Turkey and Greece. We would lessen the chances of military coups in Latin America. I believe that too much of our military aid, too often, is used by military groups in various countries to entrench themselves in power, to the detriment of the establishment of freedom. They all know that so far as our own national sovereignty and territorial integrity are concerned, existing mutual security pacts give the assurance of protection against a war with Russia.

On the last point, some will probably argue—as they have argued with me in committee and elsewhere—that if they do not get protection from us, they will get it from Russia.

We should find out, should we not?

On that argument, I say that I am not going to vote to send a dollar of the

American taxpayers' money under a blackmail proposal.

That is international blackmail. If they want to go to Russia to get their military aid and pay the tribute that they would have to pay, let them make that decision.

They would not go. They know what would happen to them if they went voluntarily into the Russian orbit. We have a great chance here for world leadership on what I consider to be a moral issue as well as an economic issue. We have a great opportunity to place before the world the policy guideline that I ask to have inserted in the bill:

The United States has decided that the time has come to start tapering off in the building up of these powerful military regimes and machines around the world.

We ought to put it in the bill. It would be salutary in its educational effects around the world. And it would be sound in the objectives that it seeks to accomplish.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE ENACTED THIS SESSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if an effective program of health care for the aged is to be established this year, the Senate must take the lead. The House of Representatives did not include health care for the aged in the social security bill which it approved on July 29, and thus it is up to the Senate to initiate such action. Action on the proposed administration Hospital Insurance Act, also known as the King-Anderson bill, has been delayed for too long. I believe the Senate should adopt this bill or a close modification of it before adjournment.

WE NEED A SELF-PAID PLAN, NOT CHARITY

There is overwhelming evidence that we need to establish a system which will help provide for the essential health care protections which many of our elderly people cannot now afford. I believe that this should be done, not by putting the burden on the Federal Government or on the general taxpayer, but rather by permitting people to make small monthly payments into a fund during their working years, so that, in their later years, they can have basic health insurance as a matter of right and not as a charity. I believe that this can be done most economically and dependably through a separate account under the existing social security system.

Let me stress that this is a bill for health care. There are no provisions in the bill which would interfere with a person's choice of doctor or with the traditional doctor-patient relationship;

moreover it does not pay physicians' and surgeons' fees. In the main it would provide insurance only for the basic health services of hospital care, nursing home care, outpatient diagnostic care, and home health benefits.

THE NEED

There are now approximately 18 million people over age 65 in the United States. The number of our aged and their proportion in our population have increased rapidly. For example, in the last 10 years the aged population grew by one-third. For our elderly, health care is a prime concern. Let us look at the facts.

First, people over 65 need more hospital care than others. They require nearly three times as much hospitalization as those under that age. Nine out of ten of them will need to be hospitalized at least once, and 1 in 6 will be hospitalized in any given year. In addition, the average stay in a hospital is longer for an older person inasmuch as chronic illnesses occur with greater frequency and severity at older ages. The national health survey indicates that 4 out of every 5 persons over 65 have one or more chronic conditions. The average hospital stay for a person over 65 is 15 days—twice as long as the average period for younger people.

In summary, the elderly are found at the top of every index of need for hospital care; they require more hospital admissions, greater lengths of stay, more days of care, and more aged persons are hospitalized per given population. Older people are simply much more likely to be hospitalized and for much longer periods. We all know this.

Second, hospital costs have increased greatly, and the drain on the resources of the aged is in many instances an insurmountable burden. No other major item of consumer expenses has undergone cost increases comparable to those for hospital costs. The hospital care that cost \$26 a day in 1957 now costs \$40 per day.

The average daily hospital charge has increased 54 percent in only 7 years. It takes only a short time in the hospital to accumulate bills exceeding \$1,000, not including doctor bills. For the elderly, hospital stays are much more costly than for other age groups. The average stay for elderly persons results in a bill of over \$500. Thus today, even those who were fortunate enough at one time to build up savings for their later years may find their savings totally wiped out by even one short stay in the hospital.

Third, the income and savings of most people over 65 is not enough to meet the costs of their health care. Half of the couples over 65 earn less than \$2,600. Half of the single persons over 65 earn under \$1,100 a year. Half of the aged have less than \$1,000 in liquid savings which they can turn to, and even more disturbing is the fact that when an older person is forced to meet an emergency by cashing in on his savings, usually there is no opportunity for him to save again. Most younger people, at least, can again work and try to rebuild their savings.