ator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 5 minutes in which to make a brief statement not on a CIA matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS OF VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 29, 1966, units of the U.S. Air Force and Navy struck oil storage installations in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam. This action was taken in support of 270,000 U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam, and to deny necessary fuel supplies to aggressor forces. Most significantly, this action was taken to convince the Hanoi regime that its own best interests lie in abandoning war and choosing peace for Vietnam.

The decision of the Commander in Chief in consultation with his military and diplomatic advisers was no rash escalation of the tragic war in southeast Asia. It was, in my opinion, the logical consequence of events transpiring in that area in the past 6 months.

General Westmoreland has pointed out that the tide of battle is no longer running against the forces of the Republic of South Vietnam and those of her allies. With the substantial support of American troops, who have shown amazing skill, resourcefulness, and superb courage, the forces of freedom have taken the heart out of the Vietcong effort; they have effectively diminished if not, indeed, destroyed the Red hopes of victory through subversion and wanton murder. In so doing, they have completely altered the political outlook in Vietnam. The ends for which we fight can be achieved by force of arms, if not by negotiation.

In the course of recent political disturbances, it remained clear that the large bulk of the Vietnamese in the South want nothing to do with the terror tactics or the attempted domination by the so-called National Liberation Front. This point is agreed upon by Buddhists and Catholics, by merchants, farmers, laborers, and by General Ky and Thich Tri Quang.

In the past 6 months there has been a continuing U.S. effort to find a formula for peace, to which there has been no forthright response from the Communists to U.S. offers of unconditional discussions, or of any mutual reduction of hostilities. The only response has been that South Vietnam and her allies must accept the program of the National Liberation Front—in effect, surrender.

I find no logic in the argument that these recent air strikes will further delay reaching the conference table. Openhanded efforts, "the pause," public announcements of willingness to meet, repeated appeals to the United Nations, indications of an acceptance of a reconvened Geneva Conference, global diplomatic efforts—all have failed to produce a significant response because the forces of North Vietnam have counted on a military victory.

The logic is much more persuasive, it seems to me, that our continuing military exertions in the South, and, on a carefully measured basis in the North—as part of a resolute policy of standing up to aggression—will actually expedite the chances for a political settlement. This is the logic of reality as against sophistry.

The North Vietnamese now have further evidence that they must seek solutions other than their assumed future "victory." It is more timely than ever to press for an honorable settlement—after the Communists have had an opportunity to assess the changed military situation, and to see, perhaps more clearly now, America's unyielding determination to set South Vietnam free.

I also disagree with those who argue that the considered use of American military power means an increased risk of global war. Their argument rests on the abstract premise that the free world must exclude war as an instrument of foreign policy, and that military action by the other side must countered, on our part, only by some kind of splendid moral inaction. If adequate and world wide peacekeeping machinery were available, if, indeed, the other great powers of the world were willing to concert with us for peace, if there were no aggressor nations, then perhaps a presently available alternative of war might be found. But I see no evidence of this when France and China explode their nuclear bombs, when other nations clamor to possess this dread weapon, when neither the United Nations nor any of the great powers of Europe dare come to grips with the problems of southeast Asia.

At this moment in the history of mankind, the strength of the peoples of the world who would be free rests fundamentally on the power of the United States of America and its determination to maintain her freedom. To argue that this power must not be used in defense of freedom is to give way to the fallacy, so assiduously practiced in Communist propaganda, that military action is morally wrong except when taken in the name of world revolution. The world is not perfect yet, but there is much good that needs defending, and it will not be improved without positive action.

Earlier this year, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Approprrations, of which I am a member, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, defined the objective of the war as "restoring the integrity and security of Vietnam and its people; so this means no attempt to overthrow the North Vietnamese Government, no wish to be involved in China, but that whatever is required in South Vietnam would be done."

While questions may remain regarding the history and constitutional sanction of our involvement, they have little relevance to the immediate problems of the United States in Vietnam. America has fought her campaign in the wilderness. The President has found his generals. As the Secretary of Defense pointed out only this week, a long road still lies ahead toward a successful conclusion of American military efforts. But let there be no doubt about American intention to see these efforts through. From this point on, the central issue is not solely the war, but the reconstruction as well.

American men have been sent to fight and to risk their lives in Vietnam. For many months, this commitment of our forces has ben the subject of a great national dialog on our purposes in Vietnam. Because we possess such enormous power, it is relatively easier to solve the military problems than the more complex political ones. It has always been so. But at this point, as the possibility of a successful conclusion of the Allied military effort may loom dimly in the distance, America must not lose sight of its real purpose: the independence and integrity of the people of South Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor said earlier this year:

> If we are to leave the country after the end of the Viet Cong insurgency, it is essential that we make progress, even under the conditions of war, in stabilizing the government, the society and the economy.

Six months ago, at the University of California at Los Angeles, I said that, in Vietnam:

> We have shown our determination to accept the consequences of belief in the brotherhood of man and of our determination that communism can be defeated by the "good news" of democracy.

In traditional Vietnamese society there has been for centuries a tradition of village democracy. In modern times there have been several examples of successful elections by secret ballot. These practices were temporarily halted by the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem, who feared that they might be exploited by the Communists. More recently, efforts to achieve representative government through local elections have been resumed.

In my view, Diem's retreat from democracy played into the hands of the Vietcong. Free elections need to be put back in the hands of the people of South Vietnam. The time is right. The Vietcong have intimidated the people by exploiting the propaganda of "victory." Vietcong cadres have won adherents on the premise that the NLF is the way of the future—an argument which they have supported with terror.

I must say that I am greatly disturbed by reports from South Vietnam that the Ky government may seek to manipulate elections in order to exclude its opposition and to perpetuate itself. I devoutly hope that such reports are untrue, and are proved to be untrue. The United States must recognize that the processes of nation building and government building require time. There is no such thing as instant democracy. The United States must be assured that the elections in South Vietnam will be honest and fair, and that the trappings of democracy will not be substituted for the substance of popular government.

The right to vote ought not to be denied to any South Vietnamese citizen who believes in the freedom and integrity of his nation and who will accept the

duties and obligations of citizenship. I mean by that, all citizens, who meet these qualifications, regardless of whether theirs is a history of association with the Communist Vietcong.

Furthermore, the restrictions on candidates should be applied only against those opposed to constitutional, self-government. The right to vote, to run for public office, to participate in the process of government, compose the foundation of orderly, democratic society. They are the strongest weapons available for the defense of freedom.

I should think that the immense contribution of the U.S. Government to the cause of a free, independent South Vietnam would allow us to exact the simple requirement that these rights be broadly given.

We seek no colony anywhere in the globe. We seek a secure South Vietnam, from which American forces can depart in peace and honor, with the assurance that man's capacity to flourish in freedom will once again be vindicated against totalitarianism in any form.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, request has been made by a member of the minority to object to such unanimous-consent request. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, is there any Member who now wishes to be heard in the morning hour?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 3-minute limitation on the morning hour be concluded not later than 11:30; that when it is concluded, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be recognized to make a general statement on the resolution which he will offer, and that he be followed by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once those general statements have been concluded, it is my intention to move that the Senate go into executive session, and I want to put the Senate on notice to that effect.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a great deal of difference between an executive and a closed session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be a closed session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be a closed session as provided for under rule XXXV.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is, a closed session.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 8 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I speak out this morning to express my commendation of the services of our Senate colleagues who are members of the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. President, this Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct composed of Senators chosen by their colleagues deserves and has the support and confidence of all U.S. Senators.

Our colleagues on this important committee did not seek membership. In fact, a majority, if not all, reluctantly accepted this added responsibility and duty out of a sense of duty and of their pride in the Senate. We have read newspaper accounts of the proceedings of this committee in connection with hearings in executive session and also the recent public hearings.

There is every reason for Senators to be proud of the manner in which the proceedings have been conducted and to be proud of the dedication and high public service being rendered by our colleagues serving on this committee.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman, is one of the Nation's outstanding lawyers. In the past he has served as district prosecuting attorney of a judicial district in Mississippi and was a distinguished judge of the circuit court of his State. His name has frequently been mentioned in connection with a possible appointment as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Senators will agree he has eminent qualifications for the highest judicial position in our Government. No one could possibly challenge his judgment or question his integrity.

The committee vice chairman, WALLACE BENNETT of Utah, is entitled to have, and does have the confidence, respect, and admiration of his Senate colleagues. His high intelligence and integrity are beyond question.

Likewise, the four other Senators of this committee are nationally known as Senators of the highest competence and excellent character and unquestioned integrity.

This committee is now engaged in sifting evidence regarding one of our colleagues. They neither asked nor wanted to have this additional public service. Very definitely, they did not seek to sit in this semijudicial and factfinding capacity. The senior Senator from Connecticut asked that they hold these hearings. It is certain they have done and will continue to do their duty thoroughly, fearlessly, and with the utmost fairness.

I wish to manifest my confidence and admiration toward each of these Senators.

Mr. President, more than 40 years ago I served as chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Following that time for many years I was a trial lawyer in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I have been president of two bar associations. My purpose in speaking briefly today is to call attention to the attempted intimidation of Senate witnesses by attorneys for the senior Senator from Connecticut before the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee. I want to commend the chairman of the Ethics Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for his forthright reminder that Senate witnesses are wards of the Senate. It would appear to me that some of the acts and actions of certain of the battery of attorneys representing the respondent have been improper. We should bear in mind that the Senate committee of which Senator STENNIS is chairman and Senator BENNETT is vice chairman were asked by the senior Senator from Connecticut to hold these hearings and they are doing an unpleasant duty not of their own violation.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to reports of intimidation of witnesses conducted by members of one of the largest law firms in the United States—Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl. Lawyers certainly should be familiar with the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association, if not the criminal laws of the United States.

I am informed that partners of the Cahill firm even sit on the grievance committee of the bar association. In view of this fact, if it is a fact, certainly none of these attorneys should flout the canons of ethics of the bar association.

There has already been published in the Washington Star an account of the manner in which Walter J. Kenny of this firm telephoned Michael B. O'Hare, a witness, stating:

> We just want you to know we have got a complete check on Terry Golden. It would be a shame for a lovely girl like her to have her reputation hurt in any way. Maybe after you hear the type of questions we throw at Jim Boyd you will get the flavor of it.

If such news report is a correct statement of fact this was a flagrant attempt to intimidate a witness, which inciden-