

March 26, 1965

"Angel of Peace," which is another rich chapter in the Slav history linked with the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

ARCHBISHOP MARTIN J. SPALDING

The first among the American prelates to acquaint the U.S. Catholics with the great apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius was the Most Reverend Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, D.D., of Baltimore, Md., the predecessor of James Cardinal Gibbons, who endorsed the founding of our organization, the Slovak Catholic Federation of America in 1911 and also the predecessor of the present Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, first bishop of Bridgeport Diocese and now archbishop of Baltimore, Md., who is quite familiar with the SS. Cyril and Methodius heritage. Archbishop Spalding published in 1867 the general history of the Catholic Church in which he mentions these two Slovak apostles. No doubt this publication was encouraged by the influx of Slavs during the American Civil War in which the Slovaks had their heroes, including the well known Colonel Geza Mihalotzy. Likewise, the well known Most Rev. Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minn., was one of the first American prelates to bring students from Slavonic countries to study for the priesthood.

The late Msgr. William Heinen of Mauch Chunk, Pa., who also came to America with ambition to work among the Indians, learned here the Slovak language and founded 14 Slovak parishes in the Philadelphia archdiocese and the present Allentown diocese. Monsignor Heinen visited Velehrad, where he preached in Slovak in the church, known as basilica of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

Most Rev. Michael Hohán, late bishop of Scranton diocese visited Slovakia during the Austro-Hungarian regime before World War I to acquaint himself better with the Slovak people. Under his guidance the congregation of the Slovak sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius, founded by Rev. Mathew Jankola, was established and has a motherhouse and a beautiful St. Cyril's academy in Danville, Pa.

On September 30, 1880, Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical "Grande Munus" in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius and extended their veneration to the entire Christendom. Archbishop Jozef Strossmayer of Croatia was a great leader during this period.

IRISH MONKS IN SLOVAKIA

It is recalled that prior to the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to present Slovakia, Irish monks labored in the country of our ancestry but due to lack of knowledge of the people's language their mission was not successful.

Bishop Grukka paid them tribute during the SS. Cyril and Methodius celebration on June 22, 1963, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, where he was a great preacher in Slovak, invited by Cardinal Spellman.

Slovakia is a birthplace of St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, born in A.D. 316, then known as Pannonia. Now it is an established fact that St. Martin was related to St. Patrick, the patron of the Irish, therefore, we emphasize that what St. Boniface is to the Germans, St. Augustine to the English, and St. Patrick to the Irish, that is what SS. Cyril and Methodius are to the Slovaks. The present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, addressing the American Slovak pilgrims in the Vatican on September 14, 1963, in commemoration of the 11th centenary of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia said: "Dear Sons of the Slovak Nations * * * Continue to cultivate the memory, cult, the imitation of your saints, who from distant Middle Ages even now light the paths along which the spirit of the Slovak people must pass in our time and in the future * * * continue to maintain the SS. Cyril and Methodius Institute with your offerings and your confidence."

In conclusion it is most appropriate to pay tribute to all those, who perpetuate the

heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius, patrons and apostles now of some 300 million Slavonic peoples, the majority of whom are under the tyrannical rule of atheistic communism.

Considering the fact that before the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to the present Slovakia and its neighboring countries 11 centuries ago the Irish monks labored there, it is, indeed, providential, that the day before their feast day, in the year of the 11th centennial, on July 6, 1963, one of the most beautiful churches, named in their honor, was dedicated by Most Rev. Walter Kellenberg, Bishop of Rockville Center diocese, at Deer Park, Long Island, N.Y., where Rev. William Behan is pastor. The mission was originally started by the Slovaks, who rejoice with their American Catholic neighbors of other nationalities that while the SS. Cyril and Methodius' Christian faith is being uprooted by the Reds in the countries, where they planted it, that here in a free America, their heritage is perpetuated in a true democratic spirit.

The author of the article, Mr. John C. Sciranka, is a well-known American Slovak journalist who in this article calls to our attention these forgotten pioneers, including Father Gallitzin, who labored for 41 years among the people of western Pennsylvania, spending his own money and refusing to return to Russia to claim his patrimony. We owe these great pioneers our tribute in their very historical and unique contributions to America.

Since we very proudly recognize our Nation to be the "melting pot" of the world, the contributions of these individual and national groups of immigrants are a very special chapter in the history of our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members this fascinating historical review by Mr. Sciranka.

BILL TO MAKE THE KILLING OF THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT A FEDERAL CRIME

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, many of us believed the assassination of President Kennedy and its tragicomic aftermath would so arouse Congress that it would, after years of procrastination, achieve passage of a law declaring the killing of the President a Federal offense.

Our belief was short lived. Although a number of bills have been introduced to accomplish this end, none has been approved by either House. The assassination of a President, in the eyes of the law, remains no different from any police blotter homicide.

The United States Code contains a jerry-built section—18 U.S.C. 1114—which makes it a Federal crime to kill postal inspectors, Internal Revenue Service agents, employees of the National Park Service, U.S. attorneys and judges, and, among others, property guards in the employ of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The protection extends to members of the Secret Service, including, of course, those agents charged with safeguarding the lives of the men who hold the highest

offices in the land. The situation is intolerable as well as illogical and should be remedied.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill which would make the assassination of the President or the Vice President a Federal crime, subject to Federal prosecution, adjudication and punishment.

One of the objectives of the bill is to resolve the anomalous distinction that presently govern prosecution of crimes against officers and employees of the Federal Government. To cite two examples, it is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 871—to mail a threat to kill the President, but not to kill him. It also is a Federal offense—18 U.S.C. 372—if one person conspires with another to injure or kill the President. But the Federal Government has no jurisdiction if an individual, acting alone, murders the Chief Executive.

The bill I am sponsoring attempts, as simply and effectively as possible, to codify the various statutes relating to the killing or attempt killing of the President and Vice President, and all other officers or employees of the U.S. Government.

First, the bill designates the murder of the President or the Vice President, or the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, a Federal crime. The maximum penalty upon conviction would be death if the jury decided the case did not recommend clemency.

The attempted murder of the President or Vice President also would become a Federal offense, carrying a maximum penalty of 40 years imprisonment.

Second, the bill extends Federal jurisdiction to anyone who kills or attempts to kill any officer or employee of the United States while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties. The maximum penalty for murder in the first degree would be death. Conviction of attempted murder would carry a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment.

The bill further provides that anyone who assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates or interferes with the President, the Vice President or any Federal employee or officer while they are performing their official duties shall be charged with a Federal offense. The maximum penalty would be a fine of \$5,000 and a 3-year prison sentence, or both. However, if a deadly or dangerous weapon is used in the assault or similar offense the penalties would be increased to a maximum fine of \$10,000 or a prison term of 10 years, or both.

My bill attaches no reservations whatever to Federal jurisdiction over the assassination of the President or Vice President. Other bills introduced on this subject have granted jurisdiction only when the President is "engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties." This proviso seems to me to be unnecessarily restrictive. The language may present needless problems in determining whether the President was engaged in the performance of his official duties. Moreover, I see no reason why the murder of a President should not be a Federal crime even if the killing occurs while the Chief Executive is play-

ing golf, attending a family funeral or engaged in other activities which may or may not be defined as "official."

The provision affecting Federal employees and officers, however, confines Federal jurisdiction to those offenses committed while the employee or officer is, so to speak, on the job.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is a worthy one, and deserving of passage. I urge its favorable consideration. It is not yet too late for us to acknowledge that we have learned the lessons so tragically brought to our attention by the events in Dallas during the last week of November 1963.

"WELL DONE," MAJOR GRISSOM

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Hoosiers, and all Americans, in saying, "Well done" to Maj. Gus Grissom on his extraordinary flight in the Gemini spacecraft this week. He and his flight companion, John Young, exhibited great courage and rarely excelled spirit of adventure in the calm manner in which they conducted this flight.

We in Indiana are especially proud of Gus Grissom, not only because he was born and raised in our State, but because he exemplifies those qualities which we want to instill in the youth of America. As an example of a good family man, and reflecting a good upbringing in a good environment, Gus Grissom is an outstanding American in more than one category.

I congratulate Gus on his most recent achievement and wish him and his family the best in the future. Gus' accomplishments in the space program afford us valuable information for future space exploration. Indiana, a State settled by some very hardy and persevering pioneer stock, is proud that one of its own has helped pioneer in the newest of frontiers.

THE CURTIS COROLLARY TO GRESHAM'S LAW

(Mr. CLEVELAND was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], is acknowledged to be one of the most brilliant Members in either Chamber. He is one of the leading financial and economic experts in the country. He is also one of the most diligent and hard-working men I know. He has evolved a theory of economics which he himself has dubbed "CURTIS' Corollary to Gresham's Law." He presented it to the House last month during the debate on H.R. 45, the Inter-American Development Bank bill.

Gresham's law is simply that bad money will drive out good and the Curtis corollary is that Government money drives out private capital.

The formulation of this law has been noted by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which recently carried an excellent editorial on the subject. I heartily endorse the editorial and its conclusion and recommend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

In 1558 Sir Thomas Gresham, financial agent of the Crown, painstakingly explained to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth that when two or more kinds of money of equal denomination—but unequal intrinsic value—are in circulation, the one with the greater value is hoarded and exported. Basically, the good knight explained to the Virgin Queen, bad money drives out good money.

Some 299 years later the economic principle was given the name of Gresham's law. Now more than a century later on the floor of Congress there has been appended CURTIS' corollary—Government money drives out private capital.

While the news has yet to be hailed on the fields of academe, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS' corollary certainly seems to hold true for the Alliance for Progress, which program is in need of reevaluation.

As envisioned under the Alliance, \$20 billion in investment moneys would go south of the Rio Grande, half of it from private sources. But Mr. CURTIS charges that, as the Government dollars are being sent into Latin America, not only has the private sector not caught up, but it has actually declined during those years.

Nor is it just American private capital that is being withdrawn. Latin capital is likewise being pulled out.

Mr. CURTIS suggests, and we second it, that the Alliance for Progress stop blindly pouring in dollars as though all is going according to plan, when all is quite obviously not going according to plan. It is time an exhaustive reappraisal was made of the entire Alliance for Progress program.

Pointing to our payments imbalance, Mr. CURTIS asks why 90 percent of the programs are for services—not goods—which further aggravate that problem.

Mr. CURTIS asks why the Bank's Fund for Special Operations—which lends to governments whose payments problems prevent their getting conventional loans—encourages Latins to spend the money in Latin America rather than here. How can one justify this type of operation when we face a critical payments problem ourselves?

What Mr. CURTIS is asking is that the Johnson administration, which is calling on one and all to cut back on expenditures abroad, starts practicing a little bit of what it is so plausibly preaching.

WASHINGTON POST HITS ADMINISTRATION'S INCONSISTENT STAND ON USE OF GAS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. CLEVELAND was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday—page 5598 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I called the attention of the House to the inconsistency of the administration's handling of the decision on the use of gas as a weapon of war and the same administration's campaign opposition concerning authority for the use of tactical atomic weapons. Although field commanders are thought not competent to decide to use limited, tactical atomic weapons even under very restricted conditions, they are apparently given unrestricted rein to employ chemical

weapons. The administration is trying to brush aside this sort of criticism and to minimize the use of tear gas in Vietnam as an inflated issue of no real substance.

There is substance of the gravest importance in this issue, however, the pooch-pooching attitude of the administration notwithstanding.

The Washington Post directed itself to this point in an editorial today. The editorial clearly shows up the inconsistency involved and I offer it for the RECORD in the earnest hope that it will be pondered by every Member:

Gas

There is a considerable amount of pious hypocrisy in some of the moans of outrage over the use of nontoxic gases in South Vietnam. Some of the protests originate in countries where the cruelties of the regime make vomiting gas by comparison look as innocent as cough syrup. There is, on the other hand, a great deal of world reaction that represents a natural and justifiable revulsion at the military use of any agent that may in future make it easier to gradually move across the line into the use of lethal gases.

The reproach of American citizens and newspapers is of a double order: it runs to the use of the gas itself and to the damage that its ineffective employment has done the United States. There are few offenses in statesmen more deplorable than those that put the right in the wrong and that is what we have done. We have put a moral argument into the hands of our enemies and placed a moral burden on our friends. And it must be confessed we have not moved with agility to correct the error. A Government that only a few short months ago was voicing its horror at Senator Goldwater's suggestion that the choice of weapons be left to field commanders cannot hide behind the argument that the election to use gases is a field decision.

What is especially revolting about it all is the fact that the employment of the nauseous gases was inept, ineffectual, and indecisive even in the few cases where it was used. For no sound practical reason we have given comfort to our enemies, dismayed our friends, and outraged many of our own citizens. We might have made something of a recovery by announcing withdrawal of our own supply of this agent from the theater. We have, on the contrary, made an inept and unconvincing defense of it.

Wickedness sometimes wins in the court of world opinion by having success as a counsel and virtue often loses by having failure's clumsy clown as a lawyer.

THE FLORIDA-COLOMBIA ALLIANCE

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mrs. MINK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida's secretary of state, the Honorable Tom Adams, recently addressed the international students at Florida State University in Tallahassee. His remarks concerned a new and unique program developing between our State and Colombia. The Florida-Colombia alliance is a program for international cooperation designed to strengthen commerce and democracy between the two partners. Its beginning is described by Mr. Adams as follows:

full-time jobs. The Government's records show that approximately 25 percent of all impoverished families in America are headed by a person working full time, year round, for 50 or more weeks. These full-time working poor—with substandard wages and working conditions—represent the most shameful aspect of American poverty.

To effectively aid the more than half of our poor families headed by a person in the labor force, education and job training and the end of discrimination—vital as they are—will not be enough. For them and for the children of all poor families, the basic need is enough jobs, at decent wages, for all people who are willing and able to work.

Job-creating measures to end the persistently high rates of unemployment and underemployment must be vigorously pursued.

The answer for the 2 million families, headed by a regularly employed worker, who live in poverty is the minimum wage law improvements we seek—both the \$2 minimum and increased coverage.

Nearly half of America's impoverished families are headed by persons who are not in the labor force at all. And their family incomes, from whatever source, are just too low to provide the bare necessities of life. They include families that have been broken by death, divorce, or desertion. They include the aged. And they include impoverished families with male heads of working age, who are disabled by illness or accident.

No war against want can succeed without adequate family income protection for those who cannot be self-supporting, even under conditions of full employment. It was precisely to meet the income-maintenance needs of these people—to keep them from impoverishment—that the concept of social security against the worst hazards of modern life was conceived. Unfortunately, expectations that our social insurance programs would adequately meet this need have not been realized.

Clearly, social security benefits for retirees, survivors, and the disabled—which are too low to provide the minimum necessities of life—must be increased. A hospital insurance program for the aged, under social security principles, must be adopted immediately. The benefit and coverage levels of all State social insurance and welfare programs must be brought up to date. Adequate Federal standards are needed to upgrade the unemployment insurance system and the archaic workmen's compensation laws of the States. Insurance for the families of breadwinners separated from payrolls by illness—now limited to four States and the railroads—must be improved and extended nationally.

What is more, as part of an all-out war against want, far more must be done to improve the housing and education of the poor, to refashion Federal farm programs so that the benefits are enjoyed by those most in need, and to reshape tax policies—Federal, State, and local—to reduce the burdens imposed now on those who are most impoverished. It is a sad irony that the Federal Government collects \$100 million in income taxes and \$200 million in excise taxes from the impoverished, while it engages in a war against poverty.

A hopeful aspect of the antipoverty effort, already adopted by the Congress, is the Economic Opportunity Act. With its concentration on education, job training, and counseling—and its emphasis on youth—this act is bringing leadership and resources to a task that is essential if an overall war against want is to be waged and won.

The AFL-CIO championed passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Now, we urge Congress to substantially expand the meager appropriation for this program.

We call on all affiliated organizations to become integral, active, and leading members

of the antipoverty groups now being formed in hundreds of communities throughout the country. We urge all affiliated organizations to participate and give leadership in the development and operation of antipoverty projects.

These projects, under the Economic Opportunity Act, should provide the best possible assistance to the poor. It is also our view that on all work-related projects, the enrollees should receive no less than \$1.25 an hour (the present Federal minimum wage) for each hour of work, that the work undertaken would not otherwise be done, and that no impairment of collective bargaining contracts or reduction of new hiring results.

Since its inception, the American labor movement has been striving to banish poverty from our midst—through trade union organization, effective collective bargaining, and legislative efforts. That is our historic objective.

We applaud the President for his leadership in the present national war against poverty. What is more, we are sure the President realizes that the Economic Opportunity Act—imaginative and vastly important though it is—cannot, by itself, wipe out poverty.

We are encouraged by the broad coalition of citizens from church, civic, and civil rights groups and representatives from labor, business, social welfare, and education, and others who have joined together in the formation of the citizens crusade against poverty.

The AFL-CIO pledges to continue to seek action on all of the many battlefronts on which an effective war against want must be waged. We urge the Congress and the American people to join us in this effort.

Gas (Nonlethal) in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, five of my colleagues in the House and I joined in a letter to the President of the United States protesting the use of nonlethal gas in Vietnam and asking for the immediate halt to this practice. We took this step because we believe that even the use of nonlethal gas is so abhorrent to the world that its use is contrary to United States policy in southeast Asia and will operate contrary to our best interests in that part of the world.

Yesterday, the New York Times and the Washington Post similarly called for an end to the use of gas in Vietnam pointing out that regardless of any military considerations the use of gas, even of a nonlethal variety, will bring the moral condemnation of nations all over the world.

James Reston also writing in the New York Times yesterday outlined similar considerations and expressed the view that we may have reversed a trend toward support for American policy in southeast Asia.

I make these editorials and Mr. Reston's article available to my colleagues by inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not, will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and sensible and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

War, as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forgo the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are pre-

A1428

pared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "Benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very "benevolent" and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying "poison" gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard Fryklund, for example, recently reported on "the latest and best"—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep."

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more "benevolent" to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was dis-

covered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been demoralized, but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm fire bombs on Communist targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda was over. Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapacitating our own propagandists and not very benevolently either.

Conservation Retrenchment Would Endanger the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's struggle from the depths of the great depression our Government entered a partnership with our farmers—a compact, if you please—to conserve and rehabilitate and rebuild America's greatest resource—the soil—which was washing, blowing, eroding, and wasting away because our farmers were too poor to forestall or to check this tragic loss to our Nation.

April 27, 1965, will mark the 30th anniversary of the enactment by the Congress of an historic piece of legislation, Public Law 46, which declared soil and water conservation to be a national policy and created the Soil Conservation Service to give leadership to such a program.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, this program has wrought miracles, to assure us today and the generations to come that

the land will feed us and bless us, abundantly.

Our farmers embraced the conservation movement with amazing enthusiasm and eagerness. They have invested millions and billions of their own money, as their incomes would permit it, in works of soil and water improvement on their own farms. They have written for America a food insurance policy that will protect all Americans down through the years.

The money our Federal Government has expended on conservation, in cooperation with farmers, is the best investment this country has ever made.

In the light of all this, Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking development of our time that the administration now is proposing that the Government retreat, or withdraw, from its full participation and leadership in the conservation movement, and burden our farmers, who already are hard pressed, with larger costs for the protection of our most basic resources, a work which properly is the responsibility of all of us in towns and cities as well as upon our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Congress, the 74th, which passed the historymaking Conservation Act, without a dissenting vote, 30 years ago.

The Soil Conservation Service began its work on a demonstration basis under the direction of that great North Carolina conservationist—the father of soil conservation in America—the late Hugh Bennett.

So favorably was this program received that by June 30, 1936, the Soil Conservation Service had in operation 147 demonstration projects, averaging 25,000 to 30,000 acres each, 48 soil conservation nurseries for the development and production of new plants, 23 research stations, and 454 Civilian Conservation Corps camps. About 50,000 farmers had applied conservation measures to about 5 million acres. Thousands more sought the opportunity to participate in the program.

Experience had shown that this work would be more successful if locally managed and locally controlled—if the people themselves formulated their own programs and carried them out with Federal technical and other assistance.

Out of this came the idea of the local soil conservation district—now generally known as soil and water conservation districts—organized by the local people under State laws. Out of this came the unique partnership, entirely new in our history, wherein the Soil Conservation Service, a Federal technical agency created by the Congress, offered its assistance through these local districts in compliance with local needs and wishes, in conformity with State law, and in cooperation with local and State agencies and organizations.

In February 1937 President Franklin D. Roosevelt submitted to the Governors of all States a proposed State enabling act authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts specifically for soil and water conservation. Legislatures of 22 States passed such laws that year.

The first soil conservation district in the world was chartered August 4, 1937.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The German occupation of western Byelorussia during the First World War had provided an opportunity for the leaders of Byelorussia to express their love of freedom and their longings for independence. Although the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty between the Central Powers and Soviet Russia on March 3, 1918, ignored these aspirations for liberty, on March 25, 1918, the valiant national council proclaimed Byelorussia an independent republic.

The Byelorussian state had little chance to survive despite the bravery of its people. With the defeat of Germany, the Soviet Government repudiated the Brest treaties. Occupying all lands evacuated by the Germans, the Soviet proclaimed a Byelorussian S.S.R. on January 1, 1919. In the peace treaty between Poland and the Soviets in March 1921, Byelorussia was partitioned between its two large neighbors. The Second World War, however, ended with almost all of Byelorussia within the Soviet border.

Today the Soviets make some pretense of permitting a special status for the Byelorussian S.S.R. It is a signatory of the United Nations Charter and signed the partial test ban treaty in Moscow. We know, however, that the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated to the Soviet Communists and are among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, without basic political rights, without fundamental freedoms, and without the opportunity for self-determination.

We in the United States have a living link with the people of Byelorussia in thousands of Americans of Byelorussian ancestry and Byelorussian immigrants who have helped to build our country. As the leaders of the free world, we have a special responsibility to sustain the love of freedom among all people. As free men we must sympathize with all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied the priceless rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion.

Because of our devotion to freedom, it is fitting that we pause a moment in our daily work and join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and our countrymen of Byelorussian descent in celebrating this anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Byelorussian republic. We reaffirm that the maintenance and strengthening of freedom around the globe is the main tenet of American foreign policy, and that we have faith that freedom will ultimately win in the never-ending struggle against tyranny. We take this occasion to assure the Byelorussian people that they have

not been forgotten by the free world. We understand their plight, and sympathize with the hope for freedom that they must keep hidden from Communist sight. It is our wish that the day will come when all men may live in a world of peace and plenty and, above all, of freedom.

democratic precept—to view the issues from all sides.

We at Berkeley High School extend our hands in friendship from across the miles and welcome Wausau High School and Wisconsin into the Bellamy Award family.

**Berkeley High School of California
Salutes Wausau High School of
Wisconsin**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last year when Wausau High School of Wisconsin received the 23d Annual Bellamy Award, Phil Omi of Berkeley High School in California extended that school's greetings and best wishes.

I am enclosing a copy of Mr. Omi's remarks on behalf of the students of Berkeley High, which received the Bellamy Award in 1959, for our colleagues' information and interest.

The remarks follow:

PHIL OMI, BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL, BERKELEY, CALIF.

On October 12, 1959, Berkeley High School, adjacent to the renowned University of California campus, was the proud recipient of the Bellamy Award. Although Berkeley High is now in a secondary role, it is just as proud today, as it congratulates Wausau High School for great achievements, as it was in 1959.

Berkeley High School is proud of its traditions, achievements, and reputation. From a meager beginning in 1880 with 7 pupils, it has grown to over 3,200. In 1884, Berkeley became the first accredited high school in the State of California.

Being the only public high school in Berkeley, my school represents a cross section of the community both socially and economically. Thus it became a meeting place for the intermingling of varying ideas and cultures of many races. Varied conditions warrant particular attention. For this reason, a true democratic spirit is reasonably feasible at Berkeley. Courses in Russian, semantics, and oriental history are offered for those who seek a new experience or a special challenge.

We at Berkeley High find ourselves united throughout our daily school lives. One method for developing unity is our widely known daily newspaper, the Jacket, which features an open-forum column where all can express their views on any matter. An extensive educational program, after school activities, and excellent athletic teams bind us together in our role as students enjoying a wholesome high school education.

One highlight of this past semester has been the emergence of school government in the community spotlight. With the city split with the issues of our time, our school's student governing body, the board of control, has taken it upon itself to voice a stand on the issues. Also, we have gotten the board of education to pass a bill, making it possible to hear controversial speakers on campus. This enables all to follow a basic

Gas in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we recently learned from newspaper reports that chemical warfare is being used in Vietnam. This is the first time the United States has been involved in the combat use of gas since World War I. Editorials in yesterday's New York Times and Washington Post and James Reston's column in the New York Times reflect the reaction of many Americans to this revelation. I urge my colleagues to read the following:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old, and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and sensible and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

"War," as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells, and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

March 26, 1965

A1434

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 24, 1965]

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forego the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are prepared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very benevolent and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying "poison" gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent

of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard Fryklund, for example, recently reported on "the latest and best"—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep."

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more benevolent to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been "demoralized" but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm fire bombs on Communist targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda over Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapacitating our own propagandists, and not very benevolently either.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War many submerged and almost lost nationality groups regained their freedom and attained sovereign and independent status. That was one of the most welcome results of a terrible and most destructive war. Subject nationalities of once powerful but now crumbling empires threw off the yoke of their oppressors and proclaimed their freedom. The Byelorussian people, who had been held down under the Russian czars for centuries, proclaimed their national independence on March 25, 47 years ago.

The people of Byelorussia had their own sovereign, independent state before the rise of the Russian Empire. Then, centuries ago, they were overwhelmed by the Russians, lost their independence and suffered under the czarist autocracy of Russia. During the long period under the czars, they carefully guarded their national traditions and their heritage, never abandoning hope for a chance to regain their national freedom. They therefore seized upon the welcome opportunity provided by the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. They established their own democratic form of government in their historic capital city, Minsk; and in the short time allotted to them, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy their richly deserved reward for long. In December of that same year the Russian Bolsheviks expanded the area under their control. The Red Army overran Byelorussia, which was annexed by the Soviet Union, with some 10 million Byelorussians as helpless victims.

Since then Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of their detested Communist overlords. Their lives are rigidly regimented and their labor is ruthlessly exploited. Their movements and behavior are closely watched by the ubiquitous state police, and they are forced to work for the Moscow-controlled Communist state. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments among them, including all hope of freedom for Byelorussia.

Fortunately, even under these almost unbearable conditions, the liberty-loving Byelorussians still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. In view of their steadfast dedication to these noble ideals, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will have their reward in freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence I wish the Byelorussian people fortitude and forbearance in their struggle against totalitarian tyranny.

March 26, 1965

neutrals. As witness to this grim fact, we present Pakistan.

Under President Mohammed Ayub Khan, Pakistan was one of our strongest supporters in the cold war. He took Pakistan into the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), an association of nations formed in 1954 to aid member countries in event of external military attack. SEATO is directed against any Red aggression that might develop. Ayub Khan also brought Pakistan into North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a pact aimed at the threat of Communist territorial aggression in Europe. He also signed bilateral mutual defense as well as trade, friendship, and cooperation agreements with the United States. Pakistan appeared to be the core of anti-Communist defense in its part of the world. Our military planes used Pakistan bases. We poured in military aid to the extent of \$4 billion.

During that same period the United States was giving massive aid to India, in exchange for which we received neutralism. We also received considerable lecturing from the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who petulantly scolded us for our materialism and other alleged offenses against good form. Nehru's intellectual scorn for materialism never became so marked that he turned down any of our aid, needless to relate.

In any event our continued aid to India, with which Pakistan has a number of unsolved problems, has alienated Pakistan. Ayub Khan this month received a hero's welcome in Peiping. Agreements on trade, cultural activities, air travel, etc., have brought Pakistan and Red China closer together. What has happened is that Ayub Khan figured that if India can make hay playing a neutralist role, why not Pakistan? Frankly, we can hardly blame him. If you can benefit as much by taking neither side in a dangerous contest it isn't human nature to take sides. Our foreign policy, which doesn't distinguish friends from neutrals, or even from enemies, has had its inevitable result. A friendly nation is turning neutralist.

Perhaps it's time for the State Department to take one of its periodic agonizing reappraisals of foreign policy. We ought to examine the practical merits, as well as the morality, of a policy which allows massive aid to nations that express no choice between countries ruled by free men and those ruled by gangsters. Perhaps any nation that can't make up its mind between these two sides doesn't deserve another dime of the American taxpayers' hard-earned dough.

The Precious Rights at Stake in Ignoring the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Congress is being asked to help destroy a precious system of government which has given greater opportunity and a better way of life to more people than any other system ever devised by man. Under pressure of demonstrations, threats of mob violence and in submission to the demands of the agitators of lawlessness, the President is asking for a voting rights bill which surely will destroy this Republic as it has functioned for more than 180 years. When so much is at stake, should we not take time for at

least reasonable debate of the voting rights bill and decide upon it in an atmosphere of cool calm rather than in the heat of the national hysteria of the moment?

As a part of these remarks I would like to call your attention to the following column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1965.

VOTING BILL PILES WRONG ON WRONG

With so many interesting and pleasant things to write about—spring, Julie Andrews, Whitey Ford's arm—it is a pity, truly it is, to have to beg once again for a calm and thoughtful look at President Johnson's Voting Rights Act of 1965. Yet this is a bad bill—bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved—and the lighter topics can wait, if Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., can't.

This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values.

Under our federal system, the power to fix qualifications for voting clearly is lodged with the States. Article VIII, section 2, of the Constitution spells it out:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In the whole of the Constitution, no more explicit provision can be found.

Time after time, the Supreme Court itself has emphasized this reservation of power to the States. Just 6 years ago this spring, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the High Court expressly reaffirmed an unbroken series of opinions to this effect:

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the rights of suffrage may be exercised, absent, of course, the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. * * * The right of suffrage is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory. * * * We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record, are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. * * *"

In the particular context of Johnson's bill we should note carefully what this unanimous Court went on to say. "The ability to read and write likewise has the relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show. * * * In our society, where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise."

In the final paragraph of this 1959 opinion, the Supreme Court condemned those trumped-up "literacy tests" that have been employed in some cases as "a device to make racial discrimination easy." But no such charge could be fairly brought against North Carolina's requirement that a prospective voter "be able to read and write any section of the constitution of North Carolina in the English language."

"That seems to us," said the Court, "to be one fair way of determining whether a person is literate, not a calculated scheme to lay a trap for the citizen."

This whole body of long-established law

would be violated by the President's bill. This is a bill to establish, by Federal law, new "qualifications for voting" in certain States. The system contemplated under this bill would not be limited to registering those Negroes who might have been denied the franchise by reason of their race. The provisions would apply to "any person." Neither would the bill apply to Federal elections only; it would apply, on its own terms, to "any Federal, State, or local election." Section 3(A) of the bill spells this out. In the half a dozen affected States, "No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device." In section 3(B), "test or device" is defined to mean any requirement that a prospective voter "(1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character."

In brief, the bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved.

It is said that no fewer than 80 Senators, including some good and able men, are ready to howl their approval of this destructive scheme. To say that "Alabama has brought this on herself" is both wrong and irrelevant. This bill is the work of Johnson and the Congress. On them lies the burden of piling wrong upon wrong. And they do it, incredibly, in the name of "rights."

Lebanon Editor Appraises Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, William A. Smith, managing editor of the Granite State Free Press in Lebanon, N.H., recently wrote an editorial appraising the position of the United States with respect to the situation in Vietnam. It is a thoughtful and perceptive commentary by a distinguished editor of New Hampshire and I offer it for the RECORD for the consideration of Members:

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

Someone has described politics as "the art of the possible." In an imperfect world we must face the fact that there is a difference between what one wants to do and what, under factual circumstances, one can do. In the Vietnam crisis it is evident that the United States faces discouraging alternatives. We can withdraw like a "rubber tiger," or we can keep on like a "rubber tiger" unless we risk an all-out war.

We cannot claim that the Government of South Vietnam is asking for our help. All the present evidence, words, and actions by the Vietnamese people suggest the opposite is true. The terrain favors the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong, and we have been unable to protect ourselves or the people of South Vietnam. Our purely retaliatory moves, such as bombings of North Vietnam, carry other labels by most of the world, and especially by the Communist world. We have had only token help, financially and otherwise, from the rest of the free world.

Perhaps our leaders should make a further study of "The Art of the Possible." We have

A1466

been told what President Johnson wants to do—to negotiate from a position of strength—but we have not been told what can be done.

There are two questions that continue to puzzle us. First, why can't we turn this problem over to the United Nations, not that such action would solve the problem in Vietnam, but it would take us off the hook.

A second question is, Why do we assume that the Vietcong, or Red China, or Russia is capable of ruling all of Asia? Certainly the Western Powers have demonstrated that they cannot control even a small part. Who thinks that even the Red Chinese can control the vast area of Asia without a common language, without modern communications, without modern roads, and without the education needed for intelligent self-government? It is true that ruthless central government could liquidate millions of any opposition, but there will always be many millions left in a country that places small value on the life of an individual. Russia is already realizing the difficulties of uniting its satellites into any semblance of unity. Sometimes we think that the Red Chinese would have plenty of problems if they were handed the entire mess on a silver platter.

Greek Independence

SPEECH
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, it is highly appropriate that we should pay fitting tribute of congratulation, gratitude, and admiration to the Greek Nation and the infinitely great Greek people both at home and abroad.

Little we say could adequately express the feelings of affection and pride we have for our Greek-American friends and neighbors for their tremendous contributions of superb citizenship, marvelous achievements for our free way of life and the warmth of their friendship and the depth and inspiration of their patriotism. Surely, in these great respects, no other people in this or any other country could possibly excel them.

And there is another thought which inevitably prompts our wonder, pride, esteem, and appreciation in unlimited and glowing terms today, and that is the glory of the Greek heritage and the great debt which we share in common with all other civilized nations for the truly indescribable benefits and blessings conferred by that epochal heritage upon all mankind.

Hellenism is more than a nationality, more than a racial entity, more than a passing phase of contemporary life. It is a great, ancient, deeply entrenched world culture infusing virtually every type of civilization in the world, an influence for good and beauty and the "golden mean" that touches profoundly into many ways of life, particularly those like our own that are animated primarily by full recognition of the worth and dignity of individual man and rest upon the freedom and moral authenticity of the individual human being.

The cult of the beautiful, the supremacy of moral and familial values, the dialog of personal liberty and the exaltation of the human spirit which the ancient Greeks brought forth and gave to the world form, in truth, the very basis of our philosophy and practice of ordered free government and the modes and customs of our everyday life.

I could go on and on to recite the wonders of Greek law and culture, Greek art, literature, Greek sculpture, philosophy, science, mathematics, democracy and general culture and the immortal contributions of the Greeks to us and to world civilization.

But I could talk for many hours and days and never fully encompass the wide range, deep impact and most significant effects of Greek contributions to this great country of ours and to many other great countries, not only in this generation, but throughout the long channels of history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Greeks of antiquity and of the present-day world. I am proud and grateful for what they have done for mankind, for America, for all our people, and for our Nation.

And I am proud of their warm, inspiring friendship and personal loyalty which means so much to me. How fortunate we are to have them as great, constructive forces in our America.

And how fortunate the world is to have such a great people, wedded to all the finest principles of freedom, democracy and justice which their ancestors did so much to fashion and promulgate to the world, as neighbors, as friends and as steadfast fellow workers in the protection and enrichment of that freedom.

How fortunate we all are that the glorious Greeks are with us. May they long endure to shed their light and their warmth on struggling humanity and honor and sustain us with their devoted friendship.

Greek Independence Day

SPEECH
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and swore to win freedom or die in the attempt. On this anniversary occasion it is becoming that we here in the Congress of the United States should review and give expression to our great and everlasting debt to ancient and to modern Greece and the people of Hellenic blood. After our own Revolution the Greeks were the first nation of Europe to throw off an alien yoke and fight for national freedom. While our own freedom may have been a source of inspiration to the Greeks, we, in turn, derived from Greek history much guidance.

Alexander Hamilton, while agreeing that a federal government should be an association of independent communities,

argued for a strong central government. He said:

Theory is in this case fully confirmed by experience. The amphictyonic council had, it would seem, ample powers for general purposes. It had in particular, the power of fining and using force against delinquent members. What was the consequence? Their decrees were mere signals of war. The Phocian war is a striking example of it. Philip, at length, taking advantage of their disunion and insinuating himself into their councils, made himself master of their fortunes.

Madison, also a student of the history of Greece, warned that no foreign power should ever be permitted to deal with separate states. He pointed out that the Kings of Persia and Philip of Macedon through intrigues with the amphictyonic confederates, destroyed their league.

Madison's Journal, and other notes and journals of the Constitution, are filled with references to the experiences of the Greek cities and lessons derived from their mistakes which were applied by Madison and Hamilton to our own situation and to our profit.

Not only is Greek history interwoven with our Constitution, both through philosophy and warning against errors, Greek philosophy is discernible in our political science. In his Politics Aristotle uses the term "politics" meaning "citizens."

The early Athenian Government gave people freedom of thought, speech and action. Its laws were designed to benefit all citizens. Their early experiment with democracy came nearer to providing justice for all citizens than any form devised before or since that time.

In the field of science, Hippocrates is known as the "father of medicine." His code of medical ethics is expressed in the pledge:

With purity and holiness, I will pass my life and practice my art. Into whatever houses I enter, I will go there for the benefit of the sick and will abstain from every injurious act and corruption. Whatever in my professional practice—or even, not in connection with it—I see or hear in the lives of men which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will not divulge. While I keep this oath unviolated, may it be granted me to enjoy life and the practice of the art, always respected among men, but should I break or violate the oath, may the reverse be my lot.

This oath is still subscribed to by those who practice medicine. It is not surprising that medicine made great strides under the leadership of Hippocrates. He recognized the value of keeping and studying case records.

One of the most noted of Greek scientists was Aristotle, who wrote on such subjects as physics and biology. He explained the use of the lever a hundred years before Archimedes was born.

Two Greek scientists, Leucippus and Democritus, advanced the atomic theory.

John Stuart Mill wrote:

The Greeks are the most remarkable people who have yet existed * * *. They were the beginners of everything, Christianity excepted, of which the modern world makes its boast * * *. They were the first people who had a historical literature; as perfect of its kind * * * as their oratory, their sculpture, and their architecture. They were the founders of mathematics, of physics, of