

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 12

JULY 12, 1966, TO JULY 20, 1966

(PAGES 15189 TO 16538)

**

has to use armed forces in the absence of congressional authorization and what authority is granted to each of the executive and legislative branches in a situation of disagreement between the branches as to the use of armed force. In the light of the history of congressional action on Viet Nam these problems are certainly not presented with respect to the use of the armed forces in Viet Nam. Under our Constitution the President has broad and somewhat undefined powers as Commander-in-Chief to use the military instrument and particularly to control the military particularities in the use of that instrument. With regard to the power given to Congress, however, it would seem that in a situation of substantial use of the military instrument such as in Viet Nam, Congress should have a major role in terms of permissibility of the broad outlines of the continuing use of the military instrument. That is a role which Congress has significantly participated in with respect to Viet Nam, and is one in which Congress should continue to participate.

CONCLUSION

United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg recently said:

"Our nation derives its great influence in the world not only from great physical power, but also from the fact that our basic law and our national outlook are premised on the equality and dignity of all men.

"The way to peace in this turbulent age is to keep to that national vision, to work with all our might for the establishment of a structure of law that will be reliable and just to all nations.

"For though law alone cannot assure world peace, there can be no peace without it. Our national power and all our energies should operate in the light of that truth."⁴⁵

The United States assistance to the Republic of Viet Nam is a lawful policy alternative. That lawfulness means compliance within the spirit of Ambassador Goldberg's words with the basic structures of international law and the United Nations; structures designed to promote self-determination and world public order. In carrying out policies within these structures "our national power and all our energies" must continue to be used to maximize the prospects for peace and secure self-determination and economic and social progress to the people of the Republic of Viet Nam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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 VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS VIETNAM VICTORY POLICY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate have long recognized, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is an organization that has made critically important contributions to the strengthening of our national security.

This leadership, which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has provided, has been particularly helpful with respect to the war in which we are engaged in South

Vietnam. The VFW has, as an organization, demonstrated a truly remarkable understanding of the strategy of the Pacific area, the importance of South Vietnam, and the need for a clear-cut U.S. victory in that conflict.

Consequently, I am confident that Members of this Senate will be pleased to know of an outstanding editorial tribute which has recently been accorded the Veterans of Foreign Wars and Mr. Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., who is the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is a matter of satisfaction to me that such fine editorial comment with respect to the VFW appeared in the highly regarded editorial columns of the San Diego Evening Tribune on June 28, 1966.

The editorial quoted extensively from the remarks of the VFW national commander, Andy Borg, emphasizing the need to win in Vietnam and, also, why the United States must not be dissuaded, in fear of what the Kremlin or Red China might do, from taking all necessary steps to win the war.

I am also confident that the many Members of this Senate who have shared my admiration for the leadership which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has given our country in matters of national security will concur with the San Diego Evening Tribune editorial opinion that "the VFW chief and the national organization he heads are doing a public service in taking such a forceful stance."

Because of the importance of this editorial appearing in the San Diego Evening Tribune, which is one of the much respected Copley publications, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, June 28, 1966]

VFW'S VIET VICTORY POLICY PUTS BACKBONE INTO AMERICA

The United States must win the war in Viet Nam in the interest of America's vital national security.

This is a plain truth which the Veterans of Foreign Wars, now meeting in San Diego, has long espoused with vigor and conviction.

It is something which needs to be said and believed by the American people whose lives and prosperity, as well as the nation's honor, are bound up in this conflict.

And particularly it is something that needs to be said for the benefit and belief of the enemy we are fighting in Viet Nam and those who are supporting him.

Andy Borg, commander in chief of the VFW, here for the 40th annual meeting of the California department, put the issue this way:

"It is up to the United States to unite and convince the world. If the United States ever become convinced that it will go all the way, the war will go to the peace table with either a complete victory or a just and honorable peace."

Borg, an attorney from Superior, Wis., explained it this way: If a trial lawyer makes it clear from the very outset that he is prepared to go all the way up to a jury, a settlement is more likely.

Temporizing and shilly-shallying only make certain the loss of respect, not only of friends and allies, but also of our enemies. Our will and resolve are forever after cast in doubt. And that way lies destruction.

One of the most convincing ways the United States could show it means business, in the view of the VFW, is by cutting off shipping to North Viet Nam by blockade and, if necessary, by mining the port of Haiphong.

This would apply to ships of all nations—Russian, allies or otherwise—the primary consideration being our resolve that neither friends or enemies should be sending supplies to Viet Nam to kill Americans.

There have been timid and phony arguments against such forceful and convincing action.

One argument is that we cannot risk antagonizing friendly shipping nations because we are so short of ships under the American flag we must depend on them for help.

These nations who are now supplying the Communists are motivated by money, not ideology. When and as a blockade caused their risk insurance to rise astronomically, we should see a dramatic end to this trafficking with our enemy. Rather than boycotting American business, they might well look for more to replace that lost through blockade.

As for angering the Russians to the point that they would try to run the blockade, Borg has a good, straightforward American answer:

"Let them worry about that." If a Kennedy-type blockade worked around Cuba, why shouldn't one work off Viet Nam?

And as for Red China entering the war, the odds are long against it. Communist China is caught in a tight economic squeeze. It fears reprisal bombing by the United States and a Nationalist Chinese move to the mainland. It has no repair parts for war machinery formerly supplied by the Soviet Union. Moving men and material to South Viet Nam would be extremely difficult.

"The Red Chinese would not have anything to gain by entering the war because at the present time they are fighting the war with North Viet Nam soldiers without the loss of face and men and supplies," Borg pointed out in San Diego the other day.

The VFW chief and the national organization he heads are doing a public service in taking such a forceful stance.

The VFW is expressing the attitude of the American people, whose way always has been to win the war and an honorable peace.

AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE OVERSEAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on June 8, I introduced an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 to strengthen our support of adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. I have been deeply disturbed by the nearly unanimous opinion of experts that such research has been grossly neglected in our foreign aid programs, even though it has been indispensable to the unmatched progress of agriculture in our own land.

Since I introduced this amendment, cosponsored by my distinguished colleagues, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PELL, I have been gratified to receive letters of support from a number of experts in the field of agricultural assistance overseas, as well as organizations such as the National Council of Churches which have a deep moral concern over the threat of hunger and starvation in developing countries.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of these letters in support of my amendment be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

⁴⁵ N.Y. Times, May 19, 1966, p. 6, col. 4 (city ed.), at col. 5. (Typographical errors corrected).

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONDALE. I am most gratified also that, in its report to the Senate on the foreign aid legislation, the Foreign Relations Committee saw fit to endorse the substance of my amendment. On page 11 of this report, there is a declaration that:

The Committee believes that in countries where food production is not keeping pace with the demands of expanding populations, or where diets are seriously deficient, high priority should be given to promoting agricultural development, particularly programs to establish or expand research designed to adapt existing knowledge and techniques to new situations.

I continue to feel that this language should be contained in the law itself, together with a statement that:

Such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on co-operative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions.

This objective would be accomplished by the adoption of my amendment.

Because of the urgent need to improve food production in developing countries, and the insufficient efforts made in this direction in past years, I feel that the Congress cannot be too firm in insisting that the highest priority be placed on this objective.

EXHIBIT 1

INTERNATIONAL MINERALS &
CHEMICAL CORP.,
July 7, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for the note advising me of your amendment to pending foreign aid legislation designed to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations.

Certainly adequate and properly conducted research is a requisite for the intelligent and most productive use under varying local conditions, of the various food production tools which can and must be made available to agriculture in developing countries.

You and your associates are to be commended for your efforts to increase the emphasis on research toward that end.

Communication to members of the Senate on behalf of the proposed amendment is now being prepared, and we will be pleased to make favorable reference to the amendment where possible in appropriate public utterances by representatives of the corporation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. WARE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Davis, Calif., June 28, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter of June 13th and for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 8th as well as for the copy of your Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Amendment is excellent. I concur in it wholeheartedly.

As you probably know, some thirty states were lately represented at a meeting of Directors of International Agricultural Programs sponsored by the University of Minne-

sota. The consensus at this meeting, I believe, was that our institutionalized agricultural science, with necessary adaptations of course, can serve as an instrument for economic development abroad far beyond any past uses. At the same time many of us feel that the potentialities of this projection of our agricultural research institutions abroad are very poorly understood in the United States even—and perhaps especially—in educational and scientific circles which are often most influential in shaping our policies of foreign technical assistance. I hope very much that the International Agricultural Program Directors in the several states will keep in close touch with each other as well as with senators like you and Senators BURDICK, McGOVERN and PELL so that we may, as rapidly as possible, formulate programs of technical assistance abroad which make sense in terms of our own institutional framework, including our universities and also the fine research facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and make sense also in terms of the needs of recipient countries. But beyond all this we need very much to put our formulation in terms that justify Congressional support. For myself, I am convinced that as rapidly as possible we should try to get such support through the authorization by Congress of annual federal appropriations upon the assurance of which long-term technical assistance programs can be planned and executed. All this I think is very much in keeping with your own reflections on the subject and with the Amendment you have proposed.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Professor John Blackmore at the University of Minnesota who is exercising considerable leadership in this field.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES M. HARDIN,
Director, International
Agricultural Center.

cc: Professor John Blackmore, Director,
International Agricultural Programs, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 20, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for sharing with us a copy of your speech on the need to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. We agree with you that expanded efforts in this area are vital to any long-term solution to the world food crisis.

We do have one reservation. Where your amendment says that "such research programs, to the greatest extent possible, should be based on cooperative undertakings between universities and research institutions in the developing countries and United States universities and research institutions", we would prefer that the wording be to the extent practicable rather than "to the greatest extent possible".

Because we agree with you on the importance of encouraging such research in developing countries, we are sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Very sincerely yours,

OVE R. NIELSEN,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

UNITED CHURCH BOARD
FOR HOMELAND MINISTRIES,
June 20, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: The Reverend Mr. McCanna has referred a copy of your

Amendment to the Foreign Aid legislation regarding agricultural research in hungry nations to me. I am very much in favor of supporting this amendment and so state my position. I have two brothers working in Africa as deputy directors of the Peace Corps and the Foreign Aid program. I have seen at close range the results of this kind of assistance and am heartily in support of it. Your amendment would sharpen the focus of the aid in bringing the resources of the universities and research institutions to these development programs.

I have followed your leadership in the Senate with interest and heartily back you.

Sincerely yours,

SERGE F. HUMMON.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT
COLLEGES,

Washington, D.C., July 7, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In reply to your recent letter to Dr. Elton Johnson of our International Rural Development Office concerning your proposed amendment No. 587 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966:

There is no question but that increased emphasis needs to be placed on supporting adaptive agricultural research in hungry nations. By making this emphasis a matter of priority in legislative intent, your amendment would be most helpful. May I say, also that the authority requested by the administration to make grants to support the capacity of universities to conduct technical assistance work abroad, and to extend the authorization for technical assistance over a 5-year period, both are most relevant to the objective you seek, and I trust they will be included in some form in the final legislation.

Universities must be able both to involve highly competent people in their overseas programs, and at the same time maintain a high level of competence at home. Some assurance of continuity of program is also essential.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,
Executive Director.

Cc.: Chancellor John T. Caldwell.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Raleigh, July 5, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and
Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your letter relative to the amendment you have introduced to the pending foreign aid legislation. This is a most significant amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. We feel that a critical need exists for the establishment and expansion of adaptive agricultural research programs of Land-Grant colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture with foreign institutions.

We would like to second your view that we have had too much of a transfer of information bias in our foreign assistance programs. This same caution would apply to the concept of adaptive research unless it is clearly understood that adaptation of agricultural technological experiences will require creative, imaginative and experimental processes and not merely copying of work previously accomplished. It is not a simple process, but rather one that must be viewed in a long-run context and one requiring the development of an optimum number and size of research institutions.

Viewed in this context, it is important that two essential elements be included. First, that the programs be conducted with indigenous institutions and governments committed to the adaptive research philosophy

and those that have demonstrated genuine concern by initiating actions to develop such educational and research capacity. Secondly, that the concept of grants rather than contracts with interested and capable United States universities be developed that will permit long-term commitments on the part of these institutions.

At North Carolina State University we have been engaged in adaptive agricultural research in Peru and are now programming expansions in this area. Enactment of your amendment would provide essential support for the objectives of this and other United States institutions.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CALDWELL,
Chancellor.

Cc.: Dean H. B. James, School of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

CHURCH WORLD SERVICE.

New York, N.Y., June 30, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I appreciated very much your letter and the attached amendment to the pending foreign aid legislation designed to encourage increased emphasis on supporting adopted agricultural research overseas. As you are well aware, we also are deeply concerned with this problem of world hunger and the lifting of agricultural production in the developing countries. I see that your proposal would further these mutual desires.

While something along this line is apparently included in the intent of the new Food For Freedom legislation, I endorse its inclusion also in the foreign aid legislation. It seems to me that we cannot emphasize too strongly the need for this type of research which you have proposed.

I hope that you will take the liberty of sharing this letter with your colleagues.

For your information, I shall be out of the office until mid-August and in the interim, should you desire to keep us abreast of developments, I would suggest that you might want to communicate with James MacCracken, Executive Director of Church World Service.

In the meantime, thank you very much for sharing this information with me.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN B. MYERS,
Director, Material Resources Program.

Cc.—Mr. James MacCracken, Mr. Henry McCanna.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

June 15, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.:

Your proposed amendment "strengthening adaptive research" is most necessary and creative and we pledge our support. Also alerting all other town and country church leaders.

DR. HENRY A. MCCANNA,
Commission on the Church in Town and Country, National Council of Churches.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today, July 13, marks the first anniversary of the Environmental Science Services Administration. One year ago the three offices of the Department of Commerce which were dealing separately with research into the various aspects of the natural environment were merged into one unit within the Department. The previous three offices were the Weather

Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory, the latter of which was formerly a part of the Bureau of Standards.

The reorganization has permitted the agency to extend and expand its scientific capability. The result in the past year alone has been an expanded research program into oceanography and sea-air interaction, an intensified and detailed study of the Gulf Stream, and research into changes engendered in both the air and the ocean when cold air masses move from the land over the sea.

Of immediate and direct benefit to the public has been the creation of a single source of warnings of environmental hazards by the creation of ESSA.

I am hopeful that appropriations will be forthcoming in this session so that we can take full advantage of this new capability for early warnings of natural disasters. The Environmental Science Services Administration has requested funds to establish a formal service for reporting and warning of weather conditions. The system called the natural disaster warning system, would provide for upgrading and expanding detection facilities, communications capability and community preparedness procedures, especially in those areas of the country which are plagued by tornadoes, hurricanes, cyclones, floods, and even blizzards and forest fires.

Natural disasters such as these claim 500 to 600 lives annually and cause losses of between \$11 and \$15 billion annually.

It is estimated that the number of deaths could be reduced by one-half, and about \$100 million could be saved annually if the nadwarn system, as it is nicknamed, were put into operation.

I have spoken before, here in the Senate, and urged that the proposal receive favorable consideration in the appropriations committees.

I think the Environmental Science Services Administration has a bright future ahead of it. I congratulate it on the progress it has made in the space of 1 short year. I understand that today is open house day at the various ESSA offices around the country, to give the public a chance to become acquainted with ESSA's various functions. I wish that time permitted me to take such a tour, but I hope that many Americans have the time to take advantage of ESSA's invitation.

I hope also that actions can be taken to set up the nadwarn system this year. There is a great need for this program in my own State, as I am sure there is a similar need throughout the Nation.

THE VITAL ROLE OF OCEAN SHIPPING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Rear Adm. John Harlee, U.S. Navy, retired, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, has excellent qualifications to speak on the full dimensions of sea power.

As a naval officer, he saw U.S. merchant ships deliver the goods to Korea, disproving the views of some persons who demeaned the importance of the

Nation's merchant marine following World War II.

As Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, he has seen our merchant marine deliver the goods in Vietnam, again disproving the views of those persons who would let our merchant marine dwindle to extinction.

He knows that U.S. military and commercial ships carry more than 90 percent of U.S. aid and two out of three military personnel sent to Vietnam.

It was these experiences, these facts, that led Admiral Harlee, in a National Maritime Day speech in Seattle, to make the observation that "whether all-out peace or all-out war—or anywhere between—the role of ocean shipping is vital."

In that speech, Admiral Harlee also paid a well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] by describing him as the Pacific Northwest's "greatest maritime asset."

Because Admiral Harlee knows of what he speaks, I ask unanimous consent that his National Maritime Day speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF REAR ADM. JOHN HARLEE, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE A JOINT LUNCHEON OF THE PROPELLER CLUB, PORT OF SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT SEATTLE, WASH., ON MAY 20, 1966

Thirty three years ago, National Maritime Day was proclaimed, for the first time, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The son of a former ship-owner and ship's master, FDR stated that May 22 was selected in recognition of the sailing of the first trans-Atlantic steamship, *SS Savannah* 114 years earlier. "... thus making a material contribution to the advancement of ocean transportation." These were the key words of President Roosevelt's proclamation.

There are now about one dozen "days" similarly celebrated nation-wide and supported with the dignity of a Presidential proclamation. In 1933, however, there were only two, Maritime Day, and Child Health Day. Thus, National Maritime Day is, in a sense, a pioneer holiday, and it has been honored by five Presidents.

In proclaiming this year's National Maritime Day, President Lyndon B. Johnson touched not only on the past, but also mentioned the merchant marine's importance to the present and future.

He said;

"Throughout our history, American ships have contributed to the development of our modern economy, as well as to the strength and unity of the country. As this Nation's economy continues to expand, we will continue to need ships. . . ."

The President said:

"Our merchant marine is also vital to our friends all over the world. The transportation of surplus commodities . . . is an important part of our foreign aid program.

"As long as the United States may be called upon to defend the Free World's interests anywhere on the globe, our ships are necessary to insure continuous supply of the military materiel that helps to prevent or defeat aggression by any country."

So says our President.

Now, it would certainly be remiss if we let World Trade Week and Maritime Day go by without saying a word about the wonderful Congressional team that the State of Washington has sent to the Congress.