

April 6, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6823

H.R. 2362

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CASE and Mr. DOMINICK) to H.R. 2362, a bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools:

On page 8, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' shall be 50 per centum and \$2,000, respectively, and

"(2) for each of such two succeeding fiscal years, an additional amount shall be determined using a 'Federal percentage' of 25 per centum and a 'low-income factor' of \$3,000 but more than \$2,000 (excluding children counted under section 203(a)(2)(B)), and added to the basic grant, if (A) such amount is matched by State or local funds, or both, to be used for the same purpose as such basic grant and (B) at the option of the State educational agency of each State, such agency elects to receive for such year the amount determined under this clause (2) in lieu of a special incentive grant pursuant to section 204.

Any amount contributed by a State for the purpose of clause (2) shall be in addition to regular payments of State aid made by such State, and any amount made available by a local educational agency for the purpose of such clause with respect to any fiscal year shall represent an increase in such year in current expenditures of local funds for elementary and secondary school education by such agency over the amount of such expenditures in the previous fiscal year."

On page 9, line 16, after "shall" insert ", if no election has been made to receive the amount determined pursuant to section 203 (c) (2) in lieu thereof,".

On page 10, line 2, after "shall" insert ", if no election has been made to receive the amount determined pursuant to section 203 (c) (2) in lieu thereof,".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 8, 1965, I introduced a bill (S. 1412) for the relief of military and civilian personnel for losses sustained to property by fire on August 17, 1963, while stored in commercial warehouses in Alexandria, Va.

At the next printing of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as cosponsors of S. 1588 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. DAGUE, and Mr. LATTA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Article entitled "Legislators' Policy Statement on Highway Traffic Safety."

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement by Hon. CHARLES MOON, Representative, State of Washington, relating to water plan study.

Editorial published in the Seattle Times on February 28, 1965, entitled "Pacific Fisheries Competition."

Designation of March 19 as Aviation Day by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "April a Big Month for Idaho Author," by Carl E. Hayden, published in the Salt Lake City Tribune, issue of March 9, relating to Col. Glenn Balch and his authorship of books on the West.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. 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 ADMINISTRATION SHOULD SPELL OUT PREREQUISITES FOR AN ACCEPTABLE POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have prepared, for delivery this week, an extended address on the subject of Vietnam. In this address, I intend to reiterate the plea I made in the Senate on February 17 for a negotiated settlement of the war in southeast Asia. I also intend to emphasize my belief that if our carrot-and-stick strategy is to succeed in bringing Hanoi to the conference table on acceptable terms, it is not enough to brandish the stick only. It is equally important to show the carrot.

Finally, I intend to emphasize the necessity for breaking the diplomatic deadlock—first you withdraw, then we will talk—that finds both sides, in effect, demanding the surrender of the other as the price for negotiations.

The President has just disclosed that he will make a major speech on Vietnam in Baltimore tomorrow evening. This will be a policy statement of great im-

portance. Accordingly, I shall defer any statement of my own until Thursday, following the President's address to the Nation.

However, in the meantime, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the exceptionally fine Walter Lippmann column, published in the Washington Post this morning. In it, Lippmann asks for an explanation of why the administration has thus far neglected to adequately spell out the prerequisites for an acceptable political settlement in Vietnam. He writes:

We have never had, at least so far as I know, any straightforward explanation of why the administration persists in keeping its war aims uncertain. The crucial uncertainty is whether or not the administration intends to impose as yet undefined conditions which must be met before it will agree to a cease-fire and the beginning of negotiations for an armistice.

This uncertainty has seemed to many who are much concerned a deliberate tactic, designed to make the Hanoi government sue for peace before it learns the terms of the peace.

Lippmann points out that it would be easy to put an end to the uncertainty. I agree. I believe, moreover, that this is the missing ingredient which must be supplied if we are to have any prospect of soon reaching the conference table.

I strongly commend the column to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

IS UNCERTAINTY NECESSARY?

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have never had, at least so far as I know, any straightforward explanation of why the administration persists in keeping its war aims uncertain. The crucial uncertainty is whether or not the administration intends to impose as yet undefined conditions which must be met before it will agree to a cease-fire and the beginning of negotiations for an armistice.

This uncertainty has seemed to many who are much concerned a deliberate tactic, designed to make the Hanoi government sue for peace before it learns the terms of the peace. That this is the tactic of the administration is the opinion, for example, of Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, a lawyer and judge whose opinion in a matter of this kind carries weight. This is also the opinion of 17 nonaligned governments which have just addressed an appeal to the principal powers. It is, as a matter of fact, the very general opinion throughout the world, and it is a principal reason why, even among our closest allies, there are deep misgivings about us.

Yet it would be easy to put an end to the uncertainty. The administration's stock formula is that Hanoi must show a willingness to "leave its neighbors alone." This is a quite ambiguous formula. It seems to say that there can be no cease-fire, no end, that is to say, to the Vietcong terrorism in South Vietnam and to the American bombing in North Vietnam, until Hanoi does—does what? Nobody knows what. Secretary Rusk never says what. And supposing that Hanoi did show a willingness to "leave its neighbors alone," how would the administration know whether to believe Hanoi, or how long to believe it?

This fundamental vagueness and imprecision is a wholly different thing from an unconditional cease-fire. There are indications that the administration may be think-

ing of clarifying its position. But the indications are ambiguous. On Sunday evening on "Meet the Press," Mr. McGeorge Bundy allowed that, "I didn't say anything about specific preconditions." It is not clear to me from studying the text whether there are no preconditions or whether Mr. Bundy, like Mr. Rusk, would not spell out the preconditions.

We are told that there are no signs from Hanoi that it wants a cease-fire followed by talks. To insist on this is to labor the obvious and it is beside the point. Considering the military situation in South Vietnam, it would be surprising indeed if Hanoi did not think or at least say, that it was in sight of a smashing victory. There can be no guarantee that if we decided to call for an unconditional cease-fire, that there would then be one.

The consequences of a misconceived and mismanaged war cannot be erased easily or cheaply. But it is more important that we save what can be saved and strengthen our position for the future which is complicated and entangled. The essential diplomatic material must be provided without which our allies cannot proceed to play their part in saving the peace. Nor can the Soviet Union, nor the nonaligned nations, nor the Holy See, nor the Secretary General of the United Nations.

If the administration clarifies its position on a cease-fire, it will be taking the first indispensable step toward emerging from our present near isolation in southeast Asia into what could become membership in a great diplomatic coalition for peace and order.

In addition to this specific and indispensable correction of our diplomatic stance, we can improve our position in the war by spelling out—in general terms publicly, more specifically through private diplomatic channels—the nature of the overall settlement in southeast Asia which we would support. These are the "carrots" of a peace offensive, and in his statement of March 25 the President made a sketchy beginning along this line.

A diplomatic action on a sufficient scale to produce some results will have to include indications—through private channels, say of the Soviet Union and of France—of what kind of government might be set up in Saigon, and of the possible relations between North and South Vietnam which, according to the Geneva agreements of 1954, are not two sovereign nations but two zones of one sovereign nation.

Almost certainly some such political understandings as these are indispensable to the liquidation of the war. The juicier carrots of a large south Asian economic development are most desirable and talking about them will do good. But we must remember that on both sides men are dying for what they regard as inalienable political rights, and it is to that that our diplomatists must first address their minds.

THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION CUTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this week the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee begins its annual review of the justifications submitted by the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year. They contain many important items, but much attention will be centered around a proposed cut of \$100 million in the agricultural conservation program and a \$20 million cut for the Soil Conservation Service.

The agricultural conservation program cut is a direct budget slash while the Soil Conservation Service cutback will be through the "back door" in that

the administration proposes to establish a new technical assistance "revolving fund." The new fund, if set up, will shift up to 50 percent of the cost of the services of Federal soil technicians and engineers to the already hard-pressed farmer. In effect, it will amount to at least a \$20 million cut.

The so-called revolving fund is additionally noxious since it fails to recognize the contributions already being made by farmers and county and State governments to these programs. In Nebraska alone it could mean increased costs to the farmers of approximately \$500,000. This would be on top of the \$1.5 million in conservation cost sharing already being spent by our farmers, as my colleague, from Nebraska, Senator CURTIS, has previously stated on the Senate floor. These are additional costs to be heaped on the hard-pressed farmer who has been caught in the cost-price squeeze as never before.

These two programs have been on the books for 30 years. During that time they have been widely accepted by farmers and have advanced the objectives of conserving our natural resources as well as making a substantial and continuing contribution to our farm economy.

In my State of Nebraska, the agricultural conservation program and SCS programs have achieved great success. In fact, the State ranks second in total participation in the programs. However, the work has just really begun. A high official of the Department of Agriculture recently estimated that in Nebraska only about 13 percent of the job has been done to date. This estimate is founded on necessary and practical conservation objectives. These objectives are long range, as should be the planning for all sound conservation programs. It is a kind of effort that is not suited for crash projects or quick starts or stops. It needs a steady, deliberate pace of operations so that the landowners and operators, the local, State, and Federal Government officials concerned with the programs can proceed in an orderly fashion with their planning and activities to achieve those goals.

Now the Johnson administration comes forth and suggests a 40-percent cut in the SCS budget for a single year. Such a slash is irresponsible at the very least and certainly not keeping good faith with the farmers and State and local governments who have invested substantial amounts of time, effort, and money in this important task.

There are many of us, on both sides of the aisle who will oppose these reckless cuts. There are many of us who are wondering if this is what the so-called Great Society has in store for our farmers.

My information is that the cuts were imposed by the Bureau of the Budget below the level of the original requests submitted by the Department of Agriculture. This is another example of budgeteers making farm policy, a duty which should be enjoined upon the Department of Agriculture rather than upon those who would seek to do things solely from the standpoint of reducing appropriations in an area

where the uses have been demonstrated and where they are sound in order to make them available for new and larger areas. Perhaps this proposal is a logical extension of the kind of thinking that led Kermit Gordon, the Director of the Bureau, to the conclusion in his January article in Saturday Review that there is no future on the farm for 2½ million of our 3½ million farmers.

This Senator rejects the spurious thinking that led to the proposed cuts. I shall do all that I can to see that the funds are restored.

Mr. President, Mr. Gene Kemper, editor of the Alliance Daily Times-Herald, of Alliance, Nebr., has editorialized on the proposed cuts very clearly and forcefully in the March 30 edition of his newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the Record at this point.

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

CUTTING ACP AND SCS NOW WOULD BE AG FOLLY

One only has to watch the Times-Herald's farm page each Saturday to realize how many rural people hereabouts are taking advantage of conservation services and practices offered by governmental agencies.

Farmers and ranchers have taken advantage of the agriculture conservation program to build terraces, ponds, windbreaks, and otherwise prevent a return of the "dirty thirties." The Government pays half and the landowner half. An additional Government service here is technical advice provided free by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). Surveys and other help from this source have encouraged many a landowner to improve his acreage and increase its productivity.

Now comes the Federal Government, which is doing these things on the cuff in other parts of the world, wanting to cut down on the conservation program at home. The Johnson administration is recommending to Congress a \$100 million cut in the agriculture conservation program budget and a \$20 million cut in the SCS technical assistance program. The suggestion is made that landowners pay the Government for this SCS help.

The entire recommendation is inconsistent at this time when efforts started in the 1930's are starting to really pay off. And at the very moment when new programs are being started to preserve natural resources and beautify the Nation.

SCS was born in 1935. It has been a most important long-range soil resource program. The form of assistance provided is technical to make soil surveys and investigations, to plan balanced use and conservation measures designed to meet the need and land capabilities of individual farms and areas, and to draft designs and specifications and to furnish supervision when conservation plans for a farm or area are being carried out.

The agriculture conservation program was also established in 1935, and under it the Government pays farmers about 50 percent of the costs of carrying out soil conserving practices. Through it serious soil depletion and erosion problems have been corrected.

These programs have been supplemented over the years by watershed protection and flood prevention programs, by a soil bank program, by the Great Plains Conservation Act of 1956 under which a necessary effort to fight erosion was mounted.

The 88th Congress, which President Johnson has called "the greatest conservation Congress in our entire history," passed more than 30 conservation measures including the

April 6, 1965

6889

shall welcome to our shores is unjust and unworkable. When, 40 years ago, Congress adopted the national origins quota system, it was in effect declaring that immigrants from one country are preferred to immigrants from another. The clear implication is that the quality of a human being is dependent upon his place of birth.

To my mind, no more obnoxious, racist idea has ever been incorporated into the statute books of the United States. The inevitable result is a system which practices the most vicious kind of discrimination. Out of an annual overall immigration quota of 156,700. The United Kingdom, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries are allotted nearly two-thirds of the places. Greece, Italy, and Poland, on the other hand, account for less than one-tenth of all quota immigrants. As a result, some countries have waiting lists of qualified applicants that will take years to process while others use only a small portion of their annual quota. Our present immigration policy has been designed with a view to exclude certain types or groups of people.

No one can argue with the concept that Congress must regulate the flow of immigration so as to protect the Nation's economy, health, and morals. We certainly do have a responsibility to set rigorous standards that will deny entry to persons who would not make desirable citizens. But, the qualities we seek have nothing to do with national origin.

Under the present law, however, Americans of southern and eastern European extraction are told that more of their kind are neither wanted or needed. Their contributions to this country's development and their just claims to equal treatment under the law are ignored.

It seems strange to me that at a time when the Congress is taking vigorous action to insure that no American will be denied their full privilege of citizenship because of race, we still maintain an immigration policy which relegates millions of other Americans to second-class citizenship because of national origin.

The paradox is heightened by the almost universally agreed upon fact that the national origin quota system has not worked in practice. Aside from being unjust and discriminatory, it fails to come to grips with the realities of the modern world.

Time and again, Congress has been forced to compensate for the inadequacies of the present system by passing special immigration laws. In recent years, over 60,000 quota spots have been going unused annually. At the same time, increasing numbers of special non-quota immigrants have been admitted so that our total annual immigration is running nearly twice what the quota system is supposed to allow. Of this total only about a third has actually been controlled by the quota system. All of which clearly demonstrates the urgent need for a thorough overhaul of the whole system.

There are a variety of other ways in which the present immigration system works to the detriment of our national interest. While serving as director of the Illinois Department of Labor, I had

firsthand experience in dealing with problems of labor shortages and manpower recruitment, and I can emphatically state that our present immigration policies aggravate these problems.

A recent editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times pointed out that in the Chicago area alone there are critical labor shortages of hand tailors, furniture refinishers, and cabinetmakers. Elsewhere in the country, there are insufficient numbers of diemakers, glassblowers, machinists, chemists, teachers, medical personnel, and many other important occupational categories.

The case of Dr. Gustavo Bounous comes to mind in this connection. A highly skilled medical doctor from Italy, Dr. Bounous came to America hoping to settle here. After a short stay in Indianapolis, his temporary visa expired and he was forced to move to Canada. Just last month, Dr. Bounous was awarded Canada's top national medical award for his work in helping to discover the mystery of how shock from bleeding can cause death. Here is a man whose great skills we turned away from our doors. This example could be multiplied endlessly, and I submit that America cannot afford this kind of brain drain.

Labor shortages could be rectified by bringing thousands of skilled workers to America from among the masses of people crying for admission. Yet they are prevented from adding their talent to our economy and we are prevented from enjoying the benefits of their skills by our bigoted method of immigrant selection.

If we need an immigration policy more suited to our modern manpower needs, we also need one that will better serve our Nation's foreign policy goals. Secretary of State Rusk's testimony on this point was very persuasive. Just within the last year, no less than a dozen foreign ministers among our friends and allies have personally complained to him about America's immigration policy.

Their grievance had nothing to do with the numbers of immigrants we admit. Indeed, we have one of the most generous policies in that respect of any nation in the world. Rather, it concerned the insulting, discriminatory features of our quota system. No other law on our books is as damaging to our nation image abroad.

Surely a more rational basis for regulating immigration than our present confused and irrational system can be found. I believe that it has been found and that it is embodied in the administration bill.

By replacing national origin quotas with a quota reserve pool, that is assigned on a first-come, first-served basis, the bill puts all prospective immigrants on an equal footing to allow them a fair field and an honest race. The provisions facilitating the reunion of separated families show the concern for human factors that must underlie public policy in any civilized society. The priorities accorded immigrants with certain levels of skill, training, and education directly serve our own national interest. In sum, the bill substitutes order and justice for confusion and discrimination in a major area of our national law.

I can think of no more fitting step toward the truly Great Society than passage of this bill, and I urge the adoption of this vital legislation.

BRACERO LABOR FOR SUGARBEET INDUSTRY

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I received a communication from a Mr. Bruce Newkirk, superintendent of the Holly Sugar Corp., at Worland, Wyo., strongly protesting the action of the Secretary of Labor and indicating the disappointment of all management of the beet sugar industry to the attitude of the Secretary of Labor regarding bracero labor for the Wyoming sugarbeet industry. I quote from Mr. Newkirk's communication:

We feel the entire sugar industry in Wyoming is at stake in this matter and we feel that the Secretary is taking a very dim attitude and is ill-informed.

If California and the Southern States are in trouble with their perishable crops with their enormous labor pool, what can we expect in sparsely populated Wyoming. Domestic labor just is not available in this area of the type necessary for this kind of work.

We are jeopardizing our second largest industry in Wyoming to satisfy theorists. Our people at Worland have been ahead of some areas in mechanization of field equipment, but we know we have not perfected this to the point of elimination of hand labor entirely.

Even our union people at the plants are agreed we are creating an impossible situation in elimination of the bracero program at this time.

In a period of a few years the transition may be complete to the point that braceros may no longer be needed, but the time is definitely not now and we are headed for terrible and serious trouble without braceros help.

Mr. Speaker, I put these remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that the Secretary of Labor will relent an attitude which may spell ruin to the sugarbeet industry of the State of Wyoming. It is quite possible that the beets will be topped and loaded this fall without braceros labor but there will be no product to top and to load unless the braceros labor is available for work in the fields this spring in the State of Wyoming.

VOTING RIGHTS

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on the subject of voting rights which I hope will receive the careful attention of the House Judiciary Committee as well as the Members of this House.

The bill which I am presenting will apply throughout the 50 States. In other words, where discrimination is practiced with regard to race or color in depriving eligible citizens of the right to vote, or where coercion or intimidation

is exercised in order to prevent a citizen from registering or voting, this new legislation would be applicable. In addition, the bill would provide penalties for any person who makes false representations or engages in illegal voting and would penalize as well any who pay or offer to pay or who accept payment for registering or voting.

It is offensive to the American people for any qualified person to be deprived of the right to register or to vote. It is likewise reprehensible to corrupt the sanctity of the ballot by purchasing the votes of any citizens under threat of denial of public assistance or with promises of pecuniary benefits, including benefits from Federal appropriations.

The bill which I have introduced is patterned after that of my Republican colleagues of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], minority leader of the House, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], ranking minority member on the House Judiciary Committee upon which I serve.

The penalty provisions to which I have made reference are in addition to those found in the measure offered by these gentlemen.

In addition, I would like to point out that the measure which I have presented retains the authority of States to administer minimum literacy tests in which a sixth-grade education represents a conclusive presumption of literacy. A requirement is, of course, that a literacy test should be administered without discrimination on account of race or color.

The complaints of 25 or more persons alleging discrimination in any county or voting district would require the immediate appointment of Federal examiners to register qualified voters in any area where such discrimination is found to exist.

While the right to appeal to the local Federal court is assured, the measure provides for "provisional" voting to the end that no person shall be deprived of his right to vote while an appeal is pending. In other words, a full and adequate, as well as a convenient resort to the courts, is retained, while at the same time there is protection against delays in voting rights when frivolous or dilatory appeals are filed.

Mr. Speaker, the obligation of the Congress to debate and deliberate upon a great public issue was never greater than on the subject of voting rights for all eligible American citizens. We should provide full and adequate implementation of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to assure all citizens of their equality before the law, the equal protection of the laws, and to guarantee their inherent rights to register and to vote without discrimination, without intimidation, and without coercion.

PROHIBIT TRADE WITH COMMUNIST NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining in cosponsoring with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] legislation designed to halt shipments to or from the United States aboard ships engaged in trade with North Vietnam. I commend him for his work in investigating this problem, and I share his concern for an almost incredible disregard for the lives of American boys in Vietnam and for the American shipping industry which we are today subsidizing at a cost of \$350 million per year.

North Vietnam is waging a brutal and relentless war against its neighbors to the south, but yet over 200 ships of so-called allies and neutralist nations have hauled cargoes of food and war materiel into North Vietnam. We permit those same ships to pick up the profits of our own trade in our own ports.

Figures show that our own merchant marine now carries less than 10 percent of U.S. ocean trade—the least we can do is to deny our cargoes to foreign shippers who help the Communist enemy solve their biggest problem—supplying North Vietnam. Through shipping into Vietcong territory, the Vietnam crisis continues to persist and Americans have been killed in greater numbers by the Communist Vietcong.

I frankly am surprised that the administration and the Department of State have not been more firm in their requests that Britain, Japan, Greece, Lebanon, Italy, West Germany, and other nations involved call a halt to free world sea trade with the Communists now engaged in open aggression in southeast Asia in defiance of their own agreements. Since this has not been done, I see no alternative other than Congress prohibiting cargoes to or from U.S. ports being transported aboard any vessel used in sea trade with Communist North Vietnam, and I urge action as soon as possible in this regard.

PLENTY OF DOMESTICS—OF SORTS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, surely there are plenty of domestics—plenty to do all the jobs needed to be done in the United States—in our restaurants, motels, in orchards, and on our farms. And the domestics should have these jobs. And the jobs should pay a fair wage for the work they do.

Unfortunately, today there simply are not enough domestics, in the proper location, capable and willing to do the work, in restaurants and on the vegetable farms.

The efforts to reorganize our society and redistribute our work force is having some tragic and devastating effects on many small towns in rural areas.

The following editorial from the Salinas Californian touches upon one problem which the Department of Labor seems to ignore or intentionally neglect.

The big city police forces cannot control these transients when they stay home? How can anyone expect small towns to cope with these transients when

they invade the rural areas? Is it fair to empty the slums into the small towns under the guise of offering employment which they cannot perform?

PLENTY OF DOMESTICS—OF SORTS

Daily it grows more apparent that Secretary of Labor Wirtz should have stayed in his nice insulated office in Washington.

It is obvious that he and his advisers in Washington had prejudged the California farm labor situation and his widely advertised survey was only window dressing.

His monotonous and unharmonious refrain has been "there are plenty of domestics to do the farm labor."

Of sorts, that is.

We have several hundred of them on Salinas skid row, and as the city council learned Monday night, the number of arrests of these transients has nearly doubled in the first 3 months of this year as against the same period last year. The same situation, which has become acute here only in the past few years, exists in Fresno and Stockton.

Salinas police, who have chalked up 2,269 arrests in the first 3 months of the year as against 1,293 for the same period last year, say the end is not in sight. Contrary to previous years when the transient invasion peaked in March, police believe that because of the failure of the Department of Labor to authorize supplemental foreign farm labor the situation will continue to get worse as these unfortunates pour in to fill the labor vacuum. Ostensibly these men are here to work, but usually it's only long enough for the price of a bottle.

Although most of these available domestics are arrested for drunkenness, there has been a sharp increase in the number of petty thefts, and, as the influx continues, there could be an outbreak of more serious crimes. This means an increased drain on public funds and increased taxes for an area already uncertain about the future.

The city council plans to send these figures to Secretary Wirtz, but judging from past performance we doubt if he wants facts.

He demonstrated this by labeling two labor camps filthy although both camps had been inspected and approved as meeting county and State health standards. Some of the alleged filth to which Mr. Wirtz alluded was the discarded wine bottles and debris brought in by available domestics. Braceros generally were clean and orderly.

He compounded his scattergun charges by creating a name for one of the filthy camps which happens to be the same as that of a reputable firm, which has no connection here.

Meantime, while Mr. Wirtz dallies in Washington, refusing to take action on supplemental help, the strawberry crop is ripening and appeals to the public for labor are not getting very far. Growers face heavy losses and the Salinas Valley faces further economic troubles.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a sermon in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy which was delivered in St. Matthew's Cathedral at a memorial mass on the occasion of the late President's birthday, on May 29, 1964. As one who was present on that occasion, I considered myself privileged when I recently came across a copy of this remarkable discourse. It was delivered by the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, vicar gen-

April 6, 1965

6923

as producer of processed and manufactured goods.

Already we have become dependent upon foreign sources for much of our everyday consumer needs.

It is no laughing matter when 97 percent of all the fine china sold in the United States last year was imported, when great numbers of American kids ride, skate, swim, spin, jump, dance, listen, eat, drink, write, play games, clean their teeth, comb their hair, and everything but breathe with foreign-made products.

I challenge any Member of this Congress to take a family Christmas shopping list and try to fill it without losing his temper or at least his patience.

I was under the erroneous impression that the purpose of all governments, and especially ours, was to make our Nation strong and independent. Independence does not mean isolationism anymore than stopping the export of an expendable natural resource is a violation of fair trade relations.

Perhaps to you the relationship between the majestic and enduring American walnut tree and the everyday cut-throat competition of world trade is a figment of my imagination. Not so; and the facts will prove my contention that the American walnut tree is symbolic of all our trade agreements where we as a nation put the profit and the balance of trade above and beyond the true needs of the community and its peoples.

Let us look at the American walnut tree. After 60 or more years it is cut down and prepared for shipment. It can go two routes; to a foreign country or to a domestic processor. If we ship it overseas—the logger gets paid, the owner gets paid, the transportation gets paid, and finally, if it by accident happens to be an American ship, the sailors get paid.

From the stump to the faraway place, the U.S. economy benefits to the tune of about \$300 and this is from prime veneer logs. Much less will be realized from the run-of-the-mill-type logs. You can bet the foreign buyers with their wage and tax costs differentials select only the best logs for their export.

Let us take a look at what happens when the logs are shipped to an American mill. All the above get paid except the shipping line. However, the transportation from the veneer mill to the furniture plant and other users more than makes up this loss, which is only a loss if shipped American. All of you know how slim our chances are of having logs shipped to Japan and other countries via U.S. ships. Of course, if under the AID program, maybe we will have a 50-50 chance.

Now that we are even, insofar as U.S. economy is concerned, let us go further with our U.S. veneer produced from a U.S. walnut tree with U.S. labor.

The logs shipped to a U.S. mill are processed along with other woods used in making veneers or are shipped as veneer for other manufacturers who use the veneer as a veneer without backup lumber. In either case the jobs provided are the same. From the veneer plants it

moves to the furniture, cabinet, and panel manufacturers. The cuttings not suitable for veneers are shipped for stair rails, trim, frames, and other items that are fast disappearing from the American scene.

Now, when you realize that only 2 percent of veneered walnut furniture is walnut, and the balance other woods, you realize that for every walnut log consumed by our furniture industry it takes 49 other type trees to meet the needs of the industry.

What does this mean to the U.S. community? It simply means that for every logger that gets a job from an exported tree, 50 other American loggers lose 3 jobs. There is no argument in the claim that if we were not exporting the one logger would lose his job because every person except perhaps Secretary Connor knows that domestic and world demand for American walnut furniture far exceeds the supply.

Let us step further and figure how much the export logger contributes to the doctors, nurses, barbers, retailers, clothingmakers, car producers, farmers, workers in heavy and light industries making radios, TV's, air conditioners, and on and on and on.

And last but not least, how much does the export logger contribute to schools, churches, hospitals, spectator sports, charities, and on and on and on.

Let us look at figures that might help us grasp the situation. In 1961-62 we exported 8.5 million board feet of walnut, sold cut 17.5 million feet in our domestic market.

In 1963 we reached 14.3 million feet export and 23.5 million feet domestic. In 1964 without controls the normal growth use factor would have forced U.S. producers to produce 26 million feet and the exporters using the same ratio of growth would have gone to 18 million feet.

However, in 1964 even with a voluntary cutback on thickness plus a charge against the United States for exported veneer we were forced to cut back to 7.3 million feet export logs and 19.5 million feet domestic.

If we did not have controls and if we had not allowed export of logs plus export veneer the entire cutting of American walnut would have only met the needs of our own market. This certainly proves we have and are exporting jobs, wages, salaries, and service industries' earnings with every log we ship out.

Let us look at the next step that took place after only 1 year of controls. The exporters, the people who claim they are so necessary in our economy, had such a demand for veneer they contracted for veneer made here. However, they had the joker up their sleeves and export veneers were reduced to one-fiftieth of an inch thickness.

U.S. producers had to battle American users of veneer to try to sell our veneers cut to one thirty-sixth inch thickness in place of the one twenty-eighth inch formerly the standard for walnut veneers.

Foreign furniture makers thus make up for their higher priced veneers because

they get more facings for their furniture and the unsuspecting buyer gets hooked.

The facts are there for all to see. We do not need to export logs. We can and do export furniture but you can see what is going to happen in this area of export trade with the ceilings off on walnut log export.

The wily and foxy trade boys would not quit right away but I will predict the end of the veneer export business and soon the furniture will go down the same drain.

The argument of the Secretary that this free sale and export of logs will help Appalachia is just so much hog wash. One good furniture plant will hire more people, contribute more to the economy than all the logs cut in Appalachia. If you want to help Appalachia, let Bendix start making their Japanese radios in Pennsylvania; let Studebaker go back to Indiana; let the Americans start drinking from glasses made in West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania; let the dinnerware makers in the pottery areas put the plates on our dinner tables; let our textile makers make our cloth; let our transistor and electronics workers put the guts in our TVs, tape recorders, and PA systems; let steel workers make our steel and our coal miners heat our homes, produce our power, and heat our institutions along with our domestic gas and oil producers.

Let Americans produce for our own uses, let our farmers produce our food and those of us working in our factories will pay them for full production and they can give away their surplus to needy people overseas to help them get on their own two feet.

That is where we all end up, on our own two feet as peoples and as nations if not we will all end up on our backs—there is no in between.

You try to sell a free trader the proposal that he run his home on the same theory and you will find out how he is with his own job and his own family's welfare.

I find that when I scratch a free trader with foreign competition he bleeds and screams louder than any protectionist I know.

One wonders how the same government could issue one order restricting sugar export sales that had not even taken place with a worldwide supply sufficient for all needs while in the same breath using the same provision of GATT, article XX(g) in the 1947 agreement to wipe out export restrictions on walnut, a short-supply resource and affecting no other countries' exports since we alone produce American walnut logs.

Testimony before the Hartke committee shows the double talk used to accomplish this, by no means, an amateur trick.

You are not interested at this moment in the export of dollars but let me quote from a nationwide foreign products sales group. This will give you some idea of how the free trade boys operate. They claim to be freetraders for the good of mankind, maybe they are, more power to

them if they are, but I am of the opinion that mankind as they see it is the man who faces them when they shave.

Here is a little advertising that accompanies an offer to sell the following items:

1. Electric powered 8 mm. movie cameras—no winding—drop in loader—black and white or colored—for \$4.40.
2. Jeweled calendar watch—Swiss movement—tells time and date—sweep second hand—gift box—water resistant—anti-magnetic—stainless band steel back—for \$2.33 plus 11 cents for expansion band.
3. Tape recorder—4 transistors—complete with built-in powerful dynamic speaker—records—plays back erases—rewinds—includes microphone, battery, tape, reels, etc.—for \$6.70.
4. Electric razor—product Swiss craftsmanship—shaped to shave the heaviest beards—maker guarantees full 2 years—complete with cord—head guard and brush—for \$1.70.

These are only four of hundreds of import bargains you can get to make fantastic profits of over 200 percent if you want to go into business. Here is a few more:

Australian wool sweater.....	\$2.00
Transistor radio.....	1.70
Cigarette lighter.....	.17
Electric carving knife.....	1.50
Binoculars.....	1.20
Teakwood chest.....	.90
Derfingler pistol.....	5.74
Star sapphire ring.....	6.00
Electric hair dryer.....	1.37
Electric train set.....	1.36

Impossible—that is what you think. I thought so too, but I investigated further and then I came across the real free trade clincher.

This is the sales pitch showing you why it can be done, why it is being done, why we are losing our walnut industry and why we lost Studebaker, Bendix, Bell and Howell, and the hundreds of free and independent American firms that under the guise of helping our neighbors are bleeding our own Nation white; they are taking the gold out of our economic bloodstream and our kids will have limited choices of a career. They can go to school for life under subsidy, they can produce protected subsidized products, they can get a job in government, or they can inherit or marry accumulated wealth.

Of course it would not hurt if you happen to own some good export-import stock or invest in oversea American-owned facilities.

This is all good for a few but I guarantee the rest of us will be pretty much in the same ruts of poverty, not the same kind of poverty we are attempting to cure now, but a different type.

One of our first signs of the new poverty will be when we are told "to have only as many children as we can afford." From there on it is your guess as good as mine, maybe the child we did not have would have been Columbus or Einstein or Michaelangelo or for that matter you or me.

Sorry, if I get a little away from my import bargains and how it is possible so I will close by quoting verbatim from the man's sales pitch which I have for your inspection, if you will not or cannot believe me:

HERE'S WHY IMPORT PROFITS ARE FANTASTIC—YOU CAN CASH IN ON THESE LOW LABOR COSTS AND POCKET THE DIFFERENCE

Compare the high cost of domestic labor with recent oversea costs:

Overseas labor costs so little

	Per hour
United States.....	\$2.80
Japan.....	.56
Holland.....	.58
Italy.....	.65
Belgium.....	.73
Switzerland.....	.77
Great Britain.....	.80
West Germany.....	.85

Every dollar you spend for labor on overseas products is worth \$4 here. According to reports furnished by the U.S. Department of Commerce and other reliable sources, the recent average price of skilled labor in various countries does not exceed the amounts shown above. Compare the U.S. cost of \$2.80 with 56 cents an hour in Japan, or in other countries. It's easy to see why import pays so well. Compare the costs of Swiss watches, German tape recorders, Japanese transistor radios, hundreds of other imports, with the same domestic merchandise. There is no comparison. And often, the imported product has much more painstaking handwork.

My fellow Members of Congress, need I say more—this importer agent has said it much more eloquently than I could have and besides he knows what he is talking about. "It is good for business—his business."

ISSUES IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been deeply concerned about Vietnam. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I have had an opportunity to examine the issues which are at the source of the crisis and have come to appreciate their complexity. Like many of my colleagues, I have regarded it as important to respect the Executive's primary responsibility in foreign affairs. I have been moved by the President's awesome burdens in this field. I recognize his greater command of information.

But I suggest that we in positions of national trust cannot remain silent in the face of growing national anxiety. We have a responsibility to thoughtful and open debate about Vietnam. I respectfully suggest that it is wrong to maintain that in our democratic society we will do our country a disservice by discussing our present course of action. The absence of forthright dialog actually calls into question our national vitality and the strength of our representative institutions. It is clear to me that the people of this country are disturbed over the events in Vietnam. They want to hear debate, lest they be cut off from their leaders and the important decisions on foreign policy.

During the vibrant period from 1947 to 1949, when the groundwork for our postwar military and diplomatic policy was established, debates in Congress were frequent, spirited and enlightening. They contributed to the formation of the

Marshal plan and the Truman Doctrine. Why are so few voices raised now, when nothing less than our future commitment to Asia and world peace are at stake? To urge debate in Congress is not to suggest that the legislative body make foreign policy. It is to expose a maximum of ideas, a variety of thinking, to the open air. We owe it to our constituents to express our views, however mistaken we may sometimes be. I rise to speak today then out of a commitment to a free discussion of one of the vital questions facing the American Nation.

It seems clear that when the administration decided to extend the war in Vietnam to the north, it knew the risks involved. The administration chose to undertake a policy, the consequence of which was, at best, uncertain. Indeed, on a number of occasions, the President himself suggested that nobody could predict the future with confidence. It was his judgment, however, that forces on the other side—in Peiping, Moscow, Hanoi, and the Vietcong—had to be convinced of our irrevocable commitment to South Vietnam and our refusal to be coerced into withdrawal. This constituted the broader political grounds for our decision to bomb the north.

Diplomatically we were determined "to do something to the other side we could stop doing" to improve the prospects of a settlement. I fear that what began as a principle for improving our bargaining position has simply become a blueprint for the escalation of the limited Vietnamese war into a general Asian war.

It has been 2 months since we began bombing North Vietnam on a regular basis. By this time, one administration spokesman was reported to have said in February, the Communists should by now have backed down. But they show no signs of doing so. On the contrary, their will to fight appears to be stiffer than ever and we have acquired no perceptible military advantage. As a consequence, I believe it is important to evaluate the effects of this policy in an effort to improve our posture in the future.

The real issue as of today looks to me like this. The bombings have produced very little.

A UPI news release follows:

SAIGON.—American military authorities here believe the war for control of South Vietnam remained at a stalemate during March, despite the intensification of air strikes in the South and raids against the North.

Moreover, an American military spokesman said, "There certainly has been a continuation of infiltration in March," although the announced intention of the air raids against North Vietnam was to convince the Hanoi regime to halt the infiltration of men and arms into the South.

The spokesman said the number of American bombing strikes against Communist concentrations inside South Vietnam doubled in March as compared with previous months.

In spite of this increased use of airpower, however, the Government just managed to hold its own in the provinces outside those immediately surrounding the capital.

The point at which they would have forced Hanoi to negotiate—if, indeed, Hanoi does exercise its will over the Vietcong—without triggering direct Chinese

April 6, 1965

or North Vietnamese intervention has continued to elude us. We seemed to have failed to take into account the deep resources of Asian patience. Meanwhile, we have risked greater escalation and ignored viable alternative policies. There are at least some reports which indicated North Vietnamese interest in useful negotiations. Our bombing may be suppressing that interest by making it impossible for North Vietnam to negotiate in honor.

Has the bombing then been in any way successful? Did the north really want to negotiate from the outset, as some have suggested? Was Ho Chi Minh himself anxious to negotiation, actually waiting to see the Chinese contention that America was a paper tiger proven wrong? Have the North Vietnamese been preoccupied with intraparty squabbles between moderates and Maoists and hence completely precluded from settling on any single policy? Have the Russians been quietly biding their time waiting to see us call China's bluff?

These questions and many others hold the key to our future in Vietnam. Our policy has acknowledged their validity but I construe President Johnson's remarks about the difficulty of predicting the future to mean that we may not really know the answers. Without knowing the answers myself, I see us involved in a frustrating war without apparent policies for resolving it. Something must be done and I would like to propose some alternatives to our current course.

At the beginning of any analysis, we must acknowledge that we are not fighting a monolithic Communist enemy in Vietnam. We face rather a complex, divided alliance, as much preoccupied with its own incoherence as it is with waging war on its enemies. That these divisions are the consequence of conflicting objectives has rendered even more difficult our devising a logical policy for dealing with our adversaries. But we must still devise a policy.

We think we understand the intentions of the Soviet Union, one member of the Communist alliance. Russia, it now seems clear, is unhappy at the extension of Chinese revolutionary influence into southeast Asia. Though I am not deceived by Soviet objectives, I think it is indisputable that Russia does not want a general nuclear war.

We are less clear about the nature and intentions of Communist China. Are the Red Chinese nationalists before Communists?—Asians before nationalists; is there no single answer? Perhaps by adopting prudent policies we can encourage them to be what we want them to be, which is—as a minimum—peace-loving.

Even if there is some truth in the argument that, as of now, the Chinese are primarily Asian expansionists, it does not follow that their expansionism is like Germany's in the 1930's or Russia's in the 1940's. Chinese interest and influence in southeast Asia—cultural, political and racial—is centuries old. It bears little resemblance to Russia's concern with, let us say, Berlin, or Nazi Germany's ambitions in the Balkans. Mao's revolutionary guerillas are vastly differ-

ent from Hitler's Wehrmacht or Stalin's Red Army. We do not confront them in the same way. Mao's revolutionaries fight with ideological weapons, with which we oftentimes do not know how to deal.

However noble our motives and however reprehensible theirs, they use, along with a dose of terrorism, hope and the promise of a better future. Why have we—heirs to Wilsonian idealism and a great revolutionary tradition—forgotten how to use the weapons of that tradition. We know what China is, in reality, a threat to the aspirations of the southeast Asian countries. But we have failed to exploit that threat and have instead put ourselves, in the minds of many Asians, into the positions not of defenders of independence but of neo-colonial aggressors.

We have also failed to exploit effectively the strains within the Communist alliance. We have an investment in Russia's strategy of peaceful coexistence. But we have played into Chinese hands by making it appear as if deathlock struggle is the reality of world affairs. We have not sufficiently encouraged the development of a pluralistic world communism of Titoist states balancing the two giants. Though military establishments since Caesar have operated on the principle of divide and conquer, we have not sufficiently promoted such divisions.

Ironically, our Vietnamese policy, while contributing to Communist unity, imposes enormous strains on our own alliance. Prime Minister Wilson, himself at work on creating a great society, faces increased dissension in his own party. De Gaulle's France, long a proponent of a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia, recognizes in our predicament a repetition of their own troubles of ten years ago. We demand and receive the ostensible support of our allies. But we do not have their confidence. There is intense concern, deep skepticism, over our bombings. Will they force Hanoi to give up or will they escalate the conflict into general war? I do not suggest that this country base its policies on world opinion or the private doubts of our allies. I merely argue that these components cannot be ignored.

Our friends and allies, world opinion generally, and my own constituents have a right to expect clarification of our goals in southeast Asia. They urgently desire that we take the lead in seeking an honorable settlement in Vietnam. I do not accept the argument that we compromise our negotiating position by clarifying our goals. I think we suffer from a diplomacy of silence. I see no reason why this country cannot afford to talk openly and directly. The climate of distrust and suspicion—created by questionable military tactics and ambiguous diplomatic objectives—is hardly conducive to peace.

President Johnson opened a new chapter in our southeast Asian diplomacy at his March 20 news conference. His words deserve careful attention and highest praise:

The real goal of all of us in southeast Asia must be the peaceful progress of the people of that area. They have the right

to live side by side in peace and independence. And if this little country does not have that right then the question is, What will happen to the other hundred little countries who want to preserve that right. They have a right to build a new sense of community among themselves. They have a right to join, with help from others, in the full development of their own resources for their own benefit. They have a right to live together without fear or oppression or domination from any quarter of this globe.

The question now being asked throughout the world is: How do we recognize and provide for the honorable realization of these rights?

In my view, we must offer to North Vietnam an alternative to its present situation in southeast Asia. Those forces in that country which fear domination from China must be shown that there is an alternative other than domination from the West. We have to make it clear that Americans are prepared to feed Asians rather than fight them, clothe Asians rather than bomb them, and teach Asians rather than gas them. And we must show that we will promote and support a system of security in that area which counterbalances the threat of China.

No one should pretend for one moment that such a promise has a strong chance of realization. American presence in southeast Asia is as unnatural and resented as Chinese influence is historic and preponderant. Revolutionary communism, at least in its early stages, is often an attractive path for aspiring nations. But it is clear that America can produce no better policy than one which seeks to promote an independent southeast Asia with an ideology and diplomacy of its own.

There is a chance to take the first step toward this goal right now. Ho Chi Minh is an old Bolshevik, to whom Mao is as much a menace as America. He has carefully built up an industrial base which he is not anxious to lose. He has interests in trade arrangements with the economically complementary South. He is attracted by fuller diplomatic recognition. The prospects of growth through development aid and participation in regional economic plans is more compelling than the protracted attrition of the past 20 years. Ho Chi Minh is an old man, desirous of seeing some general advancement for his country after 20 years of war.

To offer him an alternative to Chinese domination, the United States must overcome an enormous legacy of resentment and hatred. Unless our offers of assistance are above suspicion, they will not succeed. We must be prepared, for example, to join in informal cooperation with Russia in formulating plans for the economic development of southeast Asia. Such coordination, besides promoting stability in southeast Asia, will improve relations with the Soviet Union. It will help isolate China and certain Chinese influence. It will advance the prospects for a system of international cooperation to assist in the development of the poorer regions of the world. I think it is crucial that this country make a commitment to a new deal for southeast Asia. We will, thereby, open up the doors

to honorable negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

I urge, as a first step, that the United States cease, for the time being, its bombing raids in the north. At the same time, we might informally request from Hanoi a significant reduction of the incident level in the south. What I suggest is not a total cease-fire. This country will be able to continue its air reconnaissance, intelligence, and antiguerrilla political pressure. Hanoi will probably be unable to prevent isolated incidents of banditry and some insubordination in the Vietcong. But my plan represents a start.

This is diplomacy by mutual example—a process already begun between the United States and Russia by President Kennedy. There is no reason why such diplomacy cannot be extended to Asia. A temporary cessation of bombing will allow Hanoi to receive and initiate peace overtures without appearing to be under coercion. This country would be taking no irrevocable steps. Nor would such action compromise any particular military strategy since, for the most part, the bombings have always been political and psychological in character.

To the argument that such a move would demoralize the South Vietnamese Government, it can fairly be answered that this country has tolerated the impossible behavior of South Vietnamese governments for long enough. Sooner or later, even Saigon must come to accept peace.

During a period of a temporary military moratorium, the United States could pursue a full diplomatic offensive, in an atmosphere of open conversation. Channels heretofore closed might be opened. Proposals for settlement previously repressed might now be considered. And the talents of the country's and perhaps the world's most skilled political negotiator—Lyndon B. Johnson—could be released in pursuit of a settlement honoring this country's commitments, respecting Asian sentiments and promoting world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I fear we are in danger of becoming the victims of our own diplomatic rigidity. I respectfully call for a policy of flexibility, a policy that will recognize peace within a framework of world security as our goal. I submit that there is more than one way to achieve that goal. I call upon those responsible for formulating our foreign policy to consider every possible alternative to bring the war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing to the attention of the Congress his thoughts on a vital issue which appear to have been seriously considered. I, too, was somewhat disturbed by the action that the President had taken in Vietnam and raised some questions during the briefing at the White House on March 2 with the President and the Secretary of State. At that time I was assured that every diplomatic channel is

being kept open, in line with the suggestion that the gentleman has made, that we may negotiate for peace. The question is, with whom do we negotiate? It takes two to negotiate. We have been assured by the administration that it has made every effort to negotiate. But the only reply it has received from North Vietnam is a complete denial of any direction of or connection with the guerrilla warfare going on in South Vietnam. Under such circumstances, while I heartily agree with the gentleman now in the well of the House, that every effort toward a negotiated peace ought to be exerted, the question still remains, with whom do we negotiate?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Hawaii to an interesting piece of news that just now came across the Associated Press ticker. It is marked "bulletin." It says: "United Nations, U.N. Secretary General U Thant was reported to have received a message from Red China's Premier Chou En-lai today suggesting that a solution to the Vietnam conflict was up to the parties directly involved."

This is, to me, somewhat interesting. Whether it is credible I would not even offer a suggestion. But there are many countries in the world—Poland, Switzerland, England, France, India, Canada—who are willing to act as middleman between the United States and Hanoi. Certainly, we have the burden of openly suggesting to the world that we are willing to negotiate with Hanoi to see if this matter can be ended. If the Communists come forward and say they are not interested, and if they say, "We do not want to negotiate—we want to pursue this matter because we are winning the war," then our conscience is clean. We can pursue them with our bombers or with whatever military policy is necessary with all the vigor at our command.

I merely say that a major effort on our part must be made before any large-scale escalation can be allowed.

Surely Russia and China have differences of opinion. There is, I believe, a conflict between them. I do not believe that Russia wants China to get into this thing in Vietnam.

Our moral obligation to ourselves and the next generation is to make a massive effort to negotiate in an honorable fashion. Perhaps we can say we will take a week off from bombing the north, or 2 weeks off, or whatever it may be.

If we are not willing to participate in at least a first step toward negotiation, then we must, of course, suffer the consequences.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is not suggesting that every effort is not now being made by the administration?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am sure that efforts are being made, but perhaps those efforts would be more fruitful with a reduction in bombing.

I, too, have been with the President and the Secretary of State and others.

It may be that there is another alternative. Perhaps if we stopped bombing for 2 weeks and announced that to the world, starting tomorrow or the next day, then we could put the burden on the other side, and they would have to

carry the burden in the court of world opinion.

We must remember that we are really a great power, compared to the North Vietnamese. We can eliminate them in 12 hours any time we want. I believe that the fact that this has not happened is an indication the President has shown great restraint.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Again I commend the gentleman in the well for having given such considerable thought to this matter. I hope that his thoughts will be conveyed to the administration and that perhaps at a conference table, even with the President, his suggestion may be discussed.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. To me it is interesting that this apparent lack of full confidence in the President and the way he is handling this most difficult and complex problem in Vietnam comes from a Member of his own party rather than a Member of the opposite party.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me say at that point, there is no lack of confidence in the President at all. I am offering two suggestions.

First, there may be other alternatives, perhaps, from the ones the President's advisers have suggested to him.

Second, as I indicated in my opening remarks, I welcome this kind of discussion and dialog.

I have no lack of confidence. I suggest that, in my judgment, the President is one of the most skilled negotiators in the world. I urge him to put these talents to use in a field which requires all the skills at his command. I am offering a suggestion. I have not, by any manner or means, indicated I lacked confidence in the President.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps I was incorrect in my interpretation. I realize the gentleman said some very complimentary things about the President. I got the impression that by raising this point and making these suggestions, the gentleman had some belief or some fear that perhaps the President was not handling the situation in Vietnam as he should.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is not the case. I am suggesting there might be other alternatives. Perhaps this idea has come up before, within the President's council of advisers.

The fact that this suggestion comes from a Member of Congress—and other Members of Congress indicate similar thoughts—merely indicates that these things should be put on the table.

I welcome the gentleman's participation. I am certain it was not inspired by any partisan consideration in any way at all.

The point is that this kind of open discussion between the gentleman from California and myself and between the gentleman from Hawaii and myself is really a healthy thing. We have less information than the Executive has. We have less experience and skill. Yet,

April 6, 1965

6927

sometimes even a novice can come up with an idea which has merit.

That is the principal reason for my taking the floor today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I compliment the gentleman from New York for taking this time this afternoon and offering his very thoughtful remarks on this difficult subject which plagues all Americans and indeed the entire world. By our having what we believe is an intelligent, thoughtful dialog on this immensely difficult subject, we do not indicate in any way that we do not have the highest respect and admiration for our President.

But this is the nature of our way of life. It is the nature of our free society, where our citizens, certainly not excepting Members of Congress, can stand up and discuss the great issues of the day. President Johnson would be the first one to want us to have such a discussion.

Now I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. He recently mentioned that the administration has come up with some affirmative suggestions, insofar as the problem of southeast Asia is concerned, so that the other side would know what kind of a world we have in mind for them in the event that hostilities cease and agreement can be reached. I am sure that the gentleman from New York and indeed all of the Congress would applaud the President's support of the Mekong River Basin program. This program of the United Nations which is supported by 25 nations is an example of the type of project which could assist these underdeveloped nations of southeast Asia on the road to economic viability. As the gentleman from New York knows, this project involved Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam and could be to these nations what the Aswan Dam is to Egypt and the Volta River Dam is to Ghana. It seems to me that this kind of affirmative approach to the Vietnam program would be a considerable help in arriving at a satisfactory solution.

Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and I assure him of my appreciation for his remarks.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating in this discussion. I know that the gentleman is aware of the fact that tomorrow night at 9 o'clock the President is going to speak on national radio and television from Johns Hopkins University. I am hopeful that he will amplify American policy in southeast Asia. It may be his remarks tomorrow night will be the beginning of a major peace offensive. There is nothing wrong in that. It is the man with all of the strength who can in good grace say to the other fellow, "Well, we can stop fighting." They know as well as we do that they do not measure up in the balance of power. There is no contest between us. But certainly the gentleman from California knows as well as I do, that the major

threat to this society is a nuclear confrontation. Nobody really wants that. Maybe the Chinese would like to have some action along those lines, but so long as we in this Congress participate in making every effort to assure that this civilization is not ended by that kind of a confrontation, then we have done our job, and I think part of that job is once in a while talking about it as we are doing here today.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from California [Mr. EDWARDS], in complimenting the gentleman from New York in making his presentation. I think it is a notable contribution to the dialog on this subject. I know in my own mail from home in the comments there and in the editorials in the newspapers and from a questionnaire that I have sent out it tends to suggest a consensus which would certainly support some of the provocative and, I might say, forward looking ideas that the gentleman has presented here today in connection with a peaceful resolution of a very painful choice for you and the President and our Nation and indeed the world. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution this afternoon.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

STATEMENT ON FILING OF BILL ON TAX-EXEMPT MUNICIPALS

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I have filed legislation which will put a stop to certain abuses in the area of municipal industrial financing. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It denies to a corporation a deduction for payments—rental, lease, and so forth—made to municipalities on industrial plants financed by tax-exempt obligations. It also denies a deduction for interest payments made on mortgages which are so financed.

Under the code, the Federal Government does not tax the income received by the holder of a municipal obligation. This is as it should be in order to protect the fiscal independence of local governmental units from control by the Federal Government. However, in recent years, there have been permitted, in a number of States, an extension of municipal financing into new areas. In 28 States, it is now permissible for a municipality to issue an obligation—generally a revenue bond—in a few States they can be backed by the general credit of the municipality—and to use the proceeds for the purchase and construction of industrial sites. The procedure then is to lease or make some other arrangement with an industrial firm to use the facility.

Many communities using this type of

financing do so in order to attract new industry. It has become a competitive proposition in some areas. The proceeds are never intended to be used for a bona fide governmental purpose, but solely to enable the community to offer a better "deal" to a corporation. The municipality permits its governmental tax exemption to be used for the expansion of a private company.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, such use of municipal financing is not in accord with the original intent of the exemption. This financing was to be used for genuine municipal projects, not for the benefit and subsidization to private industry.

In most cases, it is not a question of financial need as far as the corporation is concerned. Some of this country's largest and most financially stable corporations have become involved in this type of financing with a municipality.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered on December 1, 1964, to the Investment Bankers Association, Mr. Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of the Aluminum Co. of America, indicated the dangers involved in continuing on the present course of abusing the exemption. I quote from his speech:

First off, I believe municipal industrial financing is an abuse of the right of municipalities or States to issue tax-free bonds when these bonds are issued primarily for private benefit * * * this could well serve as the opening wedge for the Federal Government to eliminate the Federal income tax exemption for all State and municipal bonds * * *

A second danger I see in municipal industrial financing is that it is unfair to industrial neighbors and especially to other companies in a competitive industry.

A third danger I see in the use of municipal industrial financing is the threat of Government ownership of industrial facilities.

I firmly believe that Mr. Magee knows from where he speaks. He heads one of the most prominent industrial establishments in the United States. As firm believers in an unsubsidized private enterprise system, I agree with him that there is no need for healthy and growing companies to force municipalities into providing financing for their private use.

It might be asked, Mr. Speaker, why I am favoring this approach, denying a tax deduction to the private company occupying industrial plant financed by tax exempt bonds, rather than removing the Federal tax exemption for such bonds. The reasons are these: My bill does not deny tax exemption to interest on bonds issued by a State or local government, which would be objectionable to local governments and to many organizations which recognize that tax exempt local government credit should not be used for the benefit of private companies. My bill would close the tax loophole by denying a Federal tax deduction to the private company which otherwise would benefit by the misuse of the tax exemption of a local government. This approach will not raise the constitutional issue of determining whether the obligation was incurred for a genuinely governmental function. The unfair advantage of a corporation being financed through municipal bonds would be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that if we are to stem the headlong competition that is now going on in this field, the Congress must act soon to insure the integrity of the original tax exemption. It must be available for genuine municipal or governmental projects. We should not allow this distortion of the exemption to continue. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

A MORE EFFECTIVE VOTING RIGHTS LAW

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE of California) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I today have the privilege of joining the distinguished minority leader and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary in sponsoring a bill which is the product of their leadership and experience and the efforts of many other able Republican Members of the House, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This proposal is offered as a comprehensive and effective substitute for the administration bill, which has been recognized from the outset to be a proposal handicapped by many serious deficiencies and omissions and which, it is widely agreed, dangerously oversteps constitutional bounds.

The Ford-McCulloch bill, to which I am proud to add my name, is a fair and speedy remedy to racial discrimination in voter registration, and it will effectively insure the constitutional right to vote without overturning other important constitutional principles, and without penalizing areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

Its enactment would give us the tools to terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements and constitutional prerogatives of the various States.

I ask that the text of the bill, as I have today introduced it, be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. In brief terms, it would provide for the appointment of a Federal examiner when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner would be empowered to disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth-grade education, or more, and could administer such tests for those not possessing this minimum education, so long as it was fair and reasonable.

Unlike the administration bill on this vital subject, our bill would reach discrimination wherever it exists, and would not, for example, exclude the entire State of Texas from its jurisdiction—a widely noted oversight in the administration-supported bill.

Our bill would also avoid the arbitrary percentage formula, whereby only those States and their subdivisions having literacy requirements where less than 50 percent of the voting-age population registered or voting in 1964 would be af-

ected by the proposed law. This would mean that we would miss serious pockets of discrimination on the one hand, and on the other would unfairly penalize other areas where, perhaps, apathy, one-party domination or deceptive census figures may account for low registrations.

The Federal examiner under our proposal would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. He would immediately determine whether complainants are qualified to vote. The States could challenge these determinations to a Federal hearing officer, also appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days. The hearing officer could be required to render his decision within 7 days.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a "pattern" or practice of discrimination under the bill. Immediately thereafter additional Federal examiners and hearing officers would be appointed as necessary to register all other persons within the county who may be subject to discrimination.

All persons found qualified to vote would be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged would be allowed to vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and court.

The administration bill does not provide the authority for provisional voting, which is included in our bill to encourage prompt determination of appeals.

The administration bill would eliminate literacy tests in some States, no matter how reasonable or how fairly applied, and would prohibit the future adoption of literacy test requirements by other States.

This is unnecessary and it goes too far. There is no reason for the Federal Government to attempt to invalidate the laws or ordinances of a State or local government in contravention of established constitutional principles. There is nothing evil or illegal about a literacy requirement, so long as it is not in violation of the 15th amendment—so long as it does not involve an element of discrimination, intimidation, or coercion.

This new bill deals with the fundamental problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation, and in addition it provides for civil and criminal penalties against those officials who engage in such activities.

In conclusion, this bill offers a constitutional, comprehensive, prompt and effective remedy for disenfranchisement because of race or color. It is a strong and sound bill and in my opinion it is more thoughtfully drafted than the administration bill. It deserves enthusiastic, nonpartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this bill at this point:

H.R. 7196

A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

Sec. 2. (a) The phrase "literacy test" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, or (2) demonstrate an educational achievement or knowledge of any particular subject.

(b) A person is "denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote" if he is (1) not provided by persons acting under color of law with an opportunity to register to vote or to qualify to vote within two weekdays after making a good faith attempt to do so, (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law, or (3) not notified by any person acting under color of law of the results of his application within seven days after making application therefor.

(c) The term "election" shall mean any general, special or primary election held in any voting district solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office or of deciding a proposition or issue of public law.

(d) The term "voting district" shall mean any county, parish, or similar political subdivision of a State in which persons, acting under color of law, administer the registration and voting laws of the State.

(e) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971 (e)).

Sec. 3. (a) Congress hereby finds that large numbers of United States citizens have been and are being denied the right to register or to vote in various States on account of race or color in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment.

(b) Congress further finds that literacy tests have been and are being used in various States and political subdivisions as a means of discrimination on account of race or color. Congress further finds that persons with a sixth grade education possess reasonable literacy, comprehension and intelligence and that, in fact, persons possessing such educational achievement have been and are being denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote for failure to satisfy literacy test requirements solely or primarily because of discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) Congress further finds that the requirements that persons as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (2) prove their qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class, have been and are being used as a means of discrimination on account of race or color.

(d) Congress further finds that where in any voting district twenty-five or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote, as determined in section 6, there is established a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

Sec. 4. (a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies to the Civil Service Commission (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty-five or more residents of a voting district each alleging that (i) the complainant satisfies the voting qualifications of the voting district, and (ii) the complainant has been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color within ninety days, and (2) that the Attorney General believes such complaints to be meritorious, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint an examiner for such voting district.

(b) A certification by the Attorney General shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The examiner shall examine those persons who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General to determine (1) whether they were denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote within ninety days and (2) whether they are qualified to vote under State law. A person's statement