

One of the programs of which I want to speak is the Job Corps. Its purpose is to enable young people, between 16 and 21 years of age, from both city and rural slums, to have an opportunity for useful labor in Job Corps Centers and to obtain basic education in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Similar programs are provided for the young man or woman who remains in his local community in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which authorizes work-training and work-study programs.

A central feature of the war on poverty, however, is the local community action program, which include a variety of projects such as educational and preschool programs, remedial reading, special classes for school dropouts, job training programs for youth and adults, expanded health clinics, guidance and counseling for poor families, rehabilitation of the mentally and physically handicapped, and programs for the assistance of the aged.

In most of these projects students like you are needed as volunteers this summer and during your free time next year.

One of the unique aspects of the poverty program is the VISTA volunteers, the domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps program. Already there are 600 VISTA volunteers in training or in the field and by the end of this month this figure is expected to double. These volunteers will bridge the widening gulf between the haves and the have-nots in America by themselves helping the poor in their own neighborhoods and homes. These volunteers, the majority of whom are young people like yourselves, are working for a year side by side with the poor in crowded tenements, slum sidewalks, decaying mill and mine towns, in unpainted shacks on worn-out farms, in migrant worker camps, and on Indian reservations.

Right here in Kentucky nine VISTA volunteers are already at work and by the end of the month 35 more volunteers will be taking part in bringing the people from the hollows of Appalachian Kentucky into the 20th century. Their first step is to teach these hollow dwellers the importance of community interaction for lifting themselves out of the slough of poverty.

One of the original VISTA volunteers right here in Kentucky is a student like yourselves, 20-year-old Paul Merrill from Utah. Paul is the only VISTA volunteer in Lower Grassy, a community of some 150 families living in deep poverty in eastern Kentucky. Since February, Paul has been living in this hollow in a two-room cabin, which is heated by a coal burning, potbellied stove, but which has no running water. One of his first projects was to engage the families of the 42 elementary and junior high school children who are taught in a one-room, 25-foot square schoolhouse, in renovating the schoolbuilding.

In addition to rebuilding the schoolhouse, Paul Merrill has encouraged the families of Lower Grassy to come together to discuss their problems and to try to find some means of working them out. This is a community of people whose primary source of income is welfare payments. Very few have jobs and the fact that hardly any collect unemployment insurance reaffirms the sad finding that most of the community has never worked.

This summer Paul is tutoring some of the seventh and eighth grade children in mathematics and English so that they will be prepared to enter the local high school. He will also be engaged in the Council of Southern Mountains project in Kentucky, which is enlisting college volunteers for the summer to assist regular VISTA volunteers like Paul.

Opportunities for you to take part in your local antipoverty programs exist right now. Students are needed as recreation leaders and as teachers in the new Operation Head Start

program. Over half a million children of the poor in some 2,300 communities in the United States will be involved in Operation Head Start this year, an effort to prepare preschool children from deprived families for school in the fall.

I have spoken of the Peace Corps and the war on poverty.

There are two other areas of opportunity for young people on which I want to touch briefly.

The first is the field of education. We need more teachers in the United States and we need better teachers.

We in Congress have been busy passing legislation to increase our national investment in education. But we still have a shortage of first-class teachers, especially in our elementary and secondary schools. We need some of you.

The second area of opportunity of which I want to say a word is politics.

A free society depends on politics, which means persons and parties of differing points of view competing for control of the government.

I am a Democrat and proud of my party but I believe that we need a strong Republican Party in the United States as well. Of course, I still hope the Democrats win the elections.

We need men and women trained and skilled in the art of politics. I hope therefore you will look upon politics as a possible vocation. For we live in an age when government touches the lives of all of us and when the decisions made by public officials, both appointed and elected, have great bearing on the lives of every citizen here at home and on millions of people in other lands.

Let me summarize what I have tried to say.

The new generation of young Americans is restless, in search of identity and purpose. They want to make the practices of American democracy conform with our principles.

This restlessness has expressed itself in the new student movements.

I find these movements encouraging for they evidence the vitality and viability of the American democracy. They show that we are still a free and open society.

I have suggested four areas where this restlessness can be most creatively channeled: The Peace Corps abroad, the war on poverty at home, the drive for improved education and the vocation of political leadership.

You can, I am sure, suggest other causes, other careers.

I think you must rejoice to be alive, to be young, to feel deeply about our country, about our democracy, and about the cause of human freedom.

I am sure you will agree with the words of Albert Camus shortly before he died: "Let us rejoice. Let us rejoice at being faced with cruel truth. . . . Let us seek the respite where it is, in the very thick of the battle."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the unfinished business pending before the Senate with relation to amending the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I am very happy that my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedey], is in charge of this bill, and I wish to support him and the committee bringing the legislation before the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, throughout our history the men and women who have chosen to immigrate to the United States have contributed vitality, ideas, resourcefulness, enthusiasm, and hard work to the economic, social, political, and cultural growth of our Nation. As President Kennedy so aptly stated, we are a "nation of immigrants." There is scarcely an area of our national life that has not been favorably affected by the work of people from other lands. The homogeneity of American life has been enhanced by the efforts of many groups of heterogeneous people.

However, our present immigration law seems to ignore the many valuable contributions which immigrants have made to our national growth.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was a comprehensive statute which codified a series of previous laws relating to immigration and naturalization. Many of its basic provisions were desirable and have worked effectively for the past 13 years. However, I voted against passage of this measure, and voted to sustain President Truman's veto of it because I felt that it contained certain basic inequities. These inequities have become increasingly apparent with the passage of time. Furthermore, our needs and responsibilities in the field of immigration have changed significantly over the years.

Throughout my service as a Member of the U.S. Senate I have sponsored legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make it fairer and more workable, and to eliminate discrimination against any cultural or racial group. On many occasions I have written to the Judiciary Committee in support of legislation to modify the existing law. I am therefore gratified that the committee has reported out this bill, H.R. 2580. The committee members are to be congratulated for the way in which they have dealt with this difficult and complex subject. They have done their job well, placing first things first. They have removed the discriminatory aspects of our immigration policy. They have emphasized the humanitarian task of reuniting families. They have included provisions to facilitate the entry of skilled workers while taking precautionary measure to insure that American jobs and working condition will be protected.

By once and for all eliminating the arbitrary and discriminatory national origins formula for selecting immigrants

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100290004-6

to come to the United States, we have finally come firmly to grips with the most serious deficiency of the McCarran-Walter Act. Too often in the past we have enacted limited or temporary measures, often on an ad hoc basis, to meet an emergency situation or to deal with a problem not covered in the basic statute. This bill represents an effective and realistic approach to the important task of reshaping and modernizing our basic immigration policy. I hope that it will be passed without further delay.

The bill makes the following changes in our current immigration law:

First. It raises the number of quota visas available each year from the present 158,561 to 170,000. It provides that no quota area can get more than 20,000 numbers in any fiscal year.

Second. It abolishes the "national origins" formula for disturbing quota numbers among the countries of the world, and substitutes new selection system on a first-come, first-qualified basis, within the percentage limitations of the adjusted preference categories.

Third. It establishes a new set of preferences giving highest priority to close family members of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and to immigrants with special talents or skills which are potentially beneficial to our national well-being.

Fourth. It extends nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens, such citizens being 21 years of age or older.

Fifth. It gives a preference to persons needed to fill jobs for which domestic workers are not available.

Sixth. It abolishes the Asia-Pacific triangle provision which discriminates against persons of oriental ancestry.

Seventh. It establishes a new set of labor controls to safeguard American workers from job competition and from declining work standards and wages as a result of immigrants entering the labor market.

Eighth. It makes permanent provision for the entry of 10,200 refugees each year.

These eight provisions, Mr. President, really modernize and make workable immigration into the United States. I think it is essential that these eight provisions be enacted into law.

PRESENT QUOTA FORMULA IS DISCRIMINATORY

The effect of the present quota allocation formula has been to discriminate against certain nationality groups, particularly those from eastern and southern European and Asian countries. Today there are many quota numbers available in some countries where there is little pressure for immigration, while in other areas, where there are many persons who wish to immigrate to the United States, few quota numbers are available and the quotas are heavily oversubscribed. Some 70 percent of the total 158,561 quota numbers authorized under present law are assigned to only three quota areas. Only half of these are used each year. On a worldwide basis, approximately 50,000 quota numbers are left over each year, but no provision has ever been made to allow for the pooling of these unused numbers,

and for their subsequent allocation in areas with oversubscribed quotas.

The remaining 30 percent of the total numbers presently authorized are available to applicants in the rest of the world's countries, but statistics show that the demand is heaviest in these areas. Approximately 60 percent of those on quota waiting lists in oversubscribed areas are from four countries: Italy, 249,583; Greece, 98,385; Poland, 80,481, and Portugal, 71,477. Another 40,443 are waiting on the Chinese persons quota.

In addition to being discriminatory in principle, the national origins system has not, in fact, proven effective in regulating immigration. Total immigration to the United States has averaged some 300,000 annually for the past several years. However, of this number, an average of only 100,000 per year, or 1 out of every 3 persons, has entered as a quota immigrant. The remainder enter either as nonquota immigrants or as beneficiaries of private legislation. For example, in 1963, 103,036 persons entered under the established quota system, whereas 203,244 entered outside of the quota. The corresponding figures for 1964 are 102,844 quota immigrants, and 189,404 outside of the quota.

The primary objective of the bill is to abolish the national origins system. The bill proposes only a modest increase in the total number of quota immigrants who will be admitted to the United States annually, from the present 158,561 to 170,000, only 12,000 additional. The important point here is that all numbers which are authorized each year will be used as long as there is a demand for them. If this law is enacted, instead of asking a prospective immigrant where he was born, we will be concerned with his relationship to a U.S. citizen or resident alien, or whether he possesses special skills or training of potential benefit to our national economy or welfare.

FAMILY REUNITING

Enactment of this legislation would help unite families.

According to 1960 census figures, approximately one-fifth of the total population of the United States was foreign born, or native born with at least one parent born abroad. In Massachusetts, out of a total 1960 population of 5,149,317, approximately 578,452 were foreign born, with another 1,481,857 native born of foreign or mixed parentage. This means that more than 2 out of every 5 residents of my State fall into this category. Many of these people have spouses, children, parents, brothers or sisters still abroad whom they wish to bring to this country to join them. Each of us in this body I know takes great satisfaction in knowing that from time to time he has been of assistance in reuniting families. However, all too often we must report to our constituents the discouraging news that delays, often of many years' duration, must be anticipated before families can be brought together. According to the State Department, as of December 28, 1964 there were some 178,515 persons registered as preference immigrants—rela-

tives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and skilled persons—on oversubscribed quota lists.

The adjusted preference system of this bill places primary emphasis on family reuniting. Parents of U.S. citizens, such citizens being at least 21 years of age, are to be nonquota. Most of those affected by this change are elderly people who wish to spend their remaining years with their children.

Spouses and children of resident aliens will also be given a higher preference than they previously had. Lesser preferences are given to other relatives. This bill would help facilitate the entry of skilled aliens, which is very important to the economy.

ENTRY OF SKILLED ALIENS FACILITATED

The bill's preference system also gives priority to persons capable of performing jobs, either in our national interest or for which there is a labor shortage in the domestic labor market. Many of our hospitals, educational institutions, industrial firms, and even our own Government agencies need qualified people to assume important positions from which they could contribute significantly to the national prosperity and growth, and more importantly, to advances of international significance in their fields. The present quota system, however, prevents many qualified and needed people from gaining prompt entry.

These people should not be required to experience long waiting periods on the quota lists when there are employment opportunities available to them in the United States. It should be emphasized that this particular group of workers is not in competition with American workers. They would be filling jobs which presently go unfilled because there are not sufficient workers in the United States to fill them. Requiring these individuals to wait serves no real purpose. By admitting them, and filling these vacant positions, the domestic economy will be enhanced, and in addition, employment opportunities will be created for domestic workers.

Many people argue that because we have a substantial unemployment rate in the United States today, we should restrict rather than expand immigration. However, the bill contains strict labor control provisions which have the support of our labor unions. Any alien seeking to enter this country as a worker, skilled or otherwise, must obtain an affirmative certification from the Secretary of Labor that he will not replace a worker in the United States and further, that his employment will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of individuals in the United States who are similarly employed. This certification is required for all immigrants from the Western Hemisphere countries, all nonpreference immigrants, and for all those applying as skilled or unskilled workers under the preference categories.

We have before us a bill which retains both qualitative and quantitative controls over immigration. After the 3-year phase-out period, which provides an orderly transition to the new system, quota numbers will be issued on a first-

come, first-qualified basis without regard to an applicant's place of birth. However, in order to insure that the quota numbers will be distributed equitably, and to insure that no one country can preempt a majority of the numbers available each year, the bill provides that not more than 20,000 numbers can go to the natives of any single quota area in any fiscal year.

All prospective immigrants will continue to be screened carefully to make sure that they meet the strict qualifications for admissibility which were established by earlier law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the reasoning supporting the conclusion that the 20,000 figure was just and equitable?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe it was a figure considered fair under all the circumstances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figure was arrived at, then, in order to prevent any one nation from receiving excessive benefits under the bill, and the limitation was adopted on that basis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand it, the Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. As I say, I believe that the bill establishes reasonable limits, not so much higher than present limits. It establishes preferences, or reasons, for admitting people into the country who are skilled workers, and will also be helpful in uniting families. Broadly speaking, the pending bill would make our immigration laws more workable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Massachusetts on the committee?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not on the committee, but I have been interested in this legislation for at least 8 to 10 years.

Madam President, a prospective immigrant must still provide evidence to show that he will not become a public charge. Persons of questionable moral character or political leanings will continue to be excluded.

REFUGEE PROVISIONS

The bill also takes a significant step forward in the area of refugee legislation. I have previously sponsored legislation in this area and am particularly pleased to note that of the total 170,000 quota numbers available each year, 10,200 are permanently reserved for the use of refugee-escapees. In this important area also we have, in the past, acted on an ad hoc basis, passing legislation to meet emergency situations. Now, a defined policy, offering refuge to persons who have fled from their homelands because of persecution on account of race, religion, or political beliefs, or who are unable to return to their homes on account of a natural disaster, will be a permanent part of our immigration statute.

Madam President, I now come to the very important provision—the Western Hemisphere provision.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE PROVISION

Madam President, in passing this legislation, we are attempting to eliminate the discriminatory features of our immigration laws. We are adopting a general principle governing immigration which imposes a ceiling of 170,000 total visas to be distributed among people all over the world who wish to immigrate to the United States, without any reference to the applicant's place of birth. However, the bill as passed by the House places the natives of the 24 Western Hemisphere countries in a favored position vis-a-vis the natives of the countries of the rest of the world. To permit these people to enjoy nonquota or "special" status as contemplated in the House version of the bill is, in fact, contradictory to our announced goal of removing special preferences for the natives of any quota area, and is inconsistent with the new quota allocation formula which imposes a maximum ceiling on immigration for all the countries of the world.

I believe that sooner or later we will have to deal with the problems posed by increasing immigration from Western Hemisphere countries. Recent demographic studies show that these nations constitute the area of the greatest future population growth. While we in the United States have an annual growth rate of approximately 1.8 percent, the growth rate in these nations is about 3 percent per annum. The population of the area is now approximately 200 million, but projections indicate that within 35 years, the population will reach 600 million.

In 1956, total immigration from the Western Hemisphere nations, including close family members of U.S. citizens, totaled some 94,274. By 1961, this figure had risen to 112,836. In 1964, the total was 139,284, and in the first 6 months of this year, some 75,402 have already been admitted from these areas. The average for the past 6 years has been 125,000 annually, including close relatives of U.S. citizens.

I believe that the compromise worked out by the Senate Judiciary Committee is a realistic and equitable one, and one which is entirely consistent with our overall objective in enacting immigration reform legislation. A total annual quota of 120,000 for Western Hemisphere nations is established, and will become effective on January 1, 1968. However, close relatives of U.S. citizens will continue to enjoy nonquota status. Estimates indicate that about 25,000 persons may be affected by this latter consideration. Therefore, if we impose a total limitation of 120,000, and add to this the 25,000 close relatives of U.S. citizens, total immigration from this area can be as high as 145,000 per year. In view of the recent pattern of immigration, this figure is a just one.

Of course we do not intend to affront our hemispheric neighbors with whom we have traditionally worked closely and

many mutual interests. As a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, I have taken great interest in promoting understanding and cooperation with the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. I think we all want that. To say that the action of the Judiciary Committee in limiting immigration from the Western Hemisphere, just as it is limiting it from the rest of the world, will destroy our relationships with those countries is to create a problem which should not arise. Our ties to our hemispheric neighbors are strong. So are our historic ties with the countries of Western Europe, which have given us not only our laws and many of our traditions, but which also sent here the first immigrants who settled the New World. These historic ties—strong as they are—are not preventing us from altering a quota formula which for many years has given these countries a significant advantage with respect to immigration. Today a qualified native of Great Britain, Chile, or Venezuela can enter this country promptly if he desires to do so. A qualified native of Greece or Italy or Poland or Portugal cannot. Our historic ties to Great Britain do not prevent us from correcting this situation—from altering the special privileged status of that country. Nor should they. Nor should our ties and friendship with Chile and Venezuela, and other Western Hemisphere countries prevent us from correcting a policy which discriminates in favor of them at the expense of other nations.

Our neighbors know that the action that we are taking here is designed to equalize opportunity to people of all nations to come here should they meet the general qualifications imposed. Surely they are reasonable and realistic enough to recognize that what is fair for the rest of the world is fair for them.

I prefer to look at the committee's recommendation with respect to the Western Hemisphere nations as a step forward to greater equality in our immigration policy, not as a step backward. We are in the process of a major revision of the concepts which have governed our immigration policy. What we want, and what our relationships with the rest of the world require, is a complete overhaul—not an incomplete job. Clearly this is the time to act. To fail to do so would be to continue our discriminatory policies—not to abolish them.

We must remember that this bill provides for a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration which is to review and study all aspects of immigration from this area, and to make appropriate recommendations to the Congress. If after careful deliberation the Commission feels that some adjustments should be made in the Western Hemisphere provisions of this bill, there will be an opportunity for it to present its views to Congress and there will be time for Congress to act before the quota limitation becomes crystallized into law on July 1, 1968.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000100290004-6

Surely the limitation of 120,000 set on Western Hemisphere immigration as opposed to only 170,000 for the rest of the world is realistic and not restrictive. The time to take such a step is now, and I hope that this amendment will be retained by the Senate, and retained in conference with the House.

IMMIGRANTS HAVE BENEFITED OUR COUNTRY

We all know how much the immigrants have benefited our country. Our Nation has, throughout the years, benefited from the contributions of our immigrants. And, with the aid and challenge of fresh ideas and talents, and the enthusiasm and industry of the immigrants we can anticipate in the future, we will continue to do well. I have had the opportunity to meet many of the individuals whom I have helped come to this country and I have been pleased by their appreciation of what this country stands for. I know that their enthusiasm for the United States, and their determination to make good and to contribute to the continued progress of our Nation has been an important asset to us. I know how successful some of them have been, and how grateful they are that these opportunities have been made available to them.

In an era when other countries seem to be moving in the direction of a more rather than a less restrictive immigration policy, our action in liberalizing our law has special meaning. We are making clear to the rest of the world that we intend to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination against any nationality group from our immigration law, and in so doing that we intend to live up to our image as the land of opportunity. Failure to act will, in the long run, result in a weakening of our position as the leader of the free nations of the world, and in a decline of our domestic, economic, and social well-being.

Passage of this bill will give renewed meaning to the famous words of Emma Lazarus on the base of the Statue of Liberty. The "Golden Door" will at last be open.

I note the presence of my junior colleague (Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts) in the Senate. I congratulate him upon fathering this measure, which I believe is of so much value to all of us in this country. I hope the proposed legislation will be passed and that, under his guidance, the committee of conference will adopt its provisions, particularly with regard to limitation in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would like to express my own personal appreciation, and I am sure that of the members of the committee, to my distinguished colleague for making this address in support of this legislation. As my colleague has pointed out in his address, it is fair legislation. It is equitable legislation. It is meaningful legislation. It is responsive to the particular needs which have been with us for some period of time. The fact that my distinguished colleague is making this eloquent sup-

port for the legislation ought to be of great importance to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what my distinguished colleague has said.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Massachusetts may yield to me for some observations, without his losing his right to the floor.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Carolina, whose resourcefulness I always appreciate.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I express my hearty commendation of what the Senator from Massachusetts has said upon the limitation of immigration from the Western Hemisphere. I would like to emphasize in this connection what the Senator from Massachusetts said—that this limitation does not go into effect until July 1, 1968; and that the commission which is to be created by the bill is specifically charged with the duty to study this limitation and make such recommendations to the Congress as it sees fit.

I commend the Senator for pointing out in such an eloquent way that this limitation on the Western Hemisphere does not constitute any discrimination whatever but, on the contrary, it brings the Western Hemisphere in line with our policy with respect to the rest of the world.

I point out also that the limitation of 120,000 as applied to the Western Hemisphere, as contradistinguished from the 170,000 in the Eastern Hemisphere, still makes provision in favor of the Western Hemisphere, in that it allocates, if my arithmetic is correct, 45 percent of our immigration from an area of the world which at the present moment contains only 15 percent of the world's population. So we are still giving the Western Hemisphere an advantage under this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate very much what the Senator from North Carolina has said. I might also add—as I know the Senator is aware—that when he says 120,000, there are 25,000 close relatives of U.S. citizens in addition to that number who can come in. So I believe what we are doing is building up a mutual relationship with the Western Hemisphere, rather than in any way making those countries feel that they should not like or appreciate what we are doing.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding to me under those conditions. What the Senator has said in his speech is of great significance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FONG. Madam President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. LAUSCHE) without losing the floor.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I believe this is an appropriate time for me to express my opinion on the bill that is pending before the Senate.

I have in mind that this Yankee from Massachusetts, of the pure blood stock, with roots dating back to the very earliest days of our history, comes upon the floor of the Senate and speaks in behalf of the immigration bill.

We are receiving letters condemning the bill; and those who write, in my opinion, are not fully informed of its contents, nor are they aware adequately of the significance of keeping our doors moderately open.

Today this Yankee is joined by this Ohioan, whose parents came from Slovenia, in the Alps of Yugoslavia, the Yankee and the Slovenian uniformly expressing the view that this is a good bill.

Moreover, I am happy to join the Kennedys, the Saltonstalls, and the Fongs of Hawaii in supporting it.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would like to comment that we all work together. The inscription on the Statue of Liberty proclaims that no matter where one comes from, we offer the opportunities of this country. Whether we came from Ireland, Yugoslavia, or Halifax, we had the same motive. And Hawaii, originally from China.

Mr. FONG. It is remarkable that the descendant of one of Hawaii's plantation laborers, coming from the Far East, should stand on the floor of the Senate and join with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, in asking the Senate to support this bill strongly.

Although we come from ancestors in different parts of the world, we know that the bill is a fine bill, and I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his excellent address on this subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research, development, and demonstrations in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of September 16, 1965, pp. 23187-23188, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

*BEST COPY
Available*

6/17/98

the promise of a rich and fertile land for the people who live there.

But when I look back at the history since World War II, what I'm impressed with is not the troubles or the problems—the world has always had those. I'm impressed with the new element in international relations: the steady effort, crystallized in our mutual development programs, our aid programs, by independent countries to work together on solving problems.

That is new, and different, and a cause for optimism.

For our part, I can assure you that we approach our role in the development partnership in the same way we have learned to view our investment in the development of our own cities. We don't see this as something we are doing for somebody else. We see it as an investment in our own future and in the world we share with you.

In closing, may I say this: The American character is one of optimism and, sometimes, impatience. It is one which leads us, from time to time, into mistakes. It is one, I am sure, which is often not fully understood in other places.

But I want to leave this message with you: We Americans are committed—committed beyond recall—to the building of a freer, better, happier world for all men.

There have been times, I know, when you may have doubted this. But today, as never before, our American Nation has come to appreciate the oneness of mankind. This appreciation makes possible the great national programs we undertake today to build better cities, to fight poverty, to eliminate discrimination in our own society, to do something on behalf of our fellow men.

And today, as never before, we know that we cannot live rich in a world too long poor.

I, for one, mean to do in my lifetime what I can to extend mankind's benefits to more of mankind. And I am joined by the overwhelming majority of the American people. I am joined, certainly, by our President.

Let us, then, together decide ourselves to creating the world of justice, hope and peace that all men long for, but have not yet achieved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio (Mr. LAUSCHE), who is to be recognized to make some remarks at this time, will yield without losing the right to the floor or having the time for the quorum call taken out of the time allotted to him, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate within the last few days there has been a discussion of what the conditions were in the Dominican Republic in April, when the U.S. Government determined to send in its Marines. A statement was made that an erroneous judgment was reached by the President because he was misinformed as to the purpose in sending in the troops. I must express vigorous disagreement with that argument.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and had the opportunity of listening to the representatives of the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the CIA in describing what took place in the Dominican Republic when the revolt of last spring began.

I can say unhesitatingly to Senators on the floor of the Senate that the proof was clear and convincing that unless we had stepped in we would have at our shores another Cuba.

We know of the difficulties that are facing us because of Cuba. In my judgment, those difficulties would be multiplied many times if another Castro and Cuba were established within 100 miles of the banks of our land on the south.

When the coup began it was led by persons who were not connected with the Communist Party. But it is an established fact that there were three groups in Cuba.

One group was known as the 14th of June movement with complete fidelity to Castro. Its members obtained guerrilla training in Cuba, especially in the year of 1964. That group is oriented to Castro and is Communist. It is the largest of the extremists parties, but does contain some non-Communist members.

The second group, that was latent and hidden in the Dominican Republic, was the PSPD, oriented to Moscow. Its members received training in Czechoslovakia in 1963. Others obtained indoctrination in Moscow in 1964.

Then, there was a third group, the APCJ, oriented to Peiping. Members of the APCJ went to Communist China late in 1964, where they received guerrilla military training.

We thus have the situation with three groups in the Dominican Republic led by Communists, with some of their members non-Communists. They were hidden, waiting for action. When the coup began, they immediately sprung to the forefront, and within a few days they were occupying the leading positions in what was happening.

When the military members of the coup began distributing arms, these three Communist oriented organizations were in the frontline. Their leaders

were distributing military equipment, and they were seen at vital places in command. All of the indications were that they were practically in control.

Military equipment was delivered to them in large quantities and taken to their headquarters, where it was distributed to their members, many of whom were Communists, and others who did not know exactly what was in the making.

There has been some criticism, particularly in the press, about the relatively small number of Communists identified as having taken part in the rebellion in the Dominican Republic.

In my judgment we miss the seriousness of the revolutionary situation by adding up the number of Communists that were identified in it.

When we add the number, we completely miss the point about the ability of Communist leaders to dominate a situation where disorder, rioting, and mob rule prevails. By skilled manipulation, propaganda, by assertion of leadership in proper points, in street fighting, by aggressive activity, these Communists take hold. That is what they did in the Dominican Republic.

A few skilled people can do this in the proper circumstances. In the Dominican Republic the circumstances were existent, enabling the Communists to seize the leadership, and to install their government.

When a temporary government was established in April, in charge of the investigative forces, there was placed at its head the most ardent Communist of the whole group.

That is a technique of Communist activity which is generally understood: Get control of the police; get control of the investigating agency, and when there is control of them, begin arresting all citizens who are in disagreement with the party in control who have the potential ability of interfering.

I merely want to remind Senators of what has happened in Cuba. Castro immediately arrested 500 of the leaders whom he thought would cause trouble to him. He had a hippodrome trial. The 500 persons were put to death under the semblance of the administration of justice, when it was nothing but the act of a tyrant, giving the semblance of a trial to the accused, with all judgments fore-ordained, and then putting them to death.

I have already stated that the man that was placed at the head of the investigative forces was one of the leading Communists in the Dominican Republic.

But one word about the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were called by the chairman of the committee (Mr. FULBRIGHT). The committee did not make the decision to hold the hearings.

I regret to say this, but it is nevertheless my judgment, that the meeting was contemplated to establish that we were in the Dominican Republic by error and injustice.

Someone had prepared a sheaf of cards, I should say 1 1/2 inches thick. When the witnesses appeared, the questions on the cards were systematically