

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 16

AUGUST 1, 1967, TO AUGUST 9, 1967

(PAGES 20751 TO 22132)

14

Thus, Hawaii considers itself privileged to welcome this distinguished group to our State, for both the American Bar Association and Hawaii are aware of the extraordinary changes taking place. And because this is the first ABA annual event "involving large-scale participation by lawyers of Australasian countries," it is appropriate that we should be given the opportunity to meet; we are both helping to fulfill the destiny that belongs not only to Americans in the Great Society but to all men in a peaceful world. For complete rapport, we hope you will take the opportunity to talk with our people as well as your colleagues here in Hawaii. Since the State's Administration is an example of the use of talent, intelligence and perspective of Hawaii's many cultures, I invite you to call on them.

Members of my Administration look forward to meeting you and answering any questions you may have because they are aware that such communication enables us to serve as the bridge between East and West.

For the time you are here, we hope the legendary Hawaiian gods, Kane, Ku and Lono, the lords of sunlight, sound and substance, be with you during your visit. We hope, also, that you experience the greatest tribute we can offer—the spirit of aloha. Mahalo.

#### LINCOLN ASSASSINATION TESTIMONY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I had the rare honor and privilege, in behalf of the Union League of Philadelphia, to present to Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, a copy of the historic Tanner manuscript. The manuscript is an eyewitness account of the assassination of President Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of this document be printed in the RECORD.

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

Shortly before midnight on April 14, 1865, a peg-legged Union veteran, Corporal James Tanner, was called upon to take down the testimony of those who witnessed the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. Stolid Secretary of War, Edwin Stanton, conducted the inquiry. Tanner faithfully recorded the statements of Henry Hawk, Phillips, Crawford, and other witnesses in rapid shorthand. In the wee hours of the following morning, the first record implicating John Wilkes Booth as the assassin was completed. Shortly after, at 7:20 a.m., Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican president of the United States, died.

Tanner transcribed a special copy of his notes for Secretary Stanton and delivered them to his home. They were not used during the trial of the conspirators, nor does any evidence exist to show that Stanton's copy of the testimony has survived.

However, Tanner thoughtfully retained the original shorthand notes and the first transcription. In 1917 he presented them to The Union League of Philadelphia, that patriotic institution that did so much to uphold the Union during the Civil War.

When it recently became known that this historical testimony could not be found in government archives, The Union League, true to its patriotic traditions, undertook to reproduce this rare document in facsimile. This commendable step will fill an important lacuna in American History.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD some correspondence I have had within the past few days concerning the alleged use of the Export-Import Bank for "third-country" purchases of arms of U.S. origin.

This issue arose in Banking and Currency Committee consideration of the Export-Import Bank Amendments Act of 1967. The controversy followed the act onto the floor of the Senate, and I prepared a set of questions which I sent to Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for his response.

As the response from Mr. Linder indicates, my questions were referred directly to the Department of Defense. The third document is a reply from Henry J. Kuss, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, responding to the questions I asked Mr. Linder. A classified attachment, which is referred to in Mr. Kuss' response, has been detached.

Mr. President, the response that I received to this series of questions clearly states that it is the policy of the Department of Defense to avoid the use of country X loans to purchase arms of U.S. origin from a third country. The letter details efforts to curb such purchases, while pointing out that any bank credits are likely to ease a cash or budgetary situation for a nation.

This response makes it clear that the Department of Defense has a policy of not encouraging such purchases. There the matter rests as far as I am concerned. The Department is on record as opposed to such use of credits, and I presume that we have its assurance that such purchases will continue to be discouraged. I believe that these documents establish a record to which the Congress may refer in future consideration of policy concerning the Export-Import Bank.

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

SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE,  
443 Old Senate Office Bldg.,  
August 8, 1967.

The Honorable ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Washington, D.C.

President and Chairman Harold F. Linder of the Export-Import Bank has suggested that I refer the following questions to you. I would appreciate very much your responding to me before the extension of the Export-Import Bank proposal comes before the Senate.

Does the phrase, "Of U.S. manufacture or origin" mean that country X loans were used by some recipients to purchase arms of U.S. origin from a third country?

Specifically, did Israel use any of the \$88 million it received in country X loans to purchase surplus American manufactured arms from Germany?

Did Venezuela use any of the \$29 million it received in country X loans to pay for F-86 saber jets it bought from Germany last year?

Did Iran use any of the \$210 million in country X loans to pay for any of the 90 F-86 saber jets which Iran bought from West Germany last year and subsequently shipped to Pakistan?

If Israel, Venezuela, or Iran did not use country X loans to purchase arms of American origin from a third country, what specifically were these country X loans used to purchase?

Also, did the provision of country X loans at any time make it possible for any of the recipients to use their own foreign exchange to purchase arms from countries other than the United States? Is this true in the cases of Venezuela, Israel, or Iran?

Were any of the arms credits provided to countries directly from the Defense Department's revolving credit fund used to purchase arms of American origin from third countries or for the purchase of arms manufactured by third countries? For example, Venezuela received \$19 million in direct arms credits from the revolving fund and Israel \$54 million?

Also, did the combination of credits from the Export-Import Bank in country X loans and the credits extended from the revolving fund itself make it possible for any of the recipients to use their own foreign exchange to purchase arms of American origin from third countries or arms manufactured by these third countries?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.  
WALTER F. MONDALE,  
Senator.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,

Washington, D.C., August 7, 1967.

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

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I regret very much that I am unable to reply in detail to your telegram which I received a few moments ago. However, I am in position to state that in connection with each loan made by the Bank and guaranteed by the Department of Defense, the Bank received a certification from the Defense Department that the equipment financed by us was of "U. S. manufacture or origin" and that the funds made available by the Bank would be used to pay "U. S. suppliers, including the Military Departments." In the light of these certifications I do not believe any of our funds could have been used for procurement of U. S. equipment from third countries.

As to the detailed questions which you have raised, the Department of Defense is the agency which I believe is best able to reply and therefore I have taken the liberty of referring your telegram to them.

Sincerely yours,  
HAROLD F. LINDER.

#### OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D.C., August 8, 1967.

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

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In the interest of saving time, I am responding directly to you and sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Linder. I refer to your telegram of 7 August to Mr. Linder and his partial reply of the same date.

With respect to your question on the phrase "of U.S. manufacture or origin," please be assured that the DOD has made no disbursements to third countries or third country suppliers utilizing the DOD revolving account, either directly or through the ExImBank or private banks. All Venezuelan, Iranian, and Israeli equipment which you questioned was from U.S. sources. The Israeli tank program referenced included only those tanks that came from the U.S. and the modification kits that were produced in the U.S. for use by the Israelis to modify tanks which they had received from the U.S. and other countries.

As to the specific equipment purchased by Israel, Venezuela, and Iran, since such details are classified, I am attaching that portion of the reply.

On your question of the Revolving Fund, please be assured that none of these funds established under Section 508 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 are "loaned" to pur-

chasing countries. In all cases, the Department of Defense sells from its own stocks or else purchases, or arranges for the purchase of, U.S. defense articles from U.S. defense suppliers. In all cases, DOD makes payment (whether ExImBank or Revolving Funds are involved) directly to U.S. suppliers. In fact, the legal authority of the DOD authorizes it to make credit sales, not to loan money. Therefore, under this system DOD retains excellent control of fund disbursements since all funds are expended directly to U.S. suppliers.

Finally, with respect to the general question of whether or not the combination of credits provided by DOD, ExImBank, or private banks facilitates the purchasing of arms from third countries through the use of the country's own foreign exchange, I can assure you of the following:

1. Each case of U.S. credit is based on the recommendations of our Ambassador and the economic and military officials in the country. At no time have any of the sales been made on credit by the U.S. for the purpose of allowing the country to use its cash to purchase from a third country.

2. In fact, there are numerous instances where our credit sales cases were extended under general agreements, e.g., Iran and India, for the country to curb its foreign exchange expenditures in third countries. Further, in certain Latin American countries we have indicated that we would take restrictive actions on credit and grant aid if such arms purchases occurred.

3. Undoubtedly, any bank credits to a country, whether from commercial banks, the World Bank, Development Loan funds, Eximbank, or the Military Assistance fund, ease the cash or budgetary situation for certain country requirements. We attempt to examine all of the country's financial resources and obtain the best possible payments situation as part of the negotiations. For example, in the case of Iran, specific conferences are held to estimate the oil revenues and the Iranians' ability to pay, and payment arrangements are developed as a result of these economic forecasts.

In conclusion, you can be assured that the best possible job is being done to avoid the problem you posed.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY J. KUSS, Jr.,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

#### TRIBUTE TO SANFORD L. PLATT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is with deep sorrow and a sense of personal loss that I report the passing of a well-known resident of Hawaii and Washington, D.C. Sanford L. Platt, vice president and Washington representative of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, died in his sleep in Colorado Springs, Colo., early today, apparently of a heart attack.

"Sandy" Platt had since 1959 represented the Hawaiian sugar industry in legislative, governmental and other activities in the Nation's Capital. He was widely known throughout the domestic U.S. sugar industry and in congressional and other Washington circles.

Born in Groveton, Tex., on July 31, 1912, "Sandy" was graduated from the University of Oregon. He joined the HSPA as assistant secretary in 1949. From 1954 until he moved to Washington 5 years later, he was secretary of the HSPA and was in charge of the Hawaii office in Honolulu.

In addition to representing the Hawaiian sugar industry, he served on numerous sugar industry boards and committees.

At the time of his death, he was in Colorado Springs to attend a meeting of the Sugar Association, Inc., an international organization of sugar companies and producers, of which he was vice president and member of the executive committee.

"Sandy" possessed a vast amount of knowledge and expertise of the sugar industry, which he served with great diligence, loyalty, and ability. He gained stature and influence among his colleagues and represented the Hawaiian sugar industry in Washington skillfully and capably. His passing will be a great loss to the sugar industry and the State of Hawaii.

I will miss "Sandy" as a personal friend whose cheerful disposition and ready smile were among his many fine traits. Mrs. Fong and I extend our heartfelt sympathy and sorrowful aloha to "Sandy's" survivors—his mother, Mrs. Serena Platt, of Honolulu; two sisters, Mrs. Lois Anderson, Portland, Oreg., and Mrs. John Pietsch, Honolulu; and three brothers, Elden Platt, Lafayette, Calif., David Platt, San Francisco, and Gene Platt, Honolulu.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1155) to shorten the name of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is under control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Ellender amendment No. 245. I speak out of the experience and knowledge I have gained in some years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. My colleagues in the Senate know that I have been willing to

give greater support to economic aid to Latin America which goes to specific projects. That is why I refer to myself as a project-to-project man where the dominant characteristic of our aid will be repayable loans for economic projects which will benefit the people who live within the economic environment of those projects, to the end of raising their standards of living.

In my judgment, the great need in Latin America is for those countries to do for their people what needs to be done—which they are not doing—where millions of people there earn a per capita income of less than \$300 a year.

And what have we been supporting?

In too much of the foreign policy of the United States toward Latin America, we have been supporting military aid to build up and maintain military oligarchies in country after country, oligarchies which have demonstrated for years that they are little interested in freedom, in building up the economic productive power of their countries for the benefit of the mass of their people. They are far more interested in perpetuating what has become, in my judgment, an overall shadow of military control in too many Latin American countries.

I am supporting the Ellender amendment today because I think it is an amendment, when implemented, which will redound to the economic benefit of the people of Latin America.

The entry of the Export-Import Bank into arms sales to underdeveloped countries has been perhaps the most cynical exploitation of foreign assistance yet embarked upon by the American Government.

Our eagerness to make arms available to countries that have no use for them other than prestige purposes, and having no economic base with which to support an army, much less a war, is apparently matched only by the eagerness of the military establishments of these countries to feed their prestige out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

Look at the record in Latin America. The figures which appeared in the New York Times on July 31 show that Brazil has received \$43 million in credit from the Eximbank in fiscal 1966 and 1967 for arms purchases. The story also reports that on top of that loan, Brazil has received another \$10 million worth of arms credit directly from the Defense Department. That is a total of \$53 million.

That is a good deal for any country to obligate itself for to buy military equipment. There is nothing productive about arms. They are not wealth creating; their cost is not self-liquidating. These loans cannot be amortized out of earnings because there are no earnings.

In fiscal year 1966, Brazil received from this country in direct bilateral economic aid \$383.6 million. That includes food for peace, but excludes assistance we provided Brazil through the Inter-American Bank and other multilateral agencies.

The economic aid bill for Brazil is something less than that this year. We are not allowed to use the figures in public, though there is no good reason why the American people should not know