

A474

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 2, 1966

State Comptroller Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., will appear as spokesman for the State government, and will be accompanied in his presentation by State Revenue Commission Director J. Ed Straughn.

The bill purports to eliminate multiple taxation on businesses operating in several States by setting up a system requiring such firms to file a single report with the Federal Government, on the basis of which States concerned would collect taxes due.

In attempting to relieve a relatively small problem, however, the proposal would impose new and far more restrictive limitations on the taxing power of the States beyond those now accepted by the courts. It would make mandatory sweeping changes in State tax policies and practices, which officials estimate would cost Florida taxpayers about \$72 million a year. Finally, the bill is viewed with alarm by State officials as a further intrusion of Federal power into State affairs which would lead to the ultimate destruction of State fiscal sovereignty through imposition of Federal controls.

Under the bill, for example, States would be prohibited from imposing income taxes, capital stock taxes, and gross receipt taxes on out-of-State businesses operating within their borders unless their legislatures adopted the uniform tax system set up under it.

Governor Burns and the full cabinet have formally gone on record in opposition to the proposal, as has the interim State tax study commission headed by Senator B. C. Pearce, of Palatka.

The proposal is another notable example of using some ostensibly desirable reform as an appealing front to accomplish a purpose which the public would never willingly accept if advanced forthrightly.

If the present system for collecting State taxes on out-of-State businesses imposes undue hardships on such businesses, it should be relatively simple to provide relief without wrecking the system and imposing shackles on the States in the process. The provisions of the bill which extend beyond that stated purpose, however, support the strong suspicion that its real purpose is not to eliminate inconvenience to a limited number of businesses, but to drive another deep wedge to separate the States from the administration of their own affairs.

Message of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire country was reassured when its President expressed his view that this Nation and its people are strong enough to meet our commitments abroad and face up to our obligations at home at the same time.

In his state of the Union speech, President Johnson made an expression of confidence of the ability of this Nation.

The President said, quite simply:

I believe we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam.

The sweep of his domestic proposals was startling, the Houston Chronicle stated editorially.

The editorial, one of many in praise of the state of the Union message, will be of interest to my colleagues, and I offer it for the RECORD.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Johnson was eloquent in his state of the Union address last night although he offered the Nation no surprises in his assessment of the war in Vietnam. On the domestic front, however, the sweep of his proposals was startling. He has asked Congress for enough new legislation to keep its second session almost as busy as was the frantic first session. Those who expected a letup in the Great Society were put straight almost from the moment the President began to speak.

This was Mr. Johnson's first full-scale television address since early October. He appeared healthy and physically up to the occasion. His face seemed more deeply lined than usual perhaps. His demeanor was enthusiastic when he spoke of his domestic program; sober and measured when he spoke of Vietnam.

The Nation, perhaps, had hoped Mr. Johnson could reveal some dramatic new development in the Vietnam conflict. In that sense, his words were disappointing, for clearly nothing new has occurred since the beginning of his peace offensive to justify high hopes for a negotiated settlement. Instead, the President reiterated the now familiar U.S. stand—peace as soon as possible, but peace only after aggression is halted.

"Let me be absolutely clear," he said in one of his most dramatic passages. "The days may become months, and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle."

Mr. Johnson clearly has rejected the gun-or-butter choice which many have said has been forced on the country.

"We will not permit those who fire on us in Vietnam to win a victory over the desires and intentions of the American people. This Nation is mighty enough—its society healthy enough—its people strong enough—to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while building a Great Society at home."

Few had expected the President to be so ambitious in his request of Congress. In the field of civil rights, he was especially bold. He asked legislation to end discrimination in jury selection—a highly controversial issue; new laws to punish in Federal courts those who murder, attack, or intimidate civil rights workers; new legislation to ban racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. There will be a battle, surely, over these measures.

He asked, also, for a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation; for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; for development of a supersonic transport airplane to fly three times the speed of sound; for new measures to deal with strikes which threaten the national interest—this, incidentally, to considerable applause from Congress; for a new attack on river and stream pollution; for Federal highway safety legislation; and on and on.

In the foreign field, the President seeks a much needed "new and daring direction" to the foreign aid program and also an expansion of trade between this Nation and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The former will be welcomed, no doubt, but the latter will make the sparks fly.

And so will Mr. Johnson's proposal to increase taxes on telephone service and new cars—cut just 2 weeks ago. That increase would help finance the rising cost of the war, but it is evident that Mr. Johnson has no desire for widespread tax increases in this election year. He expects the Federal budget to rise to \$112.8 billion—the highest ever—but he intends to hold the deficit to a slim \$1.8 billion. If he can do this, he will surprise many doubting Thomases.

In sum, it was an ambitious, exciting domestic program which the President outlined, and a restrained, though straightforward, approach of the future in Vietnam.

Bombs and Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made the only possible choice in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. The United States pursued every honorable means during the bombing lull in an effort to secure a cease-fire and the negotiation of a peaceful settlement.

We were answered with denunciations instead of negotiations.

As pointed out in the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1966, President Johnson has coupled the resumption of bombing raids with a further effort toward peace. I know his efforts will continue.

I commend the Tribune editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

BOMBS AND RESOLUTIONS

In announcing the resumption of bombing attacks on North Vietnam, President Johnson made it plain that this was the result of the considered judgment of the responsible military and political agencies of the American government. And that judgment can only be seriously contested on the assumption that the United States has no business in Vietnam at all.

For the bombing pause failed to produce any hint from Hanoi that it was willing to sit down at the conference table. It not only continued to insist on acceptance of its original four points (which would mean total victory for the Vietcong) but has added, as the British Foreign Office terms it, "a new and even more unacceptable prior condition"—recognition of the Vietcong as "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam."

Since Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war. No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice. But since it has been made so abundantly clear by the rejection of President Johnson's peace overtures, few Americans would want to endanger the lives of their men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

At the same time, the United States is fighting this war to end it, and the President has given renewed evidence of American determination in this respect by taking the case formally to the United Nations.

This has not been done before for several reasons. In the first place, the only international body which had been seized of the Vietnamese dispute was the Geneva conference of 1954. That body could be recalled to discuss the problem; the British Government, as one co-chairman, has been trying to do so. The Soviet Union, the other co-chairman, has refused.

There is also the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Red China, the power prodding Ho Chi Minh toward continued war, is a member of the U.N., and both have repeatedly and explicitly denied that the U.N. has any role to play in their affairs.

The American resolution, however, does not set forth specific terms for a settlement, or even outline fixed steps toward a settlement—which would almost certainly have brought immediate rejection by Hanoi. Rather, the American proposal would place the Security Council officially in back of a

February 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1857

to request emergency action in the U.N. Security Council. Let us hope that here is an avenue that may lead Hanoi to a serious discussion of peace.

We must be mindful, however, that Hanoi has as yet not disclosed a serious interest in peace, and today is indicating its indifference to any action which might be taken by the United Nations.

For while we and others have sought since last April to bring Hanoi to serious discussions, a long record of terrorism and violence leveled at the people of South Vietnam has been the only response.

It is therefore important that we realize that we must continue to support our commitment to the South Vietnamese people and the U.S. forces there.

This we will do; and I am sure that, as Secretary Rusk has stated, the United States will continue to explore the processes of diplomacy, both public and private, in order that any possibility of peace can be explored and tested.

Turning to another, but related, matter, yesterday we received a message from the President, submitting his foreign aid program. This program is less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the national defense budget, and for that reason its extension can, in my opinion, be largely justified.

I am delighted that the President says that from now on he wants to help nations which help themselves. This is progress, because in years gone by we were willing to help nations under any circumstances, without any regard to whether they helped themselves or anybody else. That was a rather immature approach in my judgment. For this reason I welcome the President's intention to limit economic assistance to those nations which help themselves.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that we might even take a further step. We might even be so bold as to propose that some day we will help only those who help us. But I suppose that is too revolutionary a proposal to bring up at a time like this, especially when so many people in this country do not even want to help the President.

In his foreign aid message the President said that nine-tenths of the \$665 million earmarked for development loans is for five countries.

One of these countries is Nigeria. On the same day, and almost at the same hour that the President was transmitting his foreign aid message to Congress, the Nigerian representative on the United Nations Security Council was refusing to support the American request that the Council take up the question of whether the United Nations should discuss the Vietnamese problem. In fact, all three African members of the Security Council opposed our simple and reasonable request which needs nine affirmative votes for adoption. I recall, parenthetically, that only last fall at the International Telecommunications Union Conference at Montreux, Switzerland, where I was a U.S. delegate, all 32 of the African delegates refused to support the position of the United States in a matter of importance.

I have supported foreign aid to a number of countries, including a number of African countries. I expect to continue to do so. But I shall not be bulldozed or blackmailed or threatened by a statement that any part of the world is immune, or that any nation in the world is immune, from criticism because of considerations other than their governmental actions. When they do not help us, as Nigeria refused to help us yesterday, we ought to bear in mind the limited resources available for development loans and take a good hard look to see whether or not we ought to spend them on a country that only yesterday, while we were offering development loans to it, was saying to us, "We do not believe enough in free speech to permit the United States to take its cause to the United Nations."

Fifteen Senators have submitted to the President their dissent from and concern over his Vietnam policy. They have urged him to reconsider the course of action on which he has embarked. Some of them have been heard to say, "Let us take the problem to the United Nations." So we try, and the next thing that happens is that we cannot even get enough members of the Security Council to agree merely to take it up.

Most people, like myself, I suppose, thought that the only member of the Security Council which would not want to take it up would be the Soviet Union. But lo and behold, our longtime, great ally, France, joined Russia. What purpose other than petty mischief France had in taking such action, I cannot understand. Whereupon the whole kit and kaboodle of the nations which have enjoyed our assistance sought to embarrass this Government, saying, "We will not even let you talk about it."

If that is all that the United Nations is willing to do, we may have to say that we have run our string out there. If that is the case, we must stand alone with our valiant Vietnamese ally and with the assistance of a few friendly allies, such as South Korea, the United Kingdom, and Australia. For we must do whatever is necessary to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion. I think every one of us strongly supported every step of the President's peace offensive. Now, most of us are ready to go ahead to seek an honorable settlement by using such force as may be necessary to bring about the negotiations leading to that settlement.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his kindness in yielding to me.

MORE COMMONSENSE FROM SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of all the Senators who have preceded me, and to whom I have yielded, precede in the Record the remarks I shall make. I should like to preserve the continuity of my remarks. I feel certain that no Senator will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under the same conditions on which I have yielded to other Senators, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me. I asked him to yield for the purpose of obtaining unanimous consent to place in the Record a transcript of the discussion between the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright] and two noted Columbia Broadcasting System news correspondents, Mr. Eric Sevareid and Mr. Martin Agronsky. The discussion took place on the CBS Network between 10:30 and 11 o'clock last night, Eastern Standard Time. It was another impressive demonstration of Senator Fulbright's uncommon commonsense.

Much of the discussion centered around the issue of Vietnam, and our policy not only in that country, but in other parts of Asia as well. The discussion was a most thoughtful, interesting, and forthright statement of the issues.

Near the end of the broadcast, Mr. Sevareid asked Senator Fulbright if he thought that high ranking public officials could afford the luxury of public pessimism. Senator Fulbright offered what I believe to be a perfect answer.

He said:

It seems to me that we all get along better if we say what we think, whether it is pessimistic or optimistic.

That is a good admonition to all of us. It is sometimes difficult to speak out on controversial questions, particularly at a time when our country is committed to battle. No one enjoys the prospect of having his words twisted in such a way as to imply that he has somehow undercut what our troops are trying to accomplish or has undercut the national interest in any way. But there has never been a time in our history when plain, honest talk was so desperately needed. And every Senator speaks for war or peace by his silence as well as by his words.

We are involved in what I believe is the most dangerous venture in which this country has ever been engaged. We must turn every possible stone in an effort to end this war and to bring it to a conclusion before we are pulled into what would be the most disastrous development that anyone could imagine, and that is a major all-out war on the Asian mainland.

In my judgment the great generals who have warned us against that in the past have been absolutely right. I believe that it would be calamitous for this country to take steps which would bring on such a war.

I hope that we will do everything we can to prevent that. I believe that the President wants to avoid that kind of a conflict but he needs to hear our honest convictions about this ill-advised venture in Vietnam.

One way to avoid an even larger conflict is by honest talk. If Senators will only speak out and say what they really