

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18243

McGovern	Pastore	Smathers
McIntyre	Pell	Smith
McNamara	Prouty	Sparkman
Metcalf	Proxmire	Stennis
Monroney	Randolph	Symington
Muskie	Ribicoff	Walters
Nelson	Salinger	Warborough
Neuberger	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Gore	Long, La.
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Moss
Cannon	Hruska	Pearson
Clark	Jackson	Russell
Edmondson	Javits	Scott
Goldwater	Kennedy	Williams, N.J.

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and, insofar as he knows, what the program will be for tomorrow and when he proposes to convene the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who has been most cooperative in offering amendments, will offer one more amendment this evening.

It is my further understanding that the yeas and nays may well be requested.

If there are other amendments following that—and I would hope that there would be—though I doubt it very much—the Senate would remain in session to consider them in the interest of expediting the measure now before it.

There is already an order for the Senate to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time, after conferring with the distinguished minority leader and other interested individuals, I ask unanimous consent that on the question of agreeing to the House amendment, without amendment, to Senate 2642, the so-called antipoverty bill, debate beginning at 10:15 o'clock tomorrow morning be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, with the time to be controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Tuesday, August 11, 1964, beginning at 10:15 a.m., the

No. 155—11

Senate proceed to the consideration of the House amendment, without amendment, to S. 2642, the so-called antipoverty bill, with all debate thereon limited to one hour, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE TO MEET UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK MERIDIAN TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees of the Senate may be permitted to meet up until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when the Senate meets tomorrow it will discuss the House amendment to the antipoverty bill (S. 2642) which is really the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It will then return to the foreign aid bill. I would hope that the Senate will show as much expedition tomorrow as it has shown today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. It was my understanding that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was meeting tomorrow only to consider nominations, but I have since been informed that it will also consider proposed legislation as well.

Since the members of that committee will be in the Chamber debating the House amendment to the antipoverty bill, it seems inappropriate that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should meet later than 10:15 a.m., tomorrow.

Accordingly, inasmuch as unanimous consent has already been propounded and agreed upon, would the Senator from Montana agree to change his request in regard to that committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The nurses training bill is due to be reported tomorrow, which is a matter of prime importance. It is a bill to which I know of no opposition. In view of the generosity of the Senator from Texas, I agree to rescind my previous request in regard to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TOWER. The only point I should like to make to the majority leader is that, of course, the antipoverty bill is also of prime concern to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and members of that committee would be in the Chamber; therefore, I believe it should not meet at the time specified by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be agreeable to ask permission for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—if it so desires—to meet from 11:15 a.m. tomorrow until 12:30 p.m.?

Mr. TOWER. I would not object to that request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I therefore make the request that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet from 11:15 a.m. tomorrow until 12:30 p.m.

Mr. TOWER. Could that request not be made so as to take effect after the vote on the antipoverty bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING REMAINDER OF 2D SESSION OF 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Montana whether this authorization applies only to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is only for the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1188, and ask that it be stated.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment (No. 1188) submitted by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

On page 4, line 5, after "Sec. 104." insert "(a)".

On page 4, between lines 13 and 14 insert the following:

"(b) Title VI of chapter 2 of part I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 254. RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—
(a) None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not require the withholding of assistance to

any country if, following a determination by the President that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest, the two Houses of Congress adopt a concurrent resolution approving the continuance of such assistance."

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he proposes to offer any more amendments tonight after the yeas and nays votes on the one the Senator now has pending?

Mr. MORSE. I do not plan to offer any more amendments tonight.

I shall offer more if Senators wish to stay and vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it offers no offense to Senators, I wonder if we can obtain some indication of how many amendments still remain to be offered on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield for me to make a point on that, I have a rough figure. As I check around, it appears that there will be approximately 20 amendments to be offered—including the one now pending—on the part of all Senators.

I should say that the Senator is making very good progress today, and I am highly pleased.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I ask unanimous consent—and I am sure it will be drafted for insertion before the Senate takes a recess tonight—to have printed in the Record a blanket amendment that would cut the authorization to not more than \$3 billion. That calls for a good many technical changes in the bill. I have legislative counsel working this afternoon on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that I may send that amendment to the desk, that it be printed so as to be available to Senators tomorrow, and that it lie on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the desk as requested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall read from the pending amendment and comment on it as I proceed. The amendment provides:

On page 4, line 5, after "SEC. 104." insert "(a)".

On page 4, between lines 13 and 14 insert the following:

"(b) Title VI of chapter 2 of part I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 254. RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—
(a) None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not require the withholding of assistance to any country if, following a determination by the President that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest, the two Houses of Congress adopt a concurrent resolution approving the continuance of such assistance."

I tried to place every possible safeguard in the amendment to protect our national security. This is a position that the senior Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, has taken for the past several years—not alone, either. Although we have a little difficulty getting the votes on the floor of the Senate for assistance, I will say that on the basis of my conferences in the past several years with my associates on the Committee on Foreign Relations, a considerable number of them say, "You are right." And I think I am right.

Taking a hypothetical country. The amendment provides that if a country has a government that has been democratically elected—or, as we speak of it, a constitutional form of government—and that government is overthrown by force, be it a Communist force, a military force, or a military junta—we stop the aid.

The amendment does not read "until it restores the government it overthrew." It does not require this, although one would hope that the facts in a given situation would justify that. It does provide that we will not give them aid if they overthrow a democratic form of government. It means that they must return to constitutionalism. We ought to square our practices with our representations about trying to support freedom around the world. We ought to stop encouraging outlaws and military juntas around the world from destroying constitutional government, believing that if they do it, they have nothing to lose. They believe that after a little while the United States will come along, pour millions of dollars into their country, and help them entrench themselves in a position of domination over their people and thus keep down freedom.

I am perfectly willing to talk about specific cases. If my amendment had been the law of the land at the time of the junta in the Dominican Republic, under the Bosch regime, we would not only have stopped aid—and we stopped it for awhile—but we would have stopped it until constitutionalism was returned to the Dominican Republic.

My amendment would not require the reinstatement of Mr. Bosch. After the junta, he left the country. It is true that he was taken out of the country. He went to Puerto Rico. But, Mr. President, the country had a constitution. The constitution called for succession. The constitution called for the exercise of rights and prerogative on the part of the parliament. The constitution called for self-government on the part of the people. That was what was destroyed. The junta not only overthrew a president by force, but destroyed constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic. Do not be fooled by the facade they set up. They set up a so-called civilian council or commission under the complete domination and control of the military.

I hold no brief for Bosch. I am not qualified to pass judgment on whether he was a good President or a bad President. That is an internal governmental problem for the people of the Dominican Republic who live under an alleged sys-

tem of self-government. I do hold a brief for our supporting the application of the constitutional system, and opposing the overthrow of a constitutional system.

Their constitutional system was like ours. It provides for various checks, various rights in the people to determine what their own form of government should be. That was destroyed. People became victimized by a junta.

The facade that was set up, the so-called civilian council not having U.S. recognition, continued to cause embarrassment. It produced an interesting set of facts prior to final recognition by the United States of the military junta.

We were told in the Cabinet Room by the then Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Ball—and there are men that are within the sound of my voice who heard it—that the State Department had decided that we ought to recognize the tyrannical military junta of the Dominican Republic, because that junta was about to stage a second coup and was going to stage the second coup out of resentment over the fact that the civilian council had not been able to deliver U.S. recognition, and that the second coup would be bloodier than the first.

I was shocked. In my judgment, we should have continued to refuse to recognize the military junta of the Dominican Republic until it established constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic. By recognizing it we have given encouragement to outlaw forces in Latin America that will not forget that precedent.

At the time I received some criticism when I made the statement to the effect that recognition of the Dominican Republic means that when the chips are down the United States cannot be counted upon to support freedom in Latin America. So we cannot. Our record shows time and time again that we cannot be counted upon.

Mr. President, in my judgment the record of the United States in Latin America on this point is deplorable, and to our shame. We ought to take the position, and stand by it, that if a military junta overthrows a freely elected constitutional government, we will not support that military junta.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the amendment of the Senator from Oregon were adopted, would it deny us the right to give aid to Brazil, which threw out Goulart because of the suspicion and the supporting evidence, that he was tolerating the suggestion and was likely to convert the Brazilian Government into a Communist form of government?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "No"; and I shall cover Brazil before I finish my remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the amendment would cover the Dominican Republic, where Bosch was eliminated?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I shall cover both the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And Ecuador?

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18245

Mr. MORSE. The amendment would have covered Ecuador at the time, but the amendment would not be retroactive. I wish we could make it such, but I do not think it would be fair and proper to make it retroactive. The amendment would establish the policy from now on.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That policy would be such that although the incumbent government might have all of the attributes of wanting to align itself with Red Russia and against the United States, if a military coup were achieved which would change the course of that government, we would not give aid to the substituted government.

Mr. MORSE. I still believe in the rights of the people. I believe in the rights of the people. That is for the people to determine under constitutional government. There is nothing in my amendment that requires us to give aid to a constitutional government just because it is constitutional. The best way to deal with the type of problem which the Senator from Ohio has in mind is to stop supporting military dictatorships. Communism makes more progress under those regimes than it does under constitutional regimes, as we should have learned from Cuba.

I believe that we made a great mistake in the Dominican Republic. But I wish to stress the fact that my amendment would not be retroactive.

We have recognized the Dominican Republic. I hope that democratic forces in the Dominican Republic will be able to persuade that junta that in the long pull, it is in the interest of the Dominican Republic to have elections and to return to a constitutional form of government.

Some may be surprised to hear me make this statement. There are a few leaders in the Dominican Republic who have been caught up in this mess, leaders who would that they were out of it, but feel that their best service to the Dominican Republic is to continue to do what they can to bring about a day when constitutionalism can be reestablished. These men are democrats at heart, men who believe in self-government, men who are willing to make great sacrifices and did make great sacrifices economically, and were willing to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, to overthrow Trujillo. I have great admiration for them. They are working within the junta government now. I have great hopes that in the not too distant future—2 or 3 years from now, and I hope sooner—through their influence and that of many others in the Dominican Republic there would be a return to constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic. But I could not say tonight that there is any reason to have assurance of it or any reason to finance the junta in the meantime.

The hands of those men would have been greatly strengthened if my amendment had been the law of the land at the time of the revolt, for I know what they say privately. Bosch never would have been returned. The Senate did not find the Senator from Oregon taking the position that he should be returned. The Senate found the Senator from Oregon

taking the position that the next in line under that Constitution should be vested with the powers of the President to move on from them. I took the position that it was up to the people of the Dominican Republic to determine whether or not he should be returned.

An attempt was made at the time to get me to take the position that Bosch must be returned. I said constitutionalism should be returned. And so it should. I do not believe we should have been a party to giving support to the junta.

In the Dominican Republic the issue was that the military in that country should be brought under the control of the civilian government. What is so bad about that? We like to say that that is one of the safeguards of American freedom. We like to tell the world that in the United States the civilian government is in control of the military, and the military takes its orders from the civilian government. Bosch was proposing a policy of the Dominican Government whereby the military government would be brought under control of the executive and the congress. The military saw the handwriting on the wall. I am not saying on the floor of the Senate tonight that that was the only issue, but I would say that it was one of the most dominant issues that led to the overthrow of constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic.

The military would have none of it. Rather than have any of it, they tore down the citadel of constitutionalism and desecrated self-government in the Dominican Republic. And we supported it with subsequent recognition, and now with a resumption of aid. That is it. All we can do now is wait for the people of the Dominican Republic ultimately to make the final decision. I hope it can be done peacefully. I hope it can be done by recognition on the part of all, including the type of leaders I have referred to, who were caught up in this situation, who found themselves very much in opposition to some of the executive policies of Bosch, of the need to reestablish constitutionalism and self-government there.

Now a word about Honduras. The amendment would apply to countries in the future that made the same type of mistake in overthrowing constitutionalism as in Honduras. Of course, it would not be retroactive. The Honduras situation, I think, is to our national shame, so far as recognition is concerned. It was only a short time before a presidential election in Honduras. The campaign was on.

The briefing before my committee—and I know of no one who challenges this statement—was to the effect that there was a rather close race for the Presidency. The candidate for the Presidency, who, it was taken for granted, was going to win, also took the position that the military should be subject to the control of the civilian government, and favored a constitutional amendment to that effect. That was unacceptable to the military, and it overthrew the Government, and we recognized it. We recognized it the same day we recognized the

Dominican Republic. It shocked many of our friends in Latin America. We ought to stop this.

The same would have applied years ago to Ecuador. It would have applied to Peru, although, in fact, we did not resume aid to Peru until the junta restored the country to constitutionalism. It would have applied to every area where constitutional government was overthrown by military force.

Now let us take the situation of Brazil, to which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] referred. The constitutional processes were followed in Brazil. Many people miss this point. There was agitation against Goulart. The Governor at São Paulo and the Governors in some other States were calling for great changes in their form of government. They became convinced, as I was convinced, that Goulart was really an ally of the Communists. A revolt took place, but constitutional processes were never abandoned in Brazil. Do not forget that when Goulart fled the country, he abdicated the Presidency, as provided by Brazilian law, for he had no consent to flee the country. In Brazil, like other Latin American countries—Mexico being another, I recall offhand—if a President leaves the country without the approval of the country's Parliament, he has abdicated his office, and he is no longer President.

What happened after Goulart abdicated? The Vice President was the next in line, under the Constitution, to take office. The Constitution provides, in a situation such as that, for the successor.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How close to the tail of Goulart was the army when he fled?

Mr. MORSE. There is no question that a revolution was in process, but that revolution did not mean that the constitutional processes were going to come to an end. The Senator is jumping to the conclusion that the Brazilian situation would have been the same as the Dominican Republic situation. Not at all. The head of the army was not for overthrowing the Constitution. The head of the army was pointing out, supported by the Governors of the several states, and the Parliament, that it had a constitutional government, and that the processes under the Constitution were used to take care of the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon astonishes me with the depth of his knowledge in these different situations. He has discussed the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Brazil, Ecuador, and Peru. I compliment him for his knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator, but I have no depth of knowledge at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But I do not agree with the principle he enunciates.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the compliment, but I am saddened by his last statement, because of the brilliant mind the Senator from Ohio has. Being the thinker he is, he ought to know

that we cannot justify, before the eyes of the world, supporting tyranny by overthrowing constitutional government. I do not believe that is really the true thought of the Senator from Ohio, and I believe that if he took the time to sit down and contemplate the premise on which he has based his conclusion, he would agree. He is one of the soundest constitutionalists in this body. I do not know why he is walking out on his own philosophy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Nor do I subscribe to the proposition that we should reject governments that overthrow Communist governments that are oriented to Moscow and that are favorable to us.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not have any faith in the people of those countries. He assumes that all the people are for those governments. Give them an opportunity to work their will under their constitutions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we reject their acts in overthrowing governments that are oriented toward Moscow, we in effect tell those people that we are not in agreement with what they have done. That is the aspect that causes me to disagree most vigorously with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may disagree, but he should stop rejecting the will of the people and should give the people of the country involved an opportunity to work their will under their constitution, and should not let the military supplant the will of the people or not give the people an opportunity to work their will. That is what the Senator is proposing.

The Brazil situation is interesting because in Brazil there was the application of the popular will within the framework of the constitution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Except that Goulart fled because, as we know, the military were following him so closely that he did not dare stay in Brazil. Otherwise, what would have happened to him?

Mr. MORSE. He would clearly have been put under impeachment and been put away by the Congress of that country. Read the power of the Parliament of Brazil with regard to what we would call in this country impeachment. He would have been put out of office. He should have been put out of office. When he left the country and abdicated, the next man in line to succeed in the Presidency was put in office, until the next constitutional step could be worked out. What happened in Brazil is no precedent for the very unsound doctrine the Senator has expressed on the floor in support of militarism against the exercise of the will of the people because there was one bad actor who was a Communist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not what I said.

Mr. MORSE. That is what it adds up to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that when the Communists take control, the rights of the people the Senator from Oregon has described never are given execution or application. Goulart and his followers in Brazil would never have given those who argued with them the ability to state their views.

Mr. MORSE. That is an unsupportable conclusion on the part of the Senator from Ohio, because the Congress never had a chance to work. Goulart himself, after the revolution started, did it. He would have been subject to what under our constitutional procedures is called impeachment. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator point out to me one instance in the history of the past 20 years in which what the Senator optimistically describes would have happened has happened?

Mr. MORSE. Mexico.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is one. What about the other Nations? What about Cuba? What about the other Nations in which revolutions have taken place?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say about Cuba that if we had not supported a Fascist dictatorship for years in Cuba I do not believe Castro would have come to power.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our weakness was that when Castro came to power we recognized him, knowing that he was a Communist.

Mr. MORSE. I did not do so. I raised a lone voice against Castro, when many Senators were trying to tell the country what a great democrat he was. Let Senators read the Record. It was perfectly obvious to me from the beginning that we were dealing with another type of dictator, who should not have had any support from us. Castro received a great deal of support in the United States that he never should have had.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I knew that we were dealing with a dictator when he decided to hold a circus trial in a hippodrome and put to death 500 people. I recall that the Senator from Oregon voiced those thoughts at that time.

Mr. MORSE. I have been completely consistent in my position on this issue. I shall be consistent now.

We should not follow a course of action that gives support to the overthrow of the will of the people. We should make perfectly clear that our foreign aid will go to countries which support lawful governments, and that if a self-governing country has been overthrown, irrespective of the fact that a bad actor got into the Presidency, if the Constitution covers that situation, we should make clear that he must be gotten rid of by constitutional processes, and that we will not support a military dictatorship which is the result of the overthrow of self-government.

That is the burden of my argument.

I wish to finish what I started to say about Brazil. In Brazil, the constitutional processes were followed. If I were a Brazilian, I would hold no brief for the mistakes that were made internally in carrying out their policies since they elected their new President. However, that is their right. Tonight no Senator can cite Brazil as an example of a military dictatorship, because it is not. Self-government on the part of the Brazilian people continues to proceed. If anyone thinks not, let him look at what is happening in Brazil with respect to an exchange of points of view in Parliament, in the press, and in many sources and forces of public opinion.

My amendment is one of the great protectors that can be offered to our democratic friends in Latin America.

If Senators will talk with the leaders of that Government, they will find that they are enthusiastic for the position that I have taken. I am somewhat embarrassed to make this personal reference, but when the recent conference of Latin American foreign ministers was held in the Pan American Building, the foreign ministers of six countries talked with me about the proposal which I am making tonight. They told me this was the most important thing I could do to strengthen and support the objective of the Alliance for Progress.

Their interest and encouragement is the reason I am offering this amendment. They know that too much of the American interest in Latin American aid stems from fear of communism and not from support of freedom. That knowledge throughout Latin America is one of the great weaknesses of the program.

The amendment would teach a great lesson throughout the Western Hemisphere, and would give great strength to the cause of freedom and constitutional government in Latin America. It would certainly be a discouragement to potential military juntas, if it were made a part of the foreign aid law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not accept the pending amendment. It was voted on last year and rejected by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18247

On this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 531 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Allott	Ervin	Morse
Bartlett	Gruening	Proxmire
Carlson	Johnston	Simpson
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Young, Ohio

NAYS—59

Alken	Holland	Mundt
Bayh	Humphrey	Pastore
Beall	Inouye	Pell
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Boggs	Keating	Randolph
Brewster	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Burdick	Lausche	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Salinger
Case	Magnuson	Smathers
Cooper	Mansfield	Smith
Curtis	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dirksen	McClellan	Symington
Dodd	McGee	Talmadge
Dominick	McIntyre	Thurmond
Douglas	McNamara	Tower
Eliender	Mechem	Walters
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morton	

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Neuberger
Cannon	Hruska	Pearson
Church	Jackson	Robertson
Clark	Javits	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kennedy	Scott
Edmondson	Long, La.	Stennis
Goldwater	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Moss	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, after consultation with the majority leader, I call up my amendments Nos. 1175 and 1138 and ask that they be made the pending business when debate is resumed on the foreign aid bill tomorrow morning, after the antipoverty legislation has been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have them considered en bloc?

Mr. GRUENING. I have only two of them, amendments Nos. 1175 and 1138.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from Alaska

will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendments submitted by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 1175

On page 1, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

"Sec. 101. Section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Funds made available for this title shall not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest excessive or unreasonable for the borrower and in no event shall such funds (except funds loaned under section 205 and funds which, prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, were authorized or committed to be loaned upon terms which do not meet the minimum terms set forth herein) be loaned at a rate of interest of less than the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

Redesignate the succeeding sections under part I, accordingly.

AMENDMENT No. 1138

TITLE VIII—ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

Sec. 801. Section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658; 76 Stat. 542) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,400,000,000 to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than \$800,000,000 shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended."

TRIBUTE TO MRS. CLAIR ENGLE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last year, on August 14, in Doctors Hospital in Washington, Mrs. Clair Engle, my wife, and I were in attendance on our late, great colleague, Senator Clair Engle.

He was one of the bravest and finest men I ever knew.

He was a great athlete, an active, vigorous young man of 52.

That night of August 14 last year, he was wheeled into the operating room accompanied by his wife Lucretia on one side and myself on the other, where he underwent the first of two operations for brain surgery.

Throughout the period following that time, I met with his wife Lucretia on many occasions at Doctors Hospital, and again at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda.

The Engle home is located near Capitol Hill, and on her way home from the hospital in Bethesda late at night, Mrs. Engle would frequently stop at my home. My wife and I would insist on her remaining with us rather than continuing alone to Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, Mrs. Engle is a very great lady.

In today's Washington Evening Star there is published an article written by William S. White, entitled "A Tribute to Mrs. Clair Engle."

I have personal knowledge that the statements made by this respected and nationally known columnist are factually correct—as everyone knows.

I have personal knowledge of the fact that my colleague and friend Clair Engle, with whom I vacationed over the Christmas weekend in 1962 and New Year's weekend of 1963, was a great athlete, a man of the utmost vigor, who could run for 9 miles in the sand, when I would give out at the end of a third that distance.

Yet he was stricken fatally—we who loved him knew; but he felt that he was going to recover. He had confidence that he would recover and would be able to run for reelection as a Senator from the State of California.

While Clair Engle was in the hospital, many people misunderstood the situation. This tribute to Mrs. Clair Engle written by William S. White is factually correct, because I can attest to every word in every line of it from my personal knowledge and I hope it will clear up some misunderstanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. CLAIR ENGLE

(By William S. White)

The feeling that politicians are not really people and that they can in no circumstance deserve pity is so deeply embedded as perhaps never to be dislodged by a more humane view.

The general attitude is an oversimplification of Harry Truman's wry observation: "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." Mr. Truman did not mean that politicians did not bleed like other men when wounded. He only meant that those who dish it out should be ready to take it. He did not intend to promote the idea—though he has done it—that in politics anything should go; anything at all.

Even so American folklore has commonly exempted the women and children from the more pitiless forms of political combat; just as we still don't believe that girls should serve in the infantry. Not so in the case of Mrs. Lucretia Engle, widow of Senator Clair Engle, of California. Since nobody is suddenly so friendless as a man out of power—or a widow bereft of a man who had lost power before he died—this column is meant to put the case for Lucretia Engle.

For many weeks her husband, Clair Engle, lay ill in a hospital of a brain tumor and for many months thereafter he could only hobble about his home, barely able to speak, before death came at last to end his agony. For all those weeks and months he was sustained most of all by Lucretia Engle. She remembered that line—" * * * in sickness and in health." She was the only "night nurse" he had in all that hopeless span of time. She was, in the very nature of things,