

In his statement he specifically declares that May 1st was wrong. Obviously it was wrong because the May 1 flight failed. But he states:

It should have been held on April 9 or around the middle of April.

If it were held around the middle of April, we would have had time to rebuild our relationship with the Soviet.

My question is, What would have been the position of the committee if the April 9 flight had failed? What would have been the position of the committee and its chairman if any of the flights prior to April 15 had failed? The Committee Chairman suggested that cutoff date.

I shall first try to answer those questions myself. On the basis of hindsight, the judgment would have been formed that the April 15 date was improper. If the flight of April 9 had failed, it would have been declared that that flight should not have been conducted.

The Senator from Wisconsin discussed the subject of the simplicity of forming judgments on the basis of past facts compared with the difficulty of forming them by looking into the future. I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin as to what he believes the situation would have been if the last flight had been conducted on April 9 or April 15 rather than on May 1.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator from Ohio is asking with respect to the reaction of the chairman of the committee, I suspect that if the flight had failed on any of the dates he mentioned, the same conclusions would have been drawn. But I personally feel that since the President and those who had charge of this entire procedure for 4 years knew that May 1 was the only day in that month that was available because of weather conditions, the right thing was done. We have not yet received the facts as to how Powers was shot down or came down in some other way. Those facts will have to be developed. One of the columnists lately gave the impression that Powers probably fainted and had to come down lower, or that his instruments were damaged and he had to come down. I do not know.

However, looking at the episode now, all I can say is that in my humble opinion, those who had the responsibility of making the decision made the right decision, and since they made it, it is not for me to question their right to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I point out that not one of the many, many flights made since July 12, 1956, was wrong—not a single one. The only one that should not have been flown was the May 1 flight, according to the committee chairman.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Ohio is correct. That is what would be contended, though I do not agree with that conclusion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to yield to me, provided he does not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator

from Wisconsin may first yield to me for a statement, and following my remarks, that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is present. I know he is obliged to leave the Chamber shortly. He has been seeking an opportunity to address the Senate for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may address the Senate for 5 minutes, and then when he concludes, I may have the floor to make a statement; and then that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has charge of the time.

Mr. WILEY. I had promised the Senator from Arkansas that I would yield to him. However, he had left the Chamber and I, therefore, had yielded to the Senator from New York.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

I wish to comment only briefly on the speech of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. I do not want my silence to be interpreted in any way as approval of the personal statements about me made by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Wisconsin.

His statement that I believe the English parliamentary system would be appropriate for this country is not only quite untrue and unfounded, but is wholly irrelevant to the issues raised by my statement on Tuesday concerning the U-2 incident.

His repeated insinuations that I was partisan in my observations are without any foundation, I believe.

On page 4 he stated that Members of Congress—and I suppose he means me—have questioned the motives of the President. This is entirely untrue and false. I do not question the President's motives. I have questioned only his judgment, just as I questioned the judgment of the Senator from Wisconsin, and not his motives.

As for the substantive arguments of the Senator from Wisconsin, they primarily consist of self-righteous statements which bear the hallmark of Republican foreign policy. He blames everything on the Communists, and that makes the whole matter very simple.

Our Government does not make mistakes, in his opinion, and it interprets every setback as a victory, whether it be the failure of the Paris summit conference or the withdrawal of the invitation by the Japanese Government of its invitation to the President to visit that country. I assume from that that he also feels the same way about the reception the Vice President received in Peru and Venezuela a short time ago on his last visit to that area.

Much of the substantive material in the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin is irrelevant to the U-2 incident and its aftermath, and, therefore, to discuss it would add nothing to our understanding of that event or to an understanding of our present circumstances in the world.

I can only add that I based my conclusions upon the report of the committee approved by 14 of the 17 members, including 4 of the 6 Republican members of that committee. The four members who signed the report were faithful in their attendance and were cooperative in every respect.

Finally, of course, everyone will interpret that report according to his own experience and sensitiveness to the facts which were found by the committee. It is quite natural and normal that the various members of that committee should interpret the meaning of the facts which were developed. There was very little difference of opinion in the committee as to the factual statement itself. There was no trouble in arriving at the statement of facts. The difficulty arises from the meaning of the facts, which is quite natural and normal. However, I think the members during this period exercised a great deal of control, and they succeeded in preventing partisanship from entering into the consideration of the report. I believe we succeeded under these circumstances to an unusual degree, and I think the report itself is a sound and worthwhile document. Any reasonable person, by a careful reading of the report, can gain an understanding of the major aspects of this sad and unfortunate affair which we have referred to as the U-2 affair.

I close by expressing the hope that we can keep partisanship to a minimum in discussing our foreign relations. By that I do not mean we should not discuss them. I think it is one of the most legitimate and important subjects to discuss.

I do not mean that there should not be differences of opinion about it. Of course, there should be. But these continual insinuations that anyone who might disagree with another's interpretation as being pro-Communist or an advocate of Mr. Khrushchev's position, it seems to me, is evidence of extreme partisanship.

I hope the Democrats will never be guilty of anything approaching the action of the Republicans in Congress in December 1950, when they passed a formal resolution demanding the resignation of the then Democratic Secretary of State on the eve of his departure to an important conference with our Western European allies.

I believe that is one of the classic examples of partisanship. I am glad to recite that the senior Senator from Wisconsin, according to press reports I have, was not present and did not participate in that vote. However, it was overwhelmingly adopted by the membership of both Houses. I do not believe there has been the slightest indication of any attempt on the part of the Democratic members of the committee or of the Senate to take partisan advantage out of the U-2 incident. The report itself,

as anyone can see who reads it, is very factual and, as I said, has been accepted by four of the members on the Republican side of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I submitted my own observations as being a proper and logical deduction from the facts found in that report. If those who disagree with it—and they are at liberty to disagree—and argue as to the merits of it, I have no objection. However, merely to denounce it as being in the interest of Mr. Khrushchev, it seems to me, is the height of partisanship. I do not believe that adds anything to our understanding or to the formulating of what our policy is to be in the future. I would say that the whole report is intended to give, first, understanding and, second, some guidance as to how we shall conduct our relations with the Communist empire, largely because we have no alternative but to conduct relations with them, unless we wish to resort to war. I do not believe that those who disagree with the report find that that is a tenable policy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the junior Senator from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon his conduct of the hearings on the failure of the Paris conference and incidents related thereto, and to congratulate him also upon his successful conduct of the deliberations and the eventual issuance of the report by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

As the Senator knows, the prediction was made, at the close of the hearing, that the committee would not be able to reach agreement on a report. The committee did finally, after many long and arduous sessions, examination and drafting, line by line, issue a report, and not one vote was cast against the contents of the report.

I believe it is fair to say—and I am sure if I am incorrect the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana will say so—that his opposition to the report was not based upon its contents, but upon the advisability of issuing a report. That is a point of view which, it seems to me, is a tenable one.

On the other hand, I thought that in the exercise of democracy we could not sweep under the rug a matter so important as the failure of the Paris conference.

It was necessary to have an investigation. Once we had an investigation, it seems to me, it was incumbent upon the membership of the committee, if it could possibly do so, within the bounds of accommodation, reason, and compromise, to issue a report. I am happy that it did so and that the report was approved by a vote of 14 to 1. This accomplishment was in large measure due to the impartial, nonpartisan way in which the distinguished chairman of the committee presided over the deliberations of the committee. I wish to express to him my appreciation for his efforts and my esteem for his ability, and my congratulations upon his accomplishment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator very much. He has contributed greatly to the accomplishment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

#### CORRECTIONS IN H.R. 11602, THE HAWAII OMNIBUS BILL

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of House Concurrent Resolution 706. The resolution authorizes and directs the clerk of the House to make technical corrections in H.R. 11602, the Hawaii omnibus bill, as engrossed by the House. These corrections are completely of a technical nature. The leadership on both sides of the aisle has been consulted on the matter. There is no objection.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 706, which was read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 11602) entitled "An Act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes," the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the House engrossed bill: On page 9, line 7, strike out "1960," and insert "1950"; on page 15, line 15, strike "1960" and insert "1950"; on page 31, line 2, strike out "15(a)" and insert "14(a)"; on page 31, line 3, strike out "24(a)," and insert "23(a)."; on page 31, line 4, strike out "3 of section 30(d)," and insert "(3) of section 29(d)."; on page 31, line 5, strike out "section 31," and insert "section 30,"; on page 31, line 6, strike out "section 21(b)" and insert "section 20(b)"; on page 31, line 12, strike out "31(a)" and insert "30(a)"; on page 31, line 24, strike out "section 15" and insert "section 14"; on page 32, line 2, strike out "section 15(a)" and insert "section 14(a)"; on page 32, line 8, strike out "section 15(a)" and insert "section 14(a)"; on page 32, line 10, strike out "section 31(c)(1)" and insert "section 30(c)(1)"; on page 32, line 15, strike out "section 15, by section 21(a)," and insert "section 14, by section 20(a)."; on page 32, line 16, strike out "24(b)," and insert "23(b)."; on page 32, line 17, strike out "section 30," and insert "section 29,"; and on page 32, line 18, strike out "section 31" and insert "section 30".*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### THE U-2 INCIDENT AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Missouri, and then I shall yield briefly to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I too should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in congratulating the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the very

able and constructive talk he made with respect to the U-2 incident on the floor of the Senate recently. I put in the RECORD, not long ago, a statement by Mr. Albert Wohlstetter, which he made in an article on "National Purpose," published in the New York Times and Life magazine. The statement reads:

I doubt that the public of this country was ever less informed on matters directly affecting its life and death. On the contrary at each great crisis the public has been reassured that no further effort is required.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is doing his best to keep the American people informed about matters on which they have every right to be informed. I again congratulate him on his constructive statesmanship.

Mr. JAVITS. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### UNITED STATES-JAPAN TREATY IS VALUABLE TO BOTH NATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, now that the United States-Japan Security Treaty has been ratified by both nations, and is in force, it is worth considering the significance of this alliance which some of the accompanying developments have tended to obscure.

I am particularly concerned about the public reaction in our own country to the disturbances which occurred in Japan, and especially about the false conclusion—drawn by some people who should know better—that this treaty has brought about some sort of catastrophe in the free world.

Let me remind my colleagues that another significant alliance to which we are a party was born in strife. Who can forget the opposition that was expressed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949?

No signatory joined without some domestic voices raised in protest. One parliament was stoned as it voted for ratification. Indeed, some of the most heated debate on NATO occurred right here in the U.S. Senate because many Americans questioned the advisability of committing ourselves to a provision which could mean fighting on foreign shores to defend oversea allies.

So if both our allies and we had reservations about NATO, is it so surprising to see protests raised about the important alliance which we just signed with Japan?

Neither can we consider Communist screams of protest as evidence that there is a flaw in a treaty of free world nations. To this day the 11-year-old NATO alliance sticks in the throat of the men in the Kremlin and their fanatic associates in Peiping. They have used every device short of war to break, weaken, or discredit NATO, but this has not convinced the free world that it can afford to hang together any less passionately.

But how do we explain the fact that the disturbances and street fighting in Japan were not confined to Communists?

The answer lies largely in the fact that the people of Japan have a thorough-