

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 9

MAY 5, 1969, TO MAY 14, 1969

(PAGES 11209 TO 12644)

"The United States will assist in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the burned villages, destroyed buildings and defoliated fields, and give suitable fiscal assistance to economic development. But our military efforts will cease. We will make every effort to assist the people of both North and South Vietnam to establish whatever form of government they can develop."

"Here lies a solution which both Americans and Vietnamese, I am confident, will welcome." End of President Johnson's broadcast.

I would not expect President Nixon to use that text—circumstances are somewhat different now—but the essential idea is there, namely that we should stop the killing and get out.

I am confident that such an approach would meet with widespread approval. It would lift a great fear from the hearts of millions of American parents.

But if the President persists in the obviously unproductive course that seems to be scheduled, I urge—this is my second proposal—that we turn to the Congress which shares the responsibility for our tragic and needless involvement in Southeast Asia.

It could—and indeed should—rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the rescinding of which is provided for in the resolution, but failing that, Congress should unflinchingly vote against the military authorizations and appropriations. This would have been, during the last five years, the effective method of calling a halt to our folly and ending the war. It was a matter of regret to me, as I know it was to Senator Morse, that our fellow doves with only an occasional exception would limit their opposition to the war to speeches denouncing it. President Johnson himself twitted the Congress on this issue saying that if it voted for the appropriations, he did not care what anti-war speeches they made.

But the Congress can no longer evade its responsibility. It shares equally in the guilt for the bloodshed in Southeast Asia. A promising start was made a few weeks ago when 25 House members voted against a military authorization bill. That was unprecedented and vastly encouraging. All that is needed now is to increase their numbers so that a majority of each House makes use of its Constitutional prerogative to invoke the power over the purse which Wayne Morse repeatedly urged his colleagues to do. Let no one be misled into thinking that such action could be not backing our boys at the front. There are plenty of funds in the pipeline. The copters, guns, ammunition and other paraphernalia of warfare do not reach the front for a year or more after Congressional action. Congress would on the contrary be backing the boys. We would start bringing them back home.

Having taken the steps that will end the war, The Congress should call a halt to the ABM folly. Opposition to it is growing on the Hill. A year and a half ago in October 1967, when the Sentinel Antiballistic Missile System was first brought before the Congress for its approval, only six of us in the Senate voted against it. They were Clark of Pennsylvania, Fulbright of Arkansas, Hart of Michigan, Young of Ohio, and old reliable Morse and Gruening. I am glad that so many are now joining this half-dozen.

Next the Congress should take over the examination of our commitments to Dictator Francesco Franco. To date they have been handled very secretly by the Executive Branch. It is doubtful whether those Spanish bases were ever necessary and whether the hundreds of millions of dollars spent there were not misspent. But now with missile weaponry it would seem clear that the bases are obsolete. How many Americans know that the Executive agreement the Johnson Administration entered into in 1963 and now up for renewal is in fact a formal

military alliance with Spain which pledges us to go to the defense of that fascist country if called upon? This agreement should promptly be scrapped and not renewed. The Congress should examine not only into this pending commitment but all the others made by executive action, and transform those that are clearly vital to our security into treaties—negotiated after full hearings and with the respective commitments and duties of the contracting parties clearly spelled out—the "open covenants openly arrived at" to recall a phrase from the Wilsonian era. The Congress would do well also to question—and to challenge—the existing policies of getting in bed with dictators; it is slightly nauseating in the face of all the official professions of love for freedom and democracy.

It is extremely gratifying that Senator Fulbright has created a subcommittee to look into our numerous global commitments and has appointed Senator Stuart Symington to head it. The effort deserves unqualified support. It should, in addition to its valid objectives, be a first step in re-establishing the Congress as a co-equal branch of government in the management of the Nation's affairs. During the years it has abdicated its responsibilities with the disastrous results we now are becoming aware of.

Having reduced the superswollen military establishment to a reasonable department of true defense, and not offense, we can hopefully turn that offense into a war on our domestic enemies—pollution, poverty, ignorance, crime, and start the long march back to the America we long cherished and would support with fervor and good conscience.

A REPLY TO JAMES J. KILPATRICK'S ATTACK ON FARMWORKERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Washington Star of April 22, 1969, published an article written by James J. Kilpatrick giving his version of the working and living conditions of the farmworkers in and around Delano, Calif. Copies of the article entitled "Grape Boycott in Delano Perpetrates a Hoax," have heretofore been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I have been studying the working and living conditions of the farmworkers, and I am personally aware of the union leadership and the efforts to organize those who harvest our Nation's bounty of food. It is clear to me that Mr. Kilpatrick makes many unwarranted charges not based on fact.

While I do not believe that Mr. Kilpatrick's charges are worthy of a point-by-point rebuttal at this time, I do wish to share with Senators and millions of Americans my position on Mr. Kilpatrick's article, which I have expressed in a letter to the editor of the Washington Star.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the editor of the Washington Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 23, 1969.

THE EDITOR, THE STAR,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read James J. Kilpatrick's April 22, 1969 attack on the Farm Workers' Union, its leader, Cesar Chavez, and the grape boycott. The inaccuracies and half truths in the article are too numerous to count and discuss in this forum.

I believe that Mr. Kilpatrick has done a serious disservice to millions of Americans who are committed to the peaceful pursuit of equal opportunity and justice. I know Cesar Chavez, and many of his colleagues and supporters, personally. Chavez is one of the most prominent American apostles of non-violence as a method in obtaining social justice. His supporters can more accurately be described as committed, concerned, socially conscious Americans, not gullible nuns, little children composing insulting letters, Hippies, Yippies, priests, professors, political leaders on the make, and housewives with time on their hands, as Mr. Kilpatrick calls them.

In a time of National crisis, when many turn to violent means of social action, the grape boycott, UFWOC, and Cesar Chavez stand out as a hope to all reasonable men that we can eliminate injustice in our Nation without the resort to violence. Mr. Kilpatrick's resort to innuendoes and character assassinations stands as a personal affront to Americans who are dedicated to maintaining non-violent, peaceful avenues to social change, such as those advocated by the patient, long-suffering farmworkers.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory
Labor, U.S. Senate.

THE JOB CORPS CLOSINGS—HOW DO CORPSMEN FEEL?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent announcement by the administration that it would close many Job Corps sites around the Nation has been met with mixed reaction across the country. I personally consider it to be an unfortunate miscalculation, both in terms of our Nation's commitment to the underprivileged and in human terms.

On April 20, an article entitled "How Do Job Corpsmen Feel?—We Just Can't Believe It," was published in the Lewiston, Idaho, Morning Tribune. Contained in the article are the opinions of Job Corpsmen themselves. Almost without exception, they are dismayed.

In this article they speak for themselves. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

"HOW DO JOB CORPSMEN FEEL?—WE JUST CAN'T BELIEVE IT"

Hundreds of miles from home in a strange environment, 224 young men last week were worried about their future. To them the announcement that the Cedar Flats Job Corps Center would be closed came as a shock.

They had hoped to gain an education and a good job through the Job Corps. Now this opportunity seemed to be slipping away. The Selway River center would still be open several months. There is talk of new centers to be built in or near major cities. But there were still questions. Where would they go next? What would become of them now?

Mrs. Charles E. Fifield, wife of the counselor of Cedar Flats, interviewed several corpsmen to get their reactions.

"If the center closes there wouldn't be anything left," says Wallace Evans, president of the Corpsman Senate, the governing body for the Cedar Flats youths. "I got as far as the 11th grade and had to quit because of financial difficulties.

"I came here to finish my education and now it is gone. I guess I will go back home and try to get a job. I won't be able to finish high school. We just can't believe the center