



Uploaded to the VFC Website

▶▶▶ 2020 ◀◀◀

This Document has been provided to you courtesy of Veterans-For-Change!

Feel free to pass to any veteran who might be able to use this information!

For thousands more files like this and hundreds of links to useful information, and hundreds of "Frequently Asked Questions, please go to:

[Veterans-For-Change](#)

If Veterans don't help Veterans, who will?

Note:

VFC is not liable for source information in this document, it is merely provided as a courtesy to our members & subscribers.



Monday. Federal troops were brought in during the second night of rioting, he said.

The situation in Newark was slower in erupting into a full scale riot. The disturbance the first night was considered an incident, a Newark official said. It was contained by precinct police.

The following night started out the same way with property damage and looting but then developed into mass rioting with gunfire and sniping, he said. A call went out for state troopers and national guardsmen, he said.

Local civil rights groups, leaders in the Negro community and governmental agencies have kept a watchful eye on the uneasy peace in Milwaukee since the first of the summer riots began elsewhere. With Newark and Detroit, concern grew.

Last week, rumors began to circulate that a riot was scheduled to begin Saturday or Sunday. Several Milwaukee persons, concerned at the possibility of an outbreak here, went to Madison last week to discuss the situation with officials of the governor's commission on human rights.

"Blow off steam measures" were taken by some to encourage the restless to talk it out in small groups, and Negroes known to favor the "keep your cool" move circulated through the area trying to calm the militant, one official said.

In addition, special work programs and summer projects were going in full swing. Negro youths were at work in the county's junior public works program and in a special crash program supported by federal funds and providing, in addition to jobs, recreational and educational programs.

There was no outward indication that the riot was coming, nor any single incident that touched it off, as there has been in other cities.

Milwaukee has had picketing and racial demonstrations in the past but not the sniper action, looting and destruction that it had early Monday.

Past incidents have included:

Last summer's demonstrations and picketing carried out by members of the youth council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at the homes of public officials who are members of the Eagles club. The club has a white only membership policy.

School boycotts in 1964 and 1965 in protest to what was considered the failure of the school board to act on charges of racial imbalance in the Milwaukee public schools. Sit-in demonstrations at the courthouse in 1963 staged in protest to the appointment of a member of the social development commission.

Demonstrations and picketing this summer by the youth council of the NAACP at the homes of Milwaukee aldermen in protest to their votes against the proposed open housing regulation for Milwaukee.

Mr. PROXMIER. I also ask, Mr. President, that an unusually authoritative article written by two Milwaukee Journal reporters one of whom had covered the Newark riot and one who covered the Detroit riot be printed in the RECORD at this point. This article documents the difference in response of the three cities.

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

CITY MOVED MUCH FASTER THAN DETROIT, NEWARK

(Journal reporters Frank A. Aukofer and Kenneth C. Field covered the Detroit rioting, and Field also covered the upheaval in Newark. Here they compare the disorders in Milwaukee with those in Detroit and Newark.)

From the beginning the disorders in Milwaukee differed from those in Detroit and Newark:

There was swift police response here to mobs of Negroes—young and old—rampaging down a main street smashing windows and destroying private property.

A 24 hour curfew was imposed and enforced within hours after the violence erupted here.

Authorities in both Detroit and Newark were criticized for not taking these two steps early enough.

There were other factors here—related to rapid action on the part of public officials—that spelled the difference.

Gov. Knowles immediately called out the national guard. It was on the streets within hours after Mayor Maler's request.

HELD DOWN DISORDER

This, plus prompt police action along the main street in the inner city—N. 3rd st.—held down looting and fire bombing of stores.

With the curfew, the inner core was tightly sealed with a ring of steel. With taverns, industry and business shut down because of the curfew, people were kept off the streets. This reduced the area of disorder.

Unlike other cities, the upheaval here apparently was not touched off by a specific incident which became a rallying point for rioters.

Rioters here never were in command of the situation as they were in Detroit and Newark. A chaotic situation here never developed.

Some of the other differences lend support to the statements Monday by three civil rights leaders that they had heard reports of planning behind the riots here.

But it could be, one civil rights leader said, that Milwaukee Negroes simply were reacting to the "fad" of rioting. This would seem true because the disorders of those of other cities and, apparently, lacked the popular support of the city's 90,000 Negroes.

In other cities, incidents that touched off rioting most often involved rumors surrounding police arrests. In Detroit, it was a raid on an after hours drinking joint and the rumor that police had kicked one of the men arrested down a flight of stairs.

NOT AIMED AT WHITES

In Newark, it was the arrest of a cab driver for a minor traffic violation and the rumor that he had been beaten to death in a police station.

Another rumor in Newark was that a pregnant woman was beaten by police.

But in Milwaukee the rioting apparently erupted spontaneously.

Somewhat like Detroit, it was apparent here that the rioting was not racial in character. Whites were not directly menaced.

In many respects, too, it appeared that the disturbance here had nothing to do with civil rights.

Rumors last week of imminent rioting apparently brought groups of Negroes out on N. 3rd Sunday night. Small and large groups roamed the streets. Windows were smashed and the violence was on.

There appeared to be no specific incident that involved the police.

Yet sniper fire erupted within a few hours after the violence started.

On the first day of rioting in Detroit and Newark, looting was extensive. Mobs broke into stores and business places and stripped them. Looting was light here.

VIETNAM: THE OTHER WAR—LAND REFORM MUST BE EMPHASIZED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I address myself today to our Nation's and truly the world's most urgent problem—Vietnam.

I support the President in his stated objective of seeking a political settlement of the war through genuine negotiations. I support and commend the President in

his restraint in the use of military force in Vietnam. Under President Johnson's thoughtful leadership, we are waging a limited war in Vietnam for limited objectives. This Nation is not conducting a "holy war" against communism. This Nation neither seeks, nor wants to establish, and American military presence in Vietnam.

But I have grave reservations about our Government's policies in the so-called other war in Vietnam, the fight for social and economic improvement for all the people of South Vietnam.

In this guerrilla war, the social and economic progress we make is absolutely crucial. If we lose this side of the Vietnam struggle, we cannot win in any meaningful sense in Vietnam.

If we win the social and economic battle, military success will be swift and inevitable.

Events of the last 18 months should prove this to the most hardheaded advocate of military-victory-first. There are few if any examples in history of a country which has poured such an immense amount of military fire-power from land and air against such a relatively feeble foe, with such little evidence of progress.

The American man in the street repeatedly asks the logical question: "How in the world can the most powerful military nation in the history of mankind waste such a prodigious amount of blood and treasure against a fifth-rate little power and make such little progress?"

The answer: We have poured literally 99 percent plus into the military effort, and only a small fraction of 1 percent into the war that counts.

Of course, the military effort is essential. There must be military security. It does little good to build a schoolhouse if you cannot protect it from being burned down. The trained teacher or village administrator is of little value if she or he is murdered.

But at the same time, military conquest means nothing, if we fail to bring the economic and social and health gains that persuade the people that the Vietcong do not have the answer.

The progress in some areas has been nothing short of remarkable. Over 7,000 classrooms have been built in the last year in Vietnam. Over 18,000 school-teachers have been trained. Literally millions of textbooks have been made available to South Vietnamese schoolchildren through U.S. aid. People who had no reasonable expectation of ever seeing a doctor are receiving expert medical attention. I am proud of these accomplishments by our Nation.

However, we must remember that South Vietnam is a small and crowded land—16 million people living in an area smaller than the State of Missouri. While we can be proud of the classrooms we have built and the hospitals we have staffed, we have failed to devote any proportionate amount of our resources, our energies, or our influence to the great problem of land reform.

And here is where the Vietcong slogan catches fire. The Vietcong words, "To the tiller belongs the soil"—which is their slogan—are more potent than all the bombs we have dropped since the war began.

Consider: In spite of the enormous dislocations in recent years caused by the war and the resulting movement to the cities, the overwhelming majority—three-quarters—of the Vietnamese are farmers and peasants.

Last year, when Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman visited Vietnam at the request of President Johnson, he put winning the war in terms of "satisfying the legitimate aspirations and desires of the Vietnamese farmers." But today, land reform remains at the bottom of our list of social and economic priorities and, strangely enough, occupies the identical position on the agenda of General Ky's administration.

And further consider: Patterns of land tenure are not significantly different than they were under the French. Now, as then, the absentee landlord is the rule, not the exception. Vast numbers of people scrape the land for a marginal existence.

There are in South Vietnam about 8½ million acres of cultivated land, of which a little over 6 million acres are rice land. It is these 6 million acres that concern us when we speak of land reform, because there has been neither proposal nor pressure to break up the country's upland rubber, tea, and coffee plantations.

The rice lands of South Vietnam are divided into two very different locations, each with its own characteristic land tenure pattern.

The first is the Mekong Delta region, where are found not only three-fourths of the rice land of South Vietnam, but three-fourths of the people as well. Here also we find the greatest potential for land reform.

The remainder of these rice lands are found along the coast, where increasing population pressure over the years has forced their division into tiny parcels. Here a man with 10 or 20 acres is a landowner of considerable holdings. In these coastal areas, land reform is not a major issue because there is little land to be divided up: the problem here is productivity.

So when we speak of land reform, we must remember that we are speaking of the Mekong Delta and similar regions: for it is these areas which furnish most of Vietnam's rice, contain most of the population, and which reflect the worst social abuses the Vietnamese peasant has been forced to endure. And, I might add, constitute the most difficult military problem because of the defection of the population.

According to the latest figures from AID, at least 75 percent of the people in the southern provinces—most of them in or around the Delta—rent all or part of the land they farm.

I want to emphasize that land reform in South Vietnam is not an American innovation or idea. Twelve years ago, in response to pressure from the Mekong Delta region for land reform, the Diem government enacted two preliminary measures to alleviate a socially intolerable and politically volatile problem. The first was Ordinance 2 of 1955, establishing rent ceilings of 15 to 25 percent of the main crop value and increasing land tenure to 5 years. While this measure

was hardly a bold beginning, the farmers of Vietnam have not had the chance to discover what changes it might have effected because Ordinance 2 has never been conscientiously enforced. It is common practice today, especially in the central lowlands, for farmers to pay not 15 percent, not 25 percent, but as high as 60 percent of their crops in rent to landlords who somehow manage to get along well with each Saigon administration.

The second measure, adopted in December of 1956, gave hope of being the first of several gradual steps toward equitable land distribution in South Vietnam. This was Ordinance 57, limiting the amount of rice land any individual could own to 100 hectares—which represents 247 acres. An additional 37 acres to each individual landholder was allowed for ancestor worship and family burial grounds. All holdings larger than the legal limit of 284 acres were expropriated, placed under government care, and the owners compensated.

Ordinance 57, which is so frequently pointed to with pride in official circles, was even at the time of its enactment an exceedingly modest proposal.

By this statute, an individual's holdings, and not a family's holdings, were limited to 284 acres. This provision certainly helped to encourage the common practice of dividing up a large estate among the members of a big landholder's family—each with his very own 37 acres for burial ground and ancestral worship.

At the same time, the Diem administration seized 490,000 acres of land to which no clear titles existed, in the process expelling thousands of peasants who had been farming the land as squatters. Under Diem, from 1957 to 1960, the government expropriated about 1.6 million acres, about 20 percent of the land then being farmed in South Vietnam.

Nevertheless, Ordinance 57 might have proved the beginning of a real land reform program in South Vietnam. It might have, I say, for to this day close to two-thirds of the 1.6 million acres have never been redistributed.

According to the Saigon government, 127,000 people have been permitted to purchase expropriated land. During its 2 years in power, the government of Premier Ky has made no new expropriations and, according to the most reliable estimate, has distributed a maximum of 50,000 acres, or a little over 3 percent of the land controlled by the Diem government.

I concede that there are obstacles to a meaningful land reform program in South Vietnam. Archaic surveying regulations could require up to 20 years for a legally proper survey of the land in South Vietnam. Inexcusable delays in the processing of cases and files are encountered at the hands of a sprawling and inefficient bureaucracy.

But the United States has assigned no urgency, no priority to the problem of land reform, either. From 1961 to 1965 we provided no aid in dollars or piasters for land-reform action. In 1966, our land-reform appropriation of \$953,000 for the entire year would have run our military effort not for a month, or a week, or 1 day,

or 1 hour, but for less than 20 minutes. In fiscal year 1967, the administration budgeted for land reform for all of South Vietnam a million and a half dollars which would probably sustain our military operations in Vietnam for a single half hour.

Even more tragically, of the million and a half dollars the United States will contribute this year toward land reform, \$800,000 of this amount is earmarked for surveying government land in order to draw up accurate deeds. This is analogous to a doctor on duty in the accident room of a hospital requiring a fully detailed medical history of a critically injured patient before he consents to stopping the bleeding.

Action is needed now. If it requires our prodding, our persuasion, our pressure on the Saigon government to get action, then we must prod, must persuade, must pressure.

The excuses that the Vietcong are blocking land reform are no longer good enough. It is not the Vietcong who follow the U.S. troops into a secured area and collect back rents and levy new taxes. No, indeed, it is the landlords and their agents, with the tacit consent of South Vietnamese officials.

The Vietcong, with a land-reform program of their own, do not bother with accurate surveys. When they seize an area, the Vietcong simply give the peasant title to the land he has been farming. And while his ownership under a Vietcong title is actually illusory and his taxes undoubtedly onerous, the farmer probably considers himself better off with a title to his land.

Is it any wonder then that the Vietcong have enjoyed their greatest successes in this area where land reform under succeeding South Vietnamese governments has been nothing but an empty slogan, a cruel hoax?

I do not suggest that the Vietcong's interest in the well-being of the South Vietnamese farmer is not self-serving. But I do question whether we and the South Vietnamese Government may very well be ignoring the most reasonable, most just, and least costly route to the expulsion of Hanoi's influence from the affairs of South Vietnam.

Our efforts, heretofore, have been concentrated upon raising the price of aggression for Hanoi through the measured application of military force.

I believe that the disloyalty and indifference to the Saigon government on the part of the landless farmer of South Vietnam could be converted to active support for an administration which proved its true concern for the peasants' misery through a solid commitment to a program of real land reform.

As I stated earlier, the United States is not waging a "holy war" against communism in Vietnam. Communism does not exist in a vacuum. It feeds upon ignorance, disease, and injustice.

We are helping—too modestly, but helping—to build the schools, to staff the faculties, to cure the sick, to eliminate disease. But all of our magnificent efforts in education and health, all of the valor and glory of American fighting men will be tragic mockeries unless social and economic justice prevail.

correspondence with individual Senators and the public generally.

I recall more than 60 Senators indicating to me personally that they had received correspondence opposing the action of the President in withholding trust funds set aside for the construction of the highway system of the United States.

The funds withheld by that executive action amounted to \$1.1 billion.

In light of this, I think it is important for us to consider the action of the House of Representatives approximately 2 weeks ago. In a move ostensibly designed to reduce pressures on the general fund—I repeat, on the general fund—that body adopted a 5-percent cut in the appropriations for fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Transportation. The budgetary implications in the House are not my concern as I speak today. That which does concern me, however, is that this unselective—I use that word advisedly—reduced expenditures from the highway trust fund by 5 percent. In so doing, \$189 million in actual cash was removed from the highway appropriations portion of the bill to which I have directed our attention.

The gross effect on this area of the total Transportation Department reduction will be to postpone the obligation of \$1.2 billion of highway funds. This impact on our highway construction effort—which, I emphasize, has no relation to the general fund—will be in the nature of a withdrawal of a commitment of the Congress to the highway program as it is now in effect.

We now face serious underfinancing of our highway program and these delays, and further delays, compound the problem of maintaining an orderly development, of the highways of our Nation.

All of the arguments which were presented in January of this year against the Presidential cutback order of November 1966, including those which were presented by me, when I addressed myself to that subject on January 23, hold true today with respect to the action of the House, in regard to the cut in the appropriations for the Transportation Department in connection with the highway program.

House sponsors and supporters of this 5-percent across-the-board cut in general fund expenditures are reported to have said that they did not intend to bring about the result which was the natural consequence of the implied and inherent amendment offered by Representative LAIRD, of Wisconsin. However, that may be, I urgently request the members of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Department of Transportation appropriation to recommend a restoration of at least the full amount of the budget request.

I have been informed that the Federal Highway Administrator, Lowell Bridwell, will make a request for such action of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations in his testimony before them today.

The effect of the House-passed reduction on our economy, as well as on the progress and the success of our highway program, would be most severe. Its po-

tential impact on many people in the private sector—contractors, suppliers, and labor—as well as its impact on State highway programs would be too great for us to permit this action to go unchallenged. It is unfair for this situation to come about at this time. It is my belief that we need to have it corrected as quickly as possible.

I invite my fellow Senators to join me and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and the Subcommittee on Roads, as we work with the Appropriations Subcommittee and others in this body seeking the restoration of these funds for highway development and construction.

Mr. President, another matter which is also of vital significance is the action of the House Appropriations Committee, as ratified later by the House of Representatives, in reducing the appropriations for carrying out the highway safety program from the \$100 million requested in the budget to the \$20 million proposed by the committee, and the \$19 million approved by the House.

We recall that it was only last year that Congress adopted the Highway Safety Act—a measure designed to bring into being a full-scale Federal, State, and local government program to wage a massive and, we hope, effective action to prevent the destruction of life and the loss of property on the highways of this Nation. We have held hearings on this subject in our Subcommittee on Roads within the past 10 days or 2 weeks. During that time, we have heard testimony on the program being conducted pursuant to the Highway Safety Act. It is a measure of broad interest to the people of this country.

I think it is a sad commentary on our times that a wounded soldier or marine in Vietnam has a better chance of survival than the victim of a highway accident in the United States.

I certainly believe that the expenditure to support our troops in Vietnam is a necessary one. We want them to have as great a chance of receiving prompt medical treatment and surviving injuries in the jungles, the mountains, and the rice paddies as possible. But I question the thinking behind these expenditures devoted to saving lives, if at the same time Congress refuses to appropriate the funds necessary to carry out what is perhaps the most meaningful domestic safety program which has yet been conceived.

Every year we suffer many more fatalities upon our highways than we do upon the battlefields. I am committed to any course of responsible action, and to the necessary appropriation therefor, which will reduce casualties on the battlefield, and on the highways as well. The appropriation of the \$100 million requested by the administration to carry out the highway safety program is small in comparison to the economic destruction and human distress which come from accidents, which result in approximately 52,000 deaths annually, and the maiming of additional thousands of men, women, and children, on the roads of

this country. I repeat that figure: The death toll is 52,000 annually, with many more thousands injured and maimed.

I recognize that we must examine and reexamine our expenditure priorities at a time when there are greater demands on the general fund than can be met by it. But I know of no program which is more capable of reducing human suffering more, and make a greater return on the dollars invested, than the meaningful and effective highway safety program which has been written into law, and which now needs the dollars to make it work.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works recently completed hearings reviewing the activities of the Department of Transportation in connection with the Safety Act which we passed in 1966: We heard Federal, State and local officials describe the beginnings of this promising program. Now to have the program summarily stopped would, in a sense, be illogical, and would seem to me to be a tragedy of the era of mobility in which we live. If by failing to underwrite it we cause delay in the highway safety program, it could only be because we do not see the urgency of the need. I believe that if all Members of Congress, certainly all Senators, were fully apprised of the situation, we would respond with the necessary funds.

The highway safety program, like the highway construction program, we must remember, is a joint effort of the States and the Federal Government. We have urged, and in some degree we have required, that the States undertake safety programs under penalty of losing 10 percent of their highway funds if they do not comply. We have asked the States to obligate the expenditure of large sums of money to match the Federal funds which everyone expected that Congress would make available.

Our action on appropriations will create the environment in which this program can be carried forward. If we commit ourselves to the need for urgent action, the States and the communities involved will, I think, respond accordingly. If we do not restore these funds, and the program is forced to function at the reduced level of the appropriations provided by the House of Representatives, then the States and the local communities will be correct in assessing the congressional view of this program as one which can wait for another day; and until that day, there will continue to be casualties, which currently mount to the total of approximately 52,000 killed during a 12-month period.

I do not believe that that is the sense of the Members of Congress; and we must reverse that action.

It is our obligation to restore these funds for carrying out the highway safety program and to restore the full appropriations for highway construction. Money for construction is now in a trust fund earmarked for that purpose—cash in hand, and not money which would be drawn from the general fund. It is our obligation to restore these funds so that the actual and implied promises made to the States by Congress will be

South Vietnam is a land of farmers; almost 12 million of the 16 million people live by the soil. The South Vietnamese farmer cares far more about his land than about the makeup of the government in Saigon. For as long as he can remember, governments have risen and fallen with a regularity almost approaching that of Nature's seasons. He has learned to pay little heed to his government, because no administration has showed any determination to change his lot.

Land reform, of itself, will not magically produce a stable democracy in this ancient land. But without real land reform, I fear that the prediction of the cynics—that our only choice in South Vietnam will come down to options between a dictatorship of the left or a dictatorship of the right—might very well materialize.

If this Nation's experiences since 1945 have taught us no other lesson, we must have learned that social progress is the key to national stability and popular support for governments—and that these are ultimately the most formidable defenses to Communist subversion.

If the tremendous sacrifices in human life and treasure that the people of the United States are willingly making for this tiny nation are worth anything—and I repeat that I believe they are—then they must mean not only political democracy, but social and economic justice as well.

If, at the end of this long and tragic war, we have merely succeeded in propping up one more unpopular, unresponsive, and uncaring regime, then our efforts and our sacrifices will not simply have been futile, they will be mockeries of this Nation and its ideals.

As London Times Saigon correspondent Fred Emery points out:

It may be questioned whether any progress of lasting nature can be expected, in spite of military success, so long as pacification continues without a real revolution in the government's attitude toward land reform.

Absentee landlords are still riding in with pacifying troops, not merely to grab back their lands but to extort back rents for the time they fled the Viet Cong. Senior American officials recognize the problem only too well, and say, rather nervously, that they are hoping the government will shortly come up with a decree abolishing back rents.

Mr. Emery continues:

It remains that an individual may still own up to 100 hectares (247 acres) with other members of his family owning as much again.

Added to this landlords still extort rents as high as 60 percent of the product of a rice field, and it is not hard to see why peasants keep their arms.

Mr. President, the present government in Saigon has title to nearly 1 million acres of undistributed land. Unless and until the Saigon government demonstrates a firm resolve to execute a real land-reform program, all the flights of rhetoric about "pacification" and "social resolution" will continue to be a disgraceful sham.

Let me make it clear: I do not suggest that the forceful implementation of a land-reform program in South Vietnam, alone, will miraculously transform that war-torn country into a stable democracy

or a prosperous nation. But I do say that—without a real program of land reform, honestly and forcefully executed—we will have neither.

CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to speak for about a minute or two on another topic, the subject which is going to be the main concern of the Senate today; namely, the central Arizona project, which is a complex matter, touching on many vital concerns. I would like to address myself briefly to the conservation aspects of the bill.

Last year in the 89th Congress, this bill's predecessor caused widespread concern among conservationists committed to the preservation of our great natural landscape. This was a concern I shared and for which I fought. I felt the construction of two dams in the Grand Canyon would have marred and buried sections of a great natural wonder. Future generations would have criticized us for decimating our landscape.

Today I am pleased and grateful that these two dams have been eliminated from the central Arizona project. I am even more impressed because section 13 of this bill prevents the Federal Power Commission from authorizing construction of a dam downstream from the Grand Canyon. I would have also been happy to see a similar provision for the Marble Canyon dam site, but I understand this was left out pending consideration of an expanded Grand Canyon National Park.

Because this Marble Canyon area is still in danger, I feel it imperative that we in Congress act to meet the need for an extended and expanded Grand Canyon National Park. S. 1004 does not fully protect this area, and following its consideration, we will hopefully move on to create a more complete Grand Canyon National Park to solve these important conservation needs.

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS ALSO COMPEL SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CXII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I rise once again today to urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, I believe it is good to recall that these are not merely legal documents, but also profoundly affirmative moral statements.

The moral dimension of our foreign policy has long been recognized and traditionally acknowledged by our practices. In recent years, for example, we have advanced proposals for strengthening U.N. procedures in the field of human rights. We have spoken out clearly against specific violations of human rights in different parts of the world. And, most important of all, we have earned widespread respect from other nations for the dedicated manner in which we have set about eradicating discrimination and injustice in our society.

We thus find in our past and present practices implicit affirmation of human rights.

As I have tried to emphasize before: our national interests and international responsibility compel us to ratify the Human Rights Conventions. Twice in the lifetime of many of us, the United States has been forced into world wars. Twice we watched helplessly while unchecked domestic oppression grew into unprovoked foreign aggression. Aggression since 1945 has been the exclusive practice of those regimes which first deprived their own citizens of basic human freedoms. Human rights and peace are intimately related and historically interdependent. When the human rights of any people are threatened, peace itself is threatened.

Peace and freedom are the fundamental objectives of this Nation's policies. Let us never fail to recognize that the world looks to us not merely as an arsenal of weapons and a storehouse of commodities, but as a society committed to the promotion of the dignity of man. This country was founded on the basis of ethics and morality, and we betray our heritage if we fail to state our case in moral terms.

Our most fundamental question is not "How much artillery?" or "How many men?" It is rather "To what purpose?" And for this the world awaits an answer—an answer that we have thus far failed to provide in the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions.

Let the Senate move positively toward both peace and international securing of human rights by ratifying the Treaties on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AMERICAN HIGHWAY SYSTEM—ITS CONSTRUCTION AND SAFETY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when the 90th Congress convened last January, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives were understandably concerned over the action of the President of the United States in cutting back on the highway program for fiscal year 1967.

This concern was testified to by speeches in the Senate and the House, by the communications from the chief executives of the many States, and by