

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 15

JULY 15, 1969, TO JULY 25, 1969

(PAGES 19497 TO 20846)

cause the elections will be under the watchful eyes of foreign observers."

In his recent peace proposals, Thieu suggested that an international body be set up to oversee elections in South Vietnam. The next regularly scheduled elections for a President are to be held in 1971. There have, however, been suggestions that the voting could be moved up if the Communists agreed to take part and abide by the results.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, that statement on the part of President Thieu leads us to some other reflections on the political situation in Vietnam.

The Nixon administration's commendable changes in American policy are at last being manifested in Vietnam. President Thieu's proposal for Communist participation in free elections in South Vietnam indicates that the voice of America has at last been heard in Saigon. Now we may hope that the voice of the Vietnamese people may also some day be heard in that embattled city.

Today, however, Thieu seems to grant more rights to the Communists than he does to his non-Communist opposition. While he invites the Vietcong to join an electoral commission and to take part in a free vote, the best he has to offer his anti-Communist opponents is free food and lodging—in his country's congested jails.

Thieu's democratic pretensions will be more convincing when he allows Vietnamese not in the ruling military clique to take part in their country's politics—even if they do not choose to join the Vietcong.

At present, a convention of anti-Communist South Vietnamese leaders to select democratic opposition to the military regime could only take place in prison. There are uncounted tens of thousands of non-Communist prisoners convicted for advocating too soon such negotiations as have now at last been undertaken or for otherwise offering encouragement to the enemy. Among them are: Truong Dinh Dzu who received over 900,000 votes and came in second in the 1967 elections; Thich Thien Minh, leader of the Buddhist youth movement and regarded as one of the two most important Buddhists in this dominantly Buddhist country; and Nguyen Lau, publisher of the Saigon Daily News, the most influential English language newspaper.

Last week my office was in touch with Dzu's son, David Troung, who is in New York, and who fears, on the basis of what he believes to be authoritative reports from inside the Saigon Government, that his father's life is in danger. The usual method, he says, is to transfer a prisoner to a hospital, contrive a grenade attack and attribute it to the Vietcong. This previously happened to Thich Thien Minh, the Buddhist.

Fearing incarceration, other leaders have fled the country. Trung Thanh, often envisaged as a possible leader of a reconciliation government, is in France. Duong Van Minh, known as Big Minh, leader of the coup against Diem in 1963 and excluded from the 1967 elections because of his popularity, has just returned to Saigon from exile in Bangkok. He is currently being subjected to surveillance so intense it amounts to house arrest.

Such men are as opposed as ever to Vietcong control of their country. According to the recent report of the U.S. study team on political and religious freedom in Vietnam, the overwhelming majority of prisoners represent, in fact, the middle ground of Vietnamese political opinion on which a non-Communist political alternative to the current regime must be based.

An alternative is clearly needed. As General Ky's recent comments indicated, the military regime cannot be maintained without a continued American military presence. In fact, since the total number of South Vietnamese among our Communist adversaries in the country is continuing to increase, continuation of the Thieu-Ky regime enlarges the likelihood that it will be succeeded by Communist rule.

At present, American policy seems devoted to the proposition that although we must withdraw our forces from Vietnam, we cannot withdraw our support from the present government. This policy both makes our withdrawal more difficult and Communist victory more likely.

The self-defeating implications of this approach are symbolized by Thieu's apparent offer of free elections to his Communist but not to his anti-Communist opponents. The United States should not tolerate it. We can no longer permit ourselves to be exploited, at incalculable cost of blood and treasure, by a regime that is systematically destroying both its own minimal public support and the available non-Communist alternatives to its leadership. We must as a matter of most urgent priority encourage the kind of democratic political processes indispensable to the creation of a government in South Vietnam with a sufficient popular base to survive without continued engagement of American military force.

The first step in opening new possibilities in Vietnam is to open the jails. Dzu and the others must be released. Political popularity must no longer be treated as a crime. The second step is truly to open the elections. The Thieu-Ky government is becoming as great a threat to democratic self-determination in that country as the Vietcong.

President Thieu's statements show a change chiefly in American, not South Vietnamese policy. The Nixon administration is to be commended for beginning the necessary process of American withdrawal. But our policy cannot succeed unless it is accompanied by a change of heart—and change of course—in Saigon.

THE CHALLENGE OF URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, good government has always been a matter of adapting institutions to changing social conditions. In an era of rapid social evolution, an urban crisis has developed, and the demands it places on our political system are increasing.

The measure of that system will be determined, to a great extent, by the character of its response to those demands. We are at a decision point in

history: what we do now to meet the challenge of urban problems will shape the Nation's future. Our decisions must be well considered, but they must not be delayed. "Too little, too late" would be a fitting epitaph for a political system which decided not to decide, and thereby made the worst decision of all.

On June 19, 1969, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey addressed the Minnesota League of Municipalities, and presented a forthright plan for the solution of our pressing urban problems. In calling attention to the crisis confronting American cities, Vice President Humphrey expressed confidence that with decisive leadership from government, most urban problems could be solved.

Because of the timeliness of his remarks, and because of the importance of his proposals, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES, JUNE 19, 1969

Today we are part of a massive, concentrated society. Seventy percent of the U.S. population lives in metropolitan areas. Indeed, one out of five people lives within the limits of cities with a population of over one million.

We hope to land a man on the moon within a month. We are deciphering the innermost secrets of the human cell. We have created enormous energy from minute nuclear reactors. The science of communication—telephone, radio and television and radar and computers—has made commonplace occurrences which my father—and your father—would have regarded as supernatural.

We have an industrial economy which this year will record a gross national product of one trillion dollars. Only eight years ago we somehow existed with a GNP of only 500 billion dollars.

Can we keep pace with these changes? Can we preserve the dignity of the individual?

Can our educational institutions transmit an ever-increasing body of knowledge?

Can our religious institutions become a force for justice in a changed world which complicates spiritual and moral concepts?

Can our labor and business institutions change so that management techniques and technology are the benevolent servants of man, rather than their malevolent masters?

Can our financial institutions find new ways of allocating credit other than by increasing interest rates?

Can our law enforcement institutions, now costly and slow-moving, change so that swift justice is available to all?

These are the questions which concern an ever-broadening cross-section of the American people—and these are the questions which concern persons—like yourselves—who are charged with making our municipalities true communities of people, living rewarding and satisfying lives.

Change is inevitable. Change creates crisis only when our response is inflexible and rigid. Today I want to propose two specific programs which I believe will provide a much needed flexibility and adaptability to our basic economic, political, and social institutions—those established structures which in large measure must decide the kind of local communities we are able to build in the final third of the 20th century.

My first proposal is for each state government to create and establish a new department or office for Community Development. The title and the purpose of the department should reflect the development of urban

centers. Therefore, it could be called a Department of Urban Development or preferably a Department of Community Development. This new department in state government should be the equivalent at the state level, to the Department of Housing and Urban Development at the national level. The Department of Community Development should be authorized to coordinate and activate all housing and urban development programs, particularly those from the federal level which require state participation. This new department should have its own Community Development program and budget designed to assist and stimulate local activity. It must engage in broad research pertaining to urban needs such as community planning, economic development, the proper use of land and such areas as zoning, building codes and all social services. Urban research must not be the special prerogative of the federal government. We desperately need the input—the ideas, the long-range proposals—of local and state government. This new department should be strengthened by the creation of a broadly representative advisory committee on urban and community development. This advisory committee to include representatives of local government, business, labor, the academic community, social services, financial institutions and other community leaders. Active participation by state government in urban development is essential if there is to be any hope for our cities. State governments must recognize that we are essentially an urban, industrialized nation with a highly mobile population.

But emphasis on development of urban America and new cities does not mean less attention to rural America. It means above all making rural America a more inviting place to live—making rural America modern, forward looking and attractive to its children. After all, when we talk of cities, we talk of people and new cities will have to find their location in rural America.

The second proposal outlines a new approach to amassing the credit cities need to supply basic community facilities for the coming years.

Even if our population remains stable—and it certainly will not—the amount of capital needed to clean our air and water—to build schools and hospitals—to improve law enforcement and justice is truly staggering. But this country is *not* standing still—we will have to provide for an additional 27 million people in the next 6 years.

A conservative estimate of the cost of replacing obsolete facilities, reducing backlogs, and meeting needs of an expanding population by 1975 is \$625 billion.

Between now and the turn of the century, the Institute of Public Administration estimates that \$6 trillion will have to be raised just for housing and community facilities.

In the past, current tax revenues supplied about ½ the cost of community facilities. For the other half, states and cities issued bonds—a well-established method of obtaining credit and one which should be preserved.

But we must also realize that this magnitude of borrowing will likely force interest rates beyond the point which many municipalities can pay. In addition, procedures for issuing bonds are cumbersome, expensive, and time consuming.

Many municipalities will find it difficult—if not impossible—to raise the needed money. Moreover, a bond resolution creates rigid patterns of obligations which can be changed only at great cost to the municipality.

In order to lessen these burdens, I have proposed that the U.S. Congress establish a National Metropolitan Development Bank, and I have been developing legislation which I hope Senator Mondale will introduce.

The Metro Bank—as I call it—would provide an alternative source of low-interest credit for communities. It would raise money

in investment markets throughout the nation from all groups of investors. Of greater significance to local governments, it would relieve the pressure on bond markets so that communities could pay less for money whether they borrow from the Metro Bank or whether they issue municipal bonds.

The Metro Bank would sell federally guaranteed bonds and debentures on the national investment market, and then lend to local governments at rates of interest 30–50% below the rates of the federally guaranteed bonds. The range of interest rates insures that local governments would not pay more to borrow from the Bank than they would to issue tax exempt bonds.

The Federal government would make up the difference by an annual appropriation. Because the federal bonds are taxable, however, this would not constitute a net cost to the government.

The Bank would be authorized to make long term—40 to 60 years—low interest loans for building basic community facilities. It would also make “soft” loans for up to 20 years to promote economic development in those areas where an increase in investment would be in the national interest. Such a determination would be made by the Council of Economic Advisors, with the advice of counsel of the various Federal departments with responsibilities for urban and economic development.

The Metro Bank would be chartered by act of Congress, but it would not be a Federal agency. It would work closely with the Federal government and appropriate Federal departments and agencies would be represented on the Board of Directors.

I propose the Bank be capitalized at \$6 billion—½ to be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury over a 10 year period, and the other \$3 billion by the sale of commercial stock. Each user would be required to purchase a portion of this stock based on the number of persons within its jurisdiction.

The Metro Bank would not only provide a wholly new alternative source of money for local governments, but it would also enable the Federal government to utilize flexible approaches in aiding the construction of essential community facilities.

The third proposal I want to discuss today involves a broader view of the future of our cities—how and where our people will live, work, learn, and play—30 years from today.

I believe we must find a way to build brand new cities. Whether they are located on the fringes of today's suburbs, on the sites of existing small towns, or on wide open spaces, we need no less than 100 new cities flourishing by the year 2000. Population increases alone could make necessary 20 new cities of one million population.

New cities provide an alternative to both excessive concentrations—up to 140,000 persons per square mile in New York's Harlem—and excessive sparseness found in area of suburban and rural sprawl.

In new cities we have the opportunity to avoid the mistakes of unplanned cities—to eliminate parking on the street, on-street loading and highway clutter. We can begin with new communications, using tunnel economics for the delivery of essential services, utilities and goods, and we can plan open spaces and pedestrian pathways.

Can our social and political institutions meet the new challenge?

We already possess the technical knowledge for building such cities. We have the management tools and skills—computers, cost-benefit analysis.

We have an understanding of the economic forces which must serve as a basis for a new city. The most vital task in building a new city is the creation of an industrial and employment base.

We know some of the social problems we want to avoid, and to a certain extent, we know how to avoid them.

What we lack is a public policy—a framework in which all our knowledge can be put to use. City planners, architects, sociologists, financiers, public officials and bureaucrats have produced considerable insight and knowledge about what to do—now we must generate the popular support and the governmental structures to carry out these plans.

I propose that a joint committee be created in the United States Congress charged with the responsibility of

defining the fundamental social, economic, demographic, and ecological objectives to help guide the growth of new cities;

deciding how many new cities we need and where they can be located;

designing the public development corporations that would be necessary to establish and manage the new cities until local governments are elected.

A word about the corporations themselves. First, it is absolutely essential that they be formed jointly by states and the Federal government. It is the state, and only the state, which can delegate the legal power of local self government. On the other hand, the national interest in the success of the city is so great that the corporations must reflect national developmental goals.

Second, the corporation must have available the planning skills and management skills necessary for such a complex undertaking. And the corporation should have the power of eminent domain to procure adequate land area.

But the work of our political institutions is not fulfilled solely by the activities of the Joint Congressional Committee. As I stressed earlier, the task of creating an economically viable city is essential. While much of this task can be accomplished by imaginative recruiting and promotion, or by inexpensive or free land, other incentives will be required. The Federal and the state governments can help provide these incentives.

This issue is not whether the Federal government should try to influence local development; the issue is whether the influence which the Federal government already exercises will be haphazard or directed by fundamental national goals for urban development.

The government is a major buyer. Its defense procurement practices have literally created Los Angeles.

The Congress must define national goals of development and then it must assure that practices of the Federal government contribute to those goals.

The placement of government facilities has a profound effect on local community life. The government is a major employer. The location of a defense installation, a new university, even a government office complex can mean new economic life for a community. Federal financial incentives such as tax, loan, or direct payment arrangements can foster growth in new cities. Placement of Federal procurement contracts and construction projects can provide jobs.

Federal policies such as resettlement allowances, on-the-job training allowances, and job placement, can neutralize the factors producing excessive population concentration.

These will be cities to protect and foster man's natural inclination toward community. The physical design of these cities can relieve the pressures of urban living pressures which too frequently result in the breakdown of the family. Families in our new cities can prosper, can develop a viable, modern form of this most natural and basic unit of human organization.

These cities can also relieve the pressures confounding our old cities. They can provide a moment of relief, a pause in their constant struggle against the intertwined problems of urban life.

In order to do the things which I have

been talking with you about, we need a willing electorate—a clear political decision by the American people to get the job done.

We also need creative and decisive leadership from mayors, governors, and particularly from the President of the United States.

Because the task is so complicated, because the problems are so vast, our people must be inspired to act. Only qualities of real greatness can inspire our people to greatness.

SPACE AND EARTH PRIORITIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the very fact of the moon landing is so remarkable that there is little one can say which will embellish it. It was truly an achievement for all mankind, and a striking symbol of our common destiny.

Our responsibility now, it seems to me, is to try to determine how man can take hold of that destiny—how he can “spin off” from this great scientific success solutions for some of the world’s political, social, and economic problems.

Of course, the moon walk must not be the end of our space odyssey. We must continue a steady program of development with the idea that someday we will go on to other planets in our own universe—even to other galaxies of stars. But it is premature now, I believe, to talk of going on to Mars as though that were to be the objective of another feverish 10-year plan.

We must set some national priorities, and our first priority must be to use the great technological breakthroughs which took us to the moon to improve our lives here on earth.

Our commitment should be first to America.

How can a society which can perform such miracles as putting men on the moon condone the highest crime rate in the world?

How can we justify having so many poor—so many who do not have enough to eat and who live in houses that are little more than shelter?

How can we tolerate our polluted water and air; our expanding concrete jungle; our unequal opportunity for an education, our untrained, and our jobless?

How can we explain that we do little to control our galloping population which will soon expand our pollution and education and training problems into monsters which even our most advanced technology will not let us conquer?

Mr. President, we must turn more of our national effort to our problems on the globe’s surface, and I am hopeful that the mind-opening events of the last few days, and the technology which made them possible, will allow us to attack our age-old sore spots here on earth with greater skill and plausibility.

PLANETARY EXPLORATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I have probably a little more interest than other Members of the Senate in what lies ahead for NASA now that the moon venture is practically completed and successful. Under the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council of the Space Sciences Board has sub-

mitted a report entitled “Planetary Exploration.” I do not want to burden Senators with the complete text of the report, which is extremely interesting, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the principal recommendations of this learned group.

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

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF “PLANETARY EXPLORATION”

1. We recommend that the planetary exploration program be presented, not in terms of a single goal, but rather in terms of the contribution that exploration can make to a broad range of scientific disciplines (page 3).

2. We recommend that a substantially increased fraction of the total NASA budget be devoted to unmanned planetary exploration (page 3).

3. (a) We recommend that duplicate missions for a particular opportunity be undertaken only when a clear gain in scientific information will result from such double launches (page 4).

(b) We recommend that NASA initiate now a program of Pioneer/IMP-class spinning spacecraft to orbit Venus and Mars at every opportunity and for exploratory missions to other targets (page 5).

(c) We recommend the following larger missions to Mars: A Mariner orbiter mission in 1971, and a Mariner-type orbiter and lander mission, based on a Titan-Centaur, in 1973 (page 5).

(d) We accord next priorities (in descending order) to a Mariner-class Venus-Mercury fly-by in 1973 or 1975, a multiple drop-sonde mission to Venus in 1975, and a major lander on Mars, perhaps in 1975 (page 6).

4. (a, b) Rather than attempt to define in detail payloads to be carried aboard high priority missions, we have selected several sample payloads (page 6).

(c) We recommend that with regard to Mars and Venus, NASA continually reassess, in the light of current knowledge of the planets, its program, methods, and mathematical model for meeting the internationally agreed objectives on planetary quarantine (page 11).

5. (a) We recommend strongly that NASA support radar astronomy as an integral part of its planetary program. In particular, we recommend that NASA fund the development and operation of a major new radar observatory to be used primarily for planetary investigation (page 12).

(b) We recommend that NASA planetary program planning be closely coordinated with Earth-orbital telescopes being designed for the 1970’s and with the infrared aircraft telescopes now under construction (page 13).

(c) We recommend that the NASA program of ground-based optical planetary astronomy continue to receive strong support and that opportunities for planetary astronomical investigations be increased by:

(1) Construction of an intermediate sized optical telescope in the Southern Hemisphere.

(2) Construction of an infrared telescope employing a very large collecting area and permitting interferometric measurements at a dry site.

(3) Development of new infrared devices, including improved detectors and high resolution interferometers (page 14).

(d) We recommend that steps be taken to facilitate the analysis by qualified investigators of the data secured by the photographic planetary patrol (page 14).

6. (a) We recommend that NASA openly solicit participation in all future planetary missions by the issuance of flight opportunity announcements with adequate time for response from the scientific community (page 15).

(b) We recommend that NASA develop a summer institute program expressly designed to introduce interested scientists and engineers to the science, technology, and administration of the planetary program (page 15).

7. We recommend that those resources currently intended for support of manned planetary programs be reallocated to programs for instrumented investigation of the planets (page 16).

8. We recommend a coordinated effort involving representatives of NASA, the Department of State, and the National Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of contacting knowledgeable Soviet scientists in an informal way with regard to the possibility of joint planning of planetary exploration (page 16).

THE EL SALVADOR-HONDURAS WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Honorable Murat W. Williams, who was U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador from 1961 to 1964, and who is now retired, has been kind enough to send me a copy of a letter he has written to the editor of the New York Times concerning the war between El Salvador and Honduras. I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Williams’ letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Ambassador Williams has some cogent comments to make concerning the role of the U.S. military missions in both of these countries, and he recounts his unsuccessful attempts as an ambassador to reduce the size of the mission in El Salvador where, as he points out, there were more men in the U.S. air mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.

It is hard to see how the United States can totally avoid some of the responsibility for the present war. There seems to be little doubt that the activities of the military missions and the military assistance program have contributed to the growth and influence of the national military establishments in both Honduras and El Salvador.

The war between these two little countries has been partly overshadowed by the flight of Apollo 11, and its comic opera aspects tend to obscure the tragedy which it represents for the countries involved and potentially for all of Central America.

It is long past time for the withdrawal of U.S. military missions from Latin America and for a halt in military assistance. I hope that Congress will take steps to bring this about when it acts on the pending foreign aid bill.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 16, 1969.

To the EDITOR,
The New York Times.

DEAR SIR: It is easy to imagine U.S. Military Missions as “seconds” to the fighters in that bloody and useless contest in the Salvadoran-Honduran forests.

The Missions should not be in either country. With transient encouragement from Dean Rusk, I urged our Government in 1963 and 1964 to fade out our ridiculously large Missions in El Salvador. (We had more men in our Air Mission than there were fliers in the Salvadoran Air Force.) The Secretary was getting too busy with other problems and he left my plea to deputies. One of these said: