

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 8

MAY 11, 1965, TO MAY 24, 1965

(PAGES 10073 TO 11452)

contended that the right to vote of those residing in the disfavored areas had not been effectively diluted.

Thomas Jefferson put it well. "Equal representation," he said, "is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified."

The prejudices here, in my judgment, are the forces of the status quo, the forces which wish to preserve the existing power structures in the State legislatures. A look at the mechanics of the operation of these amendments bears this out.

First, who would frame the question to be put to the people? No one other than the State legislature whose chronic malapportionment created the whole problem in the first place. The interest of the majority of that malapportioned legislature is in preserving its position of control. I think we can expect that the majority would frame a plan which perpetuates its control and maybe even enlarges it, and I certainly think that that majority would be ingenious enough to put the choice to the voters in a way which insures that they will choose the appropriate alternative.

The first point, then, is that the cards are stacked against a fair result from the outset. The people would in all probability never have the chance to make a free choice between the principle of equal representation and a plan departing from it.

I might remind you that the Colorado reapportionment plan which was before the Supreme Court last year in the Lucas case had been approved in a referendum. The Court nevertheless struck down the plan, saying, "An individual's constitutionally protected right to cast an equally weighted vote cannot be denied even by a vote of a majority of a State's electorate * * *." The Colorado choice, I might add, was between an equal-population plan and a so-called little Federal plan, but it is interesting that the former plan provided for the election of senators at large, which obviously detracted from its appeal to the voters.

Will we now let the majority of the voters dilute or deny the right to equal representation, particularly when we know that the majority may either not even appreciate the implications of what it is doing or may not be given a realistic choice to make?

Further, as most of the amendments are now drafted, they lack any mandatory provision for periodic resubmission to the voters, so majority acceptance of a particular plan would not only deny individual rights in the present, but could also bind generations of unborn citizens to a system which they had no say in choosing.

Second, what are the effects which the people's vote to depart from a population basis of representation will have in various parts of the United States?

What about the South? The Negro, of course, is still badly underrepresented in many States. Again, it will be entirely logical for the legislatures of those States to draft a plan which would protect their position against the day when Negroes obtain full voting rights. And, of course, the electorate as presently constituted is equally as interested in preserving the status quo. In much of the South, therefore, permitting a departure from reapportionment based on population will inevitably result in a serious stumbling block to the Negro's ever attaining equality in the political process.

What about other parts of the country? In heavily urbanized States the amendments could have far-reaching effects on the future of the cities and on the urban development process. The legislative majorities in these States are for the most part nonurban in composition and, once again understandably from their viewpoint, do not want anything to happen which would cause them to lose their control. These majorities can be ex-

pected to do everything in their power to utilize for their own ends any opportunity to escape from apportionment based on population.

The perpetuation of minority, nonurban control, even though confined only to one house, could be catastrophic for the cities. The result at worst would be a continuation of the shortchanging of the cities, and at best a stalemate, a legislative paralysis caused by the differing apportionment bases in the two houses.

As time passes, this situation would only become a more and more serious problem for the cities. As we become more and more urbanized, it becomes increasingly critical that every appropriate governmental resource be focused on meeting the problems of urban areas. We all know that the States have not done their share up to now, and that a major reason for the States' failure to face up to deepening urban problems has been the control of the legislatures by a rural minority having no urgent interest in the welfare of the cities.

The inadequate action by the States up to now has caused the cities and suburbs to look to the Federal Government, which has made significant and important contributions to better housing and better transportation, to eliminating slums and urban sprawl, and now, at last, to improving the quality of education.

But more—much more—is needed, and I do not think the Federal Government has the resources to do the job alone; 69.9 percent of our Nation's population now lives in urban areas, and we have only begun to provide healthy, well-planned urban environments and to see to it that urban areas have the full range of governmental services and protections which they deserve.

But in the last analysis this struggle must be fought mainly at the State and local level. The Supreme Court's decision in *Reynolds v. Sims* offered new hope that State governments would at last be truly representative and therefore responsive to the needs of the cities. It would be tragic to destroy that hope now.

And, of course, if the amendments end up injuring the people of our cities, that will be a serious blow to the cause of minority rights. Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other deprived minorities are city dwellers. Perpetuating the antiurban balance of power in the State legislatures, therefore, would jeopardize any hope that these minorities had of obtaining significant help at the State level in their struggle for equality of economic opportunity, better housing, and better schooling.

I believe these amendments will generally have an antiurban effect. But I also want to emphasize strongly that no one can be sure that this will be the effect everywhere and for all time. The majority which acts to consolidate its position at the expense of the outvoted minority need not always be rurally oriented. The coalition which holds the balance of power in the State legislature might well be composed of other interest groups. For instance, considerations relating to the coordination of metropolitan development could well bring urban and suburban interests together to formulate a plan which ended up being unfair to the rural minority. And future shifts in population could change the balance of power completely.

The point is that whatever plan is adopted will be weighted somehow, and that, however, it is weighted, someone will be the loser. I wonder, frankly, how many of those who think they will benefit from the malapportionment which the proposed amendments would create have stopped to think that they could in fact end up on the short end. There are undoubtedly many States in this country in which it is not at all clear who would be the watered-down minority.

In sum, to paraphrase Chief Justice Marshall, we must remember that this is, after

all, a Constitution we are amending. What the proponents of the amendments are advocating is the introduction of an exception to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment; an exception which says, in effect, equality is the rule except where representation in the State legislatures is concerned. What they are supporting is the removal of a right previously enjoyed—the taking away of a guarantee of equality—the equality of representation—which the 14th amendment has previously been held to encompass. They are talking about changing the basic fabric from which our Government is woven and they are talking about doing so in a way which would diminish the rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment. To me this kind of venture is inconsistent with the ideal of equality for which we have always strived, and which we have always held out to peoples of other lands as the principle which differentiates America from less democratic nations. And this whittling away at the 14th amendment represents a most troublesome precedent for the future.

I have tried in these few moments to point out the dangers in the proposed modification of the rule laid down in *Reynolds v. Sims*—dangers not just to particular interest groups or to particular segments of the population, but dangers whose ultimate effect cannot even be entirely gaged at the present time.

Reynolds v. Sims offered new hope to so many that the rule of law at the State level would finally bring results of tangible benefit.

If congressional action which destroys that hope is to be prevented, your participation is vital. The premises of the amendments need to be brought into the light of day and examined and reexamined. Their implications for all individuals and groups within the States need careful analysis.

We are confronted with a proposal to change the structure of our Government for a long time to come. This is important and significant to all of us, and we should be fully aware of what its results will be before we allow it to proceed any further.

A SALUTE TO ISRAEL ON THE CELEBRATION OF HER 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 17 years ago this week, one of this century's most significant and successful adventures in freedom was undertaken. The establishment of Israel on May 14, 1948, marked for the Jewish people both a prophecy fulfilled and a future blessed with the freedom of self-determination.

All free men had a stake in Israel's emergence as a sovereign state; and all men in bondage drew, and continue to draw, inspiration from her story. A people dispersed throughout every nation, homeless for the better part of 20 centuries, commenced building on May 14, 1948, a nation devoted to the egalitarian principles of the French and the American Revolutions.

The measure of Israeli success in the past 17 years can be gaged from many perspectives. In surveying the modern miracle of Israel's resurrection, some may prefer to talk in terms of the purely physical wonders which have been wrought; the construction of entire urban centers, rising from the ruins of the ancient world; the establishment of thriving centers of intellectual achievement, built on the foundation of an ancient wisdom which has inspired and enriched the heritage of many nations;

or the unsurpassed conversion of an unyielding desert terrain to a land of promise and harvest.

But the modern miracle which is Israel can also be approached from the vantage of values, for there are many lessons to be learned from Israel's experiment with democracy. For the most part, those lessons hew closely to those taught by our own Revolution. There is, first of all, the lesson that free men determined to remain free can accomplish all manner of objectives if they cherish freedom above all else. There is also the lesson that liberty can be salvaged even from the ashes of the greatest holocaust in the history of the world if brave and optimistic men will challenge the darkness of despair and derision. There is also the lesson that freedom means no more, and no less, than the freedom to be different; and that in recognizing the right of others to differ from us, we protect our own inalienable right to be and to do as we wish. This is the anniversary we celebrate this week. It is the anniversary of what one tireless and faithful people began to accomplish by harnessing the full power of diversity under the disciplined yoke of liberty.

We, as Americans, have a special affinity for this young state. Under the leadership of President Truman, our Nation was the first to accord full diplomatic recognition to the State of Israel. That was done immediately after its establishment. In recognition of Israel's role as a bastion of democracy in a part of the world where human rights are questioned and democratic institutions are unknown. The American Government and people have readily furnished unstinting moral and financial aid to the young state.

Like all nations in the last half of the 20th century, Israel is confronted with grave and growing problems. On all sides, the tiny country is surrounded by hostile neighbors, mutually pledged to her destruction. Time and again in the last 17 years, Israel has had to turn her resources and her national purpose away from social progress and toward military security. President Bourguiba, of Tunisia, has recently stirred peaceful hopes in this troubled part of the world by recognizing the possibility of reaching an equitable agreement under which Israel and her neighbors can live in peace. President Bourguiba has been denounced by his Arab brothers for this action; but the important thing is that the Arab world is no longer wholly united in its hostility toward Israel.

Israel's greatest domestic problem has been, and continues to be, water. Israeli planners and engineers have achieved tremendous feats in the development of all water resources in the tiny state. I am pleased to note that the United States and Israel have joined in a program of desalinization of sea water which heralds a new era of agricultural abundance and economic development, not alone to Israel, but to all the nations of the Middle East.

Mr. President, I join all other Senators and countless other Americans in saluting the State of Israel for its past achievements, and in renewing our tra-

ditional pledge to aid any friend to insure the survival and success of liberty.

CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE TSUNAMI (SEISMIC SEA WAVE) WARNING SYSTEM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a meeting of national and international importance was held in Honolulu recently when, for the first time, scientists from many nations assembled for a Conference on the International Aspects of the Tsunami Warning System of the Pacific. The effectiveness of the tsunami or seismic sea-wave warning system is a matter of life and death to all who live within reach of these destructive, giant waves. Every island and coastal city or village in the Pacific Ocean area is vulnerable to the seismic sea waves spawned from earthquakes and volcanic eruption. The tsunamis born of the March 1964 earthquake in Alaska, destroyed much of Valdez, Alaska, and caused loss of life and property at Crescent City, Calif. The same waves touched Hawaii, Chile, and Japan.

Tsunamis which struck the Hawaiian Islands in 1946 brought death to 173 persons and property damage of \$25 million. Again, in 1960, tsunamis killed 61 persons and caused \$23,550,000 in property damage in Hawaii. The problem of developing the most effective methods of providing advance warning of impending tsunamis is, therefore, of vital importance to the many peoples and governments around the Pacific basin.

The conference held in Honolulu on April 27-30 this year was of great significance because for the first time it brought together a large number of earth and oceanographic scientists to discuss various aspects of an international sea-wave warning system, including effective seismological and tide recording stations and rapid international communication systems.

Canada, Chile, Republic of China, France, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, the Philippines, the United States of America, Soviet Russia, and Western Samoa were represented by official delegations. Also represented were the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Ryukyu Islands, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, World Meteorological Organization, and Inter-American Geodetic Survey.

Although the meeting was sponsored by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, it was hosted by one of our Nation's foremost scientific organizations, the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was most fitting that the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which maintains and operates the most effective tidal wave warning system in the world, took the initiative to organize and host such a meeting on behalf of the U.S. Government.

The U.S. delegation was headed by Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. He was assisted by five official delegates, including Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr., who had

the distinction of being named Conference Chairman. Under Dr. Stewart's able direction and guidance, items of the conference agenda were approached with much enthusiasm, and a spirit of genuine international cooperation prevailed throughout the meeting. Much was accomplished, as indicated in the recommendations adopted by the body of international scientists.

Admiral Karo and the Coast and Geodetic Survey are to be commended for great leadership in their efforts to promote better international understanding and cooperation in the field of seismic sea-wave warning capabilities.

I am proud that the State of Hawaii was chosen as the site for this highly important international meeting. Organizations and institutions in Hawaii, such as the University of Hawaii and its Geophysical Institute, the Bishop Museum, the East-West Center, U.S. Army Engineers, and other deserve recognition for their assistance in making the international conference a success.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the recommendations adopted at the Honolulu meeting and the list of participants.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Working Group on the International Aspects of the Tsunami Warning System in the Pacific urges that the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission take appropriate steps to insure the implementation of the following recommendations. These are designed to provide for the development of the most expeditious, efficient, and effective methods for providing advance warning of impending tsunamis. It is therefore recommended that:

1. An International Tsunami Information Center be established on a permanent basis to collect and interpret seismic and sea-level data on a real-time basis to act as a source from which national centers may obtain data on which to base their warnings, and further that the U.S. Government be asked to strengthen its present tsunami warning service based at the Honolulu Observatory to enable it to act in addition as the International Tsunami Information Center, but it is also anticipated that other nations may be prepared to assist in operating this Center, for instance by providing personnel.

2. The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission established an International Coordinating Committee for the Tsunami Warning System in the Pacific to:
 - (i) Effect liaison among the participating countries at the technical level, particularly with regard to communications.
 - (ii) Insure exchange of information on developments of observing methods and of techniques of tsunami forecasting.
 - (iii) Effect liaison and coordination with the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, World Meteorological Organization, and the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics—particularly with its Tsunami Committee, and
 - (iv) Provide essential secretarial service for the International Tsunami Information Service and for the International Coordinating Committee.

This International Coordinating Committee should meet biennially, and preferably a few months before each meeting of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, or oftener if required, to review the technical aspects of the System and to prepare