

UNITED STATES



U.S. Congress.
OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 8

MAY 3, 1966, TO MAY 18, 1966

(PAGES 9511 TO 10980)

his presentation of the proposal assured Senate approval.

The success was characteristic. It was achieved by clear and convincing explanations of the proposal's effects, obviously broad knowledge of its various provisions, and sharp appreciation of the issues involved. But these are the capacities applied to all legislative measures handled by the distinguished Senator from Maine.

He is a Senator whose service in this body has been characterized consistently by a devotion to excellence which is unmatched. This is especially true when his great talents are devoted to the handling of legislative proposals as they come for action to the Senate floor. So today, his handling of this legislation attests amply to the high quality of the service he renders. Witnessed was a ready grasp of the complex technicalities of the measure coupled with a profound analysis of its financial consequences. Such a combination assured the success of the proposal. Such an achievement is just one more in a long line of great contributions by the Senator from Maine.

As always, we are grateful to other Members of this body whose diligence and strong efforts were responsible to a large degree for favorable Senate action on this measure today. Outstanding was the contribution of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] whose faithful presence on the floor during most of the consideration of the proposal was joined frequently with his typically brilliant support to assure success. Also, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] added his capable efforts to obtain Senate approval. So too, the efforts of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—that knowledgeable chairman of the Committee on Finance—helped to achieve success.

But cooperation also played an important role in obtaining orderly and efficient action. To those Senators who joined to oppose the measure but who nevertheless sought not to impede its disposition, we are indebted. Commendation thus goes to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the ranking minority member of the committee, whose generous cooperation is always appreciated. Similarly, the senior Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], joined by the very able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others, were characteristically sincere and strong in their opposition; characteristically too, they were fair in assuring orderly disposition.

Finally, we are once again grateful to the Senate as a whole for another achievement obtained swiftly, yet orderly, and with mutual respect for the views of all.

ADMINISTRATION FAILURES IN VIETNAM WAR

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, every thoughtful American is disturbed about the failures of the administration in reference to the Vietnam war.

American boys have been committed to fight in a far-removed place where the

odds are most difficult. It is indeed tragic that our fighting men should have to contend with any shortages whatever. This country is capable of better support for our fighting men than they are receiving. It matters not what the shortages are, nor what the particular circumstances are.

Individuals in the House and Senate, devoted to the cause of bringing about peace and staying out of war, have time and again raised serious questions concerning the policies, decisions, statements, and record of the Secretary of Defense. Reading what is said on all sides of this controversy raises a question of credibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial by Robert Hotz from the May 2, 1966, issue of the magazine, Aviation Week & Space Technology.

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

THE CREDIBILITY GAP WIDENS (By Robert Hotz)

Congressional criticism of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has risen in an unprecedented crescendo during recent weeks over a wide variety of issues including management of the Vietnam war, development of new manned bombers and the combat readiness of U.S. forces not already committed to southeast Asia. Unfortunately, Mr. McNamara's replies to these critics have been characterized by an increasing flow of invective and irrelevant statistics that carry the arguments off tangentially from the points at issue.

For a man who has always publicly prided himself on hewing to the facts wherever they may fall, Mr. McNamara made some amazing statements in his recent 3-hour testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Since Mr. McNamara has retorted "baloney" to some of his critics' allegations and "shocking distortion" to others, we feel it only fair to point out some of the significant "baloney" and distortion in Mr. McNamara's dazzling performance before Senator FULBRIGHT's committee.

Mr. McNamara, in attempting to answer charges of bomb shortages in Vietnam, told the committee:

"The reason why they [USAF] thought 750-pound bombs were surplus in 1964 was that nobody contemplated that the B-52s, designed for nuclear operations, would be carrying out 750-pound conventional bombing operations. * * * The use of B-52 bombers, not in nuclear operations but in dropping 750-pound bombs 50 at a crack, was never conceived of."

SAC BOMBING PROFICIENCY

This is simply not true. Strategic Air Command trained both its B-47 and B-52 crews on a quarterly basis from 1958 through 1961 to keep proficient in dropping iron bombs from internal bomb bays. The requirement was dropped in 1962 but resumed in 1963 at the insistence of Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, then SAC commander. In March 1964, General Power intensified SAC crew training with iron bombs and in May 1964, initiated a program to install external racks to increase the iron bomb load on some B-52s. Actual tests of this configuration began at Eglin AFB in August 1964. When escalation of the Vietnam war in 1965 produced an urgent requirement for large quantities of iron bombs to saturate targets in short periods of time, the SAC B-52 crews were already trained and equipped to do this job.

Mr. McNamara emphasized to the committee that the 1,600 U.S. military helicopters now in Vietnam are more than all U.S. forces had when he became Secretary of Defense and more than either the rest of the free world has or are in the combined Sino-Soviet inventory. This is perfectly true, but it conveniently ignores the fact that this Vietnam force level has been achieved only by stripping modern helicopters from other U.S. combat forces. It overlooks the pertinent fact that Mr. McNamara for several years drastically cut Army budget requests for helicopters on the ground that they would not be needed. He is now pouring money into a crash helicopter production program that proves more conclusively than any words that the Army's judgment on helicopter requirements was far more accurate than Mr. McNamara's.

Similarly he explained the tremendous demand for 2.75-inch rockets in Vietnam as due to the Army's discovery there for the first time that it needed armament for its helicopters. The fact is that the Army has been trying to develop armed helicopters since the early 1960's, only to be denied the dollars by the Secretary of Defense. Because of this the Army helicopters in Vietnam still carry jury-rigged armament, and the first purchase of a helicopter specifically designed and developed with armament was not authorized by Department of Defense until 1966.

KOREAN WAR SURPLUS

Another statement that will shock those who have been in the defense business a great deal longer than Mr. McNamara was his assertion to the Senate committee that "it is really immoral to spend \$12 billion of this Nation's resources for surplus as we did during the Korean war," and that he intends to buy everything needed for Vietnam but not one thing more. Again Mr. McNamara conveniently overlooks the fact that in the Korean war this country mobilized not only to combat the North Korean and Chinese armies in Korea, but also to meet the possibility of Russian intervention and a third world war. By this action, President Truman and his defense chiefs unquestionably averted the outbreak of another general war and discouraged the spread of Soviet aggression to Europe.

If Mr. McNamara really believes it is possible to fight and win a war killing the last enemy with the last bullet as the last soldier eats the last can of beans in the quartermaster's stores, this Nation faces serious trouble ahead. Events have already proved that some of Mr. McNamara's military judgments have not been as sound as he imagined. But if he persists in trying to budget the Vietnam war or any other military confrontation with the goal of emerging with no surplus materiel, he will actually be budgeting shortages in combat equipment for the future. War is an illogical and wasteful enterprise that inevitably defies the efforts of man to calculate its fury precisely.

Almost 2 years ago we warned that a credibility gap was widening between the events transpiring in Vietnam and the versions of them that Mr. McNamara was dispensing to the American people. Mr. McNamara's recent exercises in revising history and attempting to dazzle his congressional critics with irrelevant statistics are further widening this credibility gap. Unfortunately, this is the very time that the increasing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war requires the clearest public understanding of this military effort and the foreign policy on which it is based.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT— AMENDMENT NO. 537

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fine editorial from the Washington Post of May 2,

1966, entitled "Next," recommending the inclusion of Amendment No. 537 in the Traffic Safety Act legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1966]

NEXT?

In April alone, the public has learned that: Lincoln has told dealers to recall 40,000 Continentals to repair a braking defect.

Buick told dealers last December to recall certain 1964 models for a possibly troublesome brake condition.

Chrysler Corp., told dealers in November 1964, to recall certain Plymouths, Chryslers, and Dodges for a welding job on a steering bracket.

Ford told 30,000 owners of 1965 cars that their ride could be improved by a change in the rear suspension, not saying that their cars could go out of control if a suspension arm broke.

Dodge recalled 17,500 cars for a throttle change, not saying safety was at stake.

Chevrolet told dealers last July to recall 16,000 models for a faulty front door latch.

GM has just told dealers to recall 1,500,000 Chevilles and Chevrolets with Powerglide transmissions because the throttle could stick.

Pontiac recalled 80,000 1961 Tempests considered too lowslung to clear possible road obstacles.

Buick found that some 15,000 1963 Specials had fenders that could cut their tires, but made no effort to recall them for repair.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, has introduced an amendment to the administration's traffic safety bill that would require auto manufacturers to notify owners and dealers at once of new-car defects that might involve safety. Another amendment, by Senators ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, would require manufacturers to give copies of communications with dealers about defects to the Secretary of Commerce or Transportation; the Secretary would be empowered to issue public warnings. Mr. Ribicoff has also requested—and received—the manufacturers' agreement to supply a complete list of product defect warnings issued since 1960.

The administration's bill does not touch the critical matter of defect reports. The Mondale and Ribicoff-Kennedy amendments ought to be added to it.

AMBASSADOR AVRAHAM HARMAN'S
SPEECH AT GREEN GABLES
COUNTRY CLUB, DENVER, COLO.—
RESPONSIBILITY OF FREEMEN

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of hearing His Excellency Avraham Harman, Ambassador from Israel to the United States, deliver an inspiring and thought-provoking address. He was talking at the United Jewish Appeal dinner at the Green Gables Country Club in Denver, Colo. Besides giving weight to our traditional American concept of liberty he added new insight into its true meaning with his descriptions of the responsibilities all of us face as freemen. Not only was his talk down to earth, it was thoroughly refreshing in its honesty, humor, and sincerity. Mr. President, I think all of us would profit immensely from reading Ambassador Harman's remarks, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted into the RECORD.

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

REPORT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR AVRAHAM
HARMAN AT GREEN GABLES

Senator ALLOTT, Senator DOMINICK, Governor Love, Mayor Currihan, consuls, distinguished ladies and gentlemen; your allied campaign in the past two decades, has been helping to build up your own community, your own needs, all the while helping to assist Jews outside the United States.

In the past 21 years, since the end of the war, you have seen the greatest movement of Jewish people in the history of the world. During this period, 1.8 million Jews have migrated from the countries of their birth in search of freedom—freedom as human beings, freedom as Jews.

And 1.3 million of them have come to my country, which almost 18 years ago declared its independence, and fought for that independence against attack with three major purposes in mind: The first was to break open the doors, into which all Jews, denied their rights and identity as Jews, could find conditions in which they could be free.

That door has held open, and it will always be held open.

The second purpose was to create objective conditions whereby our ancient civilization and faith could recreate itself in freedom. Let me say one word in explanation of that purpose.

All of us here tonight remember what the Nazi period did to the Jewish people in terms of human sacrifice. Six million Jews, out of a total of 18 million that lived in 1939, did not emerge from the Nazi period alive.

But in an historic sense, the real loss which our people suffered at the hands of nazism was the destruction of over 30,000 organized Jewish communities in central and eastern Europe. Communities which, for many, many centuries, had been the heartland of Jewish faith, tradition, and culture.

We, who labored to create the State of Israel and those who proceeded us in the last three or four generations, foresaw that this might happen and one of our essential purposes was to create conditions in Israel which would insure the unbroken and creative continuity of our faith and our experiences as people for all time to come.

We've been trying these last 18 years to achieve that purpose. We haven't achieved it completely, but we've laid strong foundations.

The Hebrew language has been revived and is spoken today in Israel as the mother tongue of our children, and is the language of instruction in our schools and universities.

And there has been, during these last 18 years, a great upsurge in Jewish religious life and in Jewish learning. I believe that will continue.

Our third purpose, in achieving our independence, was to do what free people everywhere want to do. To use our independence in order to enlarge the horizons of liberty for each individual citizen.

Independence is not an end in itself as many of all of the newly independent countries in the world are finding out. You dream of your freedom, and you fight for it, and you always have to defend it against threats of aggression and against attack.

But when you achieve your independence, and you see your national flag go up for the first time, you discover that what you've got is not paradise, but the key to paradise.

One of the first letdowns of every independent country, a few months after it obtains its independence is that the citizens discover that their taxes go up. Of course, they go up. Because, having won self-responsibility and the capacity to chart their own course and future, they want to do things, and they discover very much to their chagrin,

that everything you won costs money and has to be paid for.

To enlarge the freedom of the individual, who is the source of origin of society, and not the subject of the state is the philosophy that we have been trying to pursue in Israel these last 18 years.

Taking the hard road of democracy, which is the most complex and difficult form of social organization man has ever devised, yet one of the most durable, because it rests on the self-discipline of human beings who respect each other and each other's rights—we found through our short experience, that this is the sure road—hard though it may be, involving compromise and different people living together.

Let me say a word or two about those people whom you helped go through the open door of Israel in the last 18 years. We've let them all come in, as the Bible describes the exodus of Jews from Egypt in ancient times—the old and young, the sick and the lame, and the blind.

Entire communities have transferred themselves to Israel, about half of them from Europe, from the remnants of nazism, and about half of them from North Africa and the Middle East, all held together by their common purpose and common aspirations.

We received in Israel in this floodtide of immigration people who would never have qualified for admission into any other country in the world. That's our pride because we felt we owed an obligation to them.

There are people with open cases of tuberculosis. There are heads of families physically incapable of earning a living for themselves. When they came into Israel, fewer than 1 percent of these 1.3 million people were farmers, but all of them needed to eat. And fewer than 2 percent of them had earned their living previously in the building trades, but all of them needed a roof over their heads. What we've had to do in Israel these past 18 years is to produce an occupational revolution among these people.

We've transplanted them to new careers, to new types of work and disciplined them into a democratic society, because most of them who had come from Europe came from countries which had seen democracy brought to the ground. And those who had come from North Africa and the Middle East came from countries where democracy had never been practiced.

This has not been an easy course, and we have not completed it. You don't complete a job like that in 18 years, but we've laid foundations. Israel today is producing 70 percent of all the food its people eat, and it is exporting surpluses of other foods, particularly citrus and other fresh fruits and vegetables.

Its economy is not yet self-sustaining, because in addition to remaking a people, we've had to try and remake an ancient and a bruised land. The whole of the Middle East is in this condition. We live in a part of the world which is not sustaining in 1966 the same size population that it sustained 2,000 years ago.

Israel is a greatly lived-in part of the world, greatly used and greatly abused. We are trying to build a new society in Israel as are our neighbors throughout the Middle East in the ashes of buried civilization. That takes time.

And it will take some time before our economy is self-sustaining, providing the standard of living which you need to maintain a democratic society. The standard to which we aspire is the standard of Western Europe. That kind of standard is needed to guarantee the perpetuity of democratic institutions.

But I think that we've found a road—in agriculture, and in the last 10 years, in industry. We've found skills among some of our new immigrants and we've put them to work. We've found some resources in our