

made as provided in section 406 of this part, finds them to have been unjust and unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or unduly prejudicial."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 387), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

INTRODUCTION

S. 1727 contains provisions to strengthen enforcement efforts against illegal carriage and to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates.

NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Illegal transportation is a major problem requiring action by Congress. Illegal transportation is big business. The Interstate Commerce Commission, on the basis of road checks in 42 States, has estimated that it involves a minimum of \$500 million a year. Other experts feel the cost of illegal transportation is even higher, amounting to from \$1 to \$5 billion a year. These experts base this higher estimate on the obvious shortcomings of the 42 State road checks in which many of the illegal carriers escaped detection.

While the annual cost of a billion dollars or more is a direct measure of the revenue lost by the regulated carriers, both truckers and railroads, to illegal transportation, the problem is more serious than that. The loss is serious in terms of the common carrier industry because these carriers are the backbone of our national transportation industry. These regulated carriers are of crucial importance because of their public interest obligation to serve all of the public, in virtually every community in America, in good weather and in bad, and in good times and in bad. Without common carriers with a universal obligation to serve, transportation would quickly deteriorate into a means of promoting the economic activity of a few. The public interest requires that we protect these carriers against the abuses of illegal carriers who assume no public responsibility.

The presence of highway poachers also penalizes the shipper, the community, and the public more directly. The illegal operator often evades tax laws as well as transportation laws, and the law abiding must pay the difference. The public also pays more for goods, because freight moved illegally takes revenues from the lawful common carriers, causing their rates to be raised to pay the fixed operating costs of labor, maintenance, and equipment. Furthermore, the evidence to date indicates that illegal truckers are far more prone to highway accidents than are the lawful operators.

This problem has been called the "gray area" of transportation. This is a misnomer. The problem is black and not gray. It arises from illegal transportation, although such illegal operations are frequently masked under various disguises and facades to give them the appearance of legality.

Combating illegal carriage is not an easy task, and even with new enforcement tools, the illegal operator will not be driven off the highways. S. 1727 would muster new weapons in this legal fight against unlawful carriage. It would increase the penalties for unlawful transportation activities, ease some of the legal burdens which handicap the enforcement efforts of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and provide new means of legal recourse for those damaged by illegal operations. Furthermore, S. 1727 would clear the way for improved enforcement cooperation between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various State commissions.

Federal-State cooperation, with primary

emphasis on State action, is a sound and effective means of proceeding. The States share with the Federal Government an equal interest in fighting illegal carriage. Only a cooperative, coordinated enforcement effort can end illegal carriage.

Section 1 of S. 1727 would authorize the ICC to enter into cooperative agreements with the States to enforce Federal and State regulations concerning highway transportation. The rapid growth of communication between the ICC and the States would improve enforcement. Section 2 of S. 1727 would assist in the complete implementation by the States of existing operating authority registration statutes. While multi-state carriers could comply with uniform standards of registration in a relatively simple operation, the illegal interstate carrier could be subject to State penalties for failure to register.

The approach embodied in S. 1727 has won solid and widespread support from virtually all segments of our highly competitive transportation system. S. 1727 is supported by, among others, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the Transportation Association of America, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Trucking Association, the Association of American Railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Department of Commerce.

The enactment of S. 1727 would be an effective, positive step toward ending the problem of illegal transportation, and thereby strengthening and improving our national transportation system.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Dr. Albert H. Moseman, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Fe *Tom Mansfield*
VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at first glance, it seems logical to say, there are missile sites around the Hanoi-Haiphong complex; we are fighting North Vietnamese; we have planes and missiles that can reach the sites and destroy them. Go ahead and bomb. Then there will be no more missile sites. Indeed, one might add, why not go the whole hog and use nuclear bombs to make doubly sure there will be no more missile sites in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. That, too, may have a certain logic.

But on second glance, it is also to be noted that there are missile sites in China and Russia and the Chinese and Russians are helping the North Vietnamese who are helping the Vietcong in the South where Americans are fighting on the ground. Our planes and missiles can reach those more distant targets. Why not go ahead and bomb them too, with or without nuclear weapons? That has, in some ways, a greater logic because the Russian missile sites are a far greater threat than those clustered in the Hanoi-Haiphong complex. The Russian sites are zeroed in on the United States itself, whereas those in North Vietnam, so far as I am aware, cannot even reach our forces in South Vietnam and are not, in themselves, causing any casualties among American forces in Vietnam. The Hanoi-Haiphong missile sites becomes a threat to our forces, in short, only if it is intended to spread the war further and change its nature by massive air attacks on the civilian populations of the Hanoi-Haiphong complex, for then, presumably the sites would be used against our planes. They become a threat, in short, if it is intended to deepen and expand the war.

If that is what is wanted, then the proposal makes sense. But I do not believe it was offered in that sense. As I understand it, the proposal was offered as a war-shortener, as an American casualty reducer, and in that sense, it does not make sense. On the contrary, if it were followed it is more likely, by raising the level of the conflict another notch, to

bring on larger American casualties and a much broader and deeper U.S. involvement in Asia. It may be that it will come to that. Circumstances may eventually compel such an action. But let there be no illusion about what the proposal implies. And speaking for myself I cannot understand the urgency in some quarters—the anxiety to speed up the process of a deeper American involvement which can only induce greater American casualties in this Asian war.

But if that is what is sought, this probable consequence of the proposal ought to be recognized outright. Otherwise the proposal is misleading and hardly constructive in its oversimplification of a complex problem. If for no other reason, it tends to stimulate false hopes and unwarranted expectation in this Nation. It implies great results at not too painful a cost.

Simple logic is not often as simple as it seems at first glance in critical international situations such as Vietnam. This situation lies in the shadows of all-out world conflict. The effort is being made by the President, in the interests of this Nation as well as the world, to prevent such a conflict. And I would hope that those who mount the civilian ramparts and cry "Charge!" would bear that in mind.

The proposal which prompted this statement was, undoubtedly, intended to be helpful to the President, for, as stated by the distinguished minority leader of the House on July 1:

Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest.

Whatever its intention, however, the issue raised by this undoubtedly innocent and nonpolitical proposal is far larger than whether to bomb or not bomb certain missile sites in the Hanoi-Haiphong complex. From an armchair, it is possible to outline a military strategy in an isolated situation of this kind and then pass on to other problems while the consequences unfold in a deepening crisis. The President does not have that luxury. He must continue to live every minute with the ticking clock of an overwhelming catastrophe, and it is brought closer to midnight with each proposal of this kind, if it is followed, whether it originates here or in Peiping or Moscow or wherever. The fact is that the President cannot afford to be either armchair general or politician in a situation of this kind. He can only be President. He cannot make a decision without a continuing awareness of other decisions which may flow from it. He cannot speak "only for himself." He cannot speak even for his party alone. In each decision, he speaks for the entire Nation. This is one reality which all of us ought to bear in mind at all times if we wish debate on this most difficult and delicate situation to be helpful.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this Nation is in trouble. So is the cause of freedom. The clouds on the horizon are darkening, and growing larger. The American people support the President of the United States. No defense needs to be made for the comments uttered by our colleague in the House of Repre-

sentatives, who is the leader of the Republican minority there. He has demonstrated his patriotism time and time again. I fully associate myself with his comments as quoted a moment ago by the majority leader. Although I have no right to do so, I believe I may speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I approve completely the statement attributed just now to our colleague in the House of Representatives. In the present crisis, the Republican Party acts as a group of Americans dedicated to the security of the American people and to the cause of world peace.

We enjoy free debate in this country; and any time any Senator—on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle—wishes to rise and make a comment criticizing the President of the United States, he has a right to do so. Anytime any Member of the Congress or any citizen of this country wishes to rise and tell the President of the United States what he believes ought specifically to be done in South Vietnam or North Vietnam, he has a right to do so.

I have listened in this Chamber on more than one occasion to some of our colleagues—perhaps I may be excused for saying that they do not sit on this side of the aisle—denouncing the policy of the Government of the United States in Indochina.

I repeat on this occasion that the cause of freedom is in trouble. Grave and dark days are ahead. We passionately pray for peace. Speaking for myself, I completely approve our earnest exertions to try to find a way by which unconditional talk may come about. At the moment, the outlook is somewhat bleak. The newspapers have told us how the Red Chinese and the Ho Chi Minh regime both have rudely and brusquely shunted aside U Thant's suggestion for discussion.

Speaking for myself, I earnestly approve what Dean Rusk said several weeks ago: that all that is necessary for peace in southeast Asia is for people to leave their neighbors alone.

I do not consider that I am qualified to give any advice on military undertakings in the defense of South Vietnam by the Government of the United States. I am a layman; I am a U.S. Senator; I am not a military expert. What I did, and what every other Member of the U.S. Senate, with two exceptions, did, was to approve, last August, a resolution clothing the President of the United States with specific authority to take such action as he deemed appropriate with respect to the gathering storm. I take it that that resolution represents today, as it did last year, the earnest judgment of the representatives of the people, and of the people of the United States themselves, with respect to the responsibilities of the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief. It is our responsibility to let the people of the world know that he discharges that responsibility in time of crisis with the approval of the American people. He will answer to the American people for his conduct in accordance with the constitutional processes. Meanwhile, I am proud that my fellow Republicans

in the House and Senate support the action of this Government in defense of peace and freedom in southeast Asia.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF SUBGRADE SMALL DIAMOND DIES AND NONSTOCKPILE GRADE BISMUTH ALLOYS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice to be published in the Federal Register, of the proposed disposition of diamond dies and bismuth alloys held in the national stockpile which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"H. RES. 603

"Resolution recognizing the need for summer employment for Oklahoma high school and college students—noting the many advantages derived by providing such gainful employment—requesting the Oklahoma State Employment Security Commission and the Oklahoma State Personnel Board to distribute information and material relating to this resolution to Oklahoma employers and personnel officers—directing journal entries—and directing distribution of this resolution

"Whereas thousands of Oklahoma high school and college students have recently completed another academic school year; and

"Whereas a vital and integral part of their education consists of an understanding of the business community and employer-employee relations; and

"Whereas innumerable advantages are derived by both employer and student-employee in providing gainful summer employment to these students; and

"Whereas it is a matter of economic necessity for many of our outstanding high school and college students to secure summer employment in order to continue their education; and

"Whereas a concerted effort on the part of all city, county, and State agencies and private enterprises to find meaningful summer employment for our high school and college students would be in the best interests of the welfare of the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recognized the need for finding summer employment for American students and has initiated similar requests for aid in securing such employment; and

"Whereas it is both fitting and proper that the House of Representatives of the 30th session of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma take official notice of the needs for providing summer employment to students and take action toward the accomplishment of this objective: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 30th session of the Oklahoma Legislature:

"SECTION 1. That the Oklahoma State Employment Security Commission and the Oklahoma State Personnel Board are hereby requested to distribute information and material to all city, county, and State agencies and private enterprises suggesting the

July 8, 1965

15379

lution 27A-65-17, to add to line 33: "Be it further resolved, To seek legislation to limit the use of eavesdropping equipment within any industry on their employees while they are performing their respective jobs" [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. I take by the response that this amendment is seconded. Delegate Hart may speak on her amendment for 5 minutes.

Delegate HART. We, in the traffic department are well acquainted with the use of monitoring equipment in the central offices in the Bell System. The use of such equipment has resulted in discharges, suspensions, and coercion. Only through law can it be curbed effectively. The Bell System is a perfect example of being able to use monitoring equipment excessively. The official observing officers in the California Traffic Department are CWA members doing observing for the Federal reports that have to go in on service. But the company goes beyond this and includes monitoring by central office management and supervising operators which causes constant harassment and unrest among the traffic employees. It is a moral issue.

We do not live in a police state, so why should we have to work in a police state?

I urge you to support this amendment. [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. On microphone No. 3, Delegate Watson, local 9430.

Delegate JEAN WATSON (local 9430). Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I rise to support this amendment. This is a situation which involves all of our operators across the Nation. This is a tremendous weapon which the company has to use against our CWA traffic girls, which causes a great strain on our girls, tremendous harassment.

This monitoring is said to be needed by the company to offer good service to the public. We maintain the device is not used for this purpose only, but is used as evidence for disciplinary actions against our girls.

I urge you to support this amendment. [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. On microphone No. 3, Delegate Lawson, local 9410.

Delegate ERMA LAWSON (local 9410). Thank you. Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: I am standing here to ask for your support on the amendment because eavesdropping is a step backward. We, delegates of the Communications Workers of America, know the complex types of electronic equipment on the market today and how easy it is to eavesdrop on someone's conversation with this equipment. So I ask this convention to pass this amendment.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. On microphone No. 3, Delegate Friday, local 9410.

Delegate JACK FRIDAY (local 9410). Mr. President and delegates, I rise in support of this amendment. Coming from a metropolitan local, 50 percent of our members are in the traffic department, toll, and information operators.

As local president, I am consistently having problems with the Pacific Telephone Co. relating to excessive observations—what is called on the box monitoring. The company is harassing the girls by listening in and giving them extensive tests to the point that they are actually being affected in their day-to-day work. [Applause.]

I urge this convention to adopt this amendment. President Beirne is well aware of this problem. He recently testified before a congressional committee with regard to these tactics.

Now it is becoming more and more apparent in the day-to-day working conditions of our traffic members. I urge you to adopt this amendment. Thank you. [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. Microphone No. 3, Delegate Wooten, local 6222.

Delegate LUCILLE WOOTEN (local 6222, Houston, Tex.). Mr. Chairman and delegates, I ask that you support this amendment because it is not only common in traffic, but I would want you to be aware that it is very prevalent in commercial.

In the office where I work there are five different locations where people can listen in on our conversations. This is done primarily for discipline reasons.

In addition to that, in our downtown office, which is about 10 miles from my office, they can listen to us. I understand that they can even listen to St. Louis. In my office alone there are 2 rooms where as many as 12 people can listen to 1 conversation.

This, I think, is carrying it a bit far and isn't necessary to give the customers good service. Our privacy with the customer should be honored.

Thank you. [Applause.]

President BEIRNE. Anything further on the question? Are you ready for the question?

The question is on an amendment proposed by Delegate Hart: "Be it further resolved, To seek legislation to limit the use of eavesdropping equipment within any industry on their employees while they are performing their respective jobs."

All those in favor of the amendment signify by raising their right hand. Down hands. Opposed by like sign. It is adopted. [Applause.]

On resolution 17 as amended, the motion is to adopt. On the question. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion to adopt resolution 17 as amended signify by raising their right hand. Down hands. Opposed by like sign. It is adopted. [Applause.]

While calling forward the Appeals Committee, I would—now that you have acted on resolution 17—like to make one or two observations, if I may.

Monitoring of employees, at least in the Bell System, is not restricted to traffic. Monitoring takes place in commercial, in accounting, and especially in plant. Having adopted your resolution 17, one matter which may not have been spelled out in there, should be suggested; namely, that when you get home, not only let the foreman, or supervisor, or acting vice president or assistant vice president, or whomever in the telephone company, know of your views, but let your Congressman and let your Senator know.

Part of my testimony, and the real concern in this area is that there is so much apathy in America, there are so many freedoms being invaded that we take these things as a joke, thinking because it is the next guy, or the person next door, or the alleged crook who is being shadowed by the electronic devices, that it is funny. It does not affect us because we are good law-abiding citizens.

Well, looking at it that way means that the men who fought in 1776 to say "you cannot come in my front door without a warrant"—their revolution will have been in vain.

I would urge all of you to read the book by Orwell, entitled "1984," and see the pattern developing now that leads toward "Big Brother," and then get aroused and then get mad, and then get after the governmental leaders to say, "Cut this stuff out," for the use of these devices corrupts the person using them.

A good, decent supervisor in a telephone company can be corrupted by the octopus. He gets to use it so much by saying, "I have got it, and I have a bad one here, so I will listen on this one all the time. I will keep a record" and then do as they did in Michigan after 3 months to suspend and later fire the girl, because they kept the book.

It corrupts the person using it as well as corrupting our freedom.

Write to your Congressmen and Senators. Send it to Long in Missouri. He is standing there all alone, trying to arouse the public on this subject. He can only reach them when he has a picture of an olive in a martini glass. The reaction is funny. Can you imagine that? But the impact of that, the real meaning escapes us for that can be applied against us.

One of the great planks of the American Revolution was the preservation of privacy. [Applause.] It was when the Redcoats came in the door, searching, that this Revolution really started.

Poor Senator LONG—I should not say it that way—courageous Senator LONG of Missouri is standing there all alone, trying to get the public to get aroused about this thing, and they are not.

So you see, under our resolution 17, which you have adopted, you have an obligation. Do not forget it when you go away. Do not listen attentively now, and when you get home get all tied up with the kids, the wife, and the job, and the park, and the overtime and all that stuff, and you forget to write a single letter.

Get mad at that stuff, because this is basic to the preservation of our institutions in America. This is basic to the preservation of our freedoms. [Applause.]

PARENT PLEADS FOR GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the fight against Communist aggression is the fight against ignorance. If this Nation cannot provide an opportunity for the men and women who have fought the physical fight against the threat of communism to further advance their educations we cannot expect to remain strong in future years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter in support of enactment of the cold war GI education bill (S. 9) be printed at this point in the RECORD. The letter is from Mr. Alfred L. Hill, 5509 Mapleleaf Drive, Austin, Tex., and is dated July 3, 1965.

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

AUSTIN, TEX.,
July 3, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Our country is now waging a war in Vietnam and this is a war which will evidently not be concluded without great cost both in materials and in human life. The war is limited compared with some in which Americans have participated, the Korean war being one in which some 60,000 members of the Armed Forces paid the supreme price.

Our commitments are such that we cannot pull out of Vietnam. We must not give in to the Communists because we know they will take the maximum with the minimum of cost to them. We cannot compromise with the Communists because they only understand force.

I served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, being assigned to Saipan, Marianas Island for more than a year. I am proud that I was able to serve my country in this respect because I, like most men, have a greater appreciation for my country having sacrificed to support it.

I am writing you because I have a son, Jason D. Hill who is assigned to the U.S. Army 173d Airborne Brigade, now holding forth in a courageous manner in Vietnam. My request is simple; I want our Govern-

ment to pass what may be similar to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which would enable the men who serve in Vietnam to go to college or university at the expense of our Government. This it appears is a responsibility our country owes to the men who risk their lives daily to protect us. I hope you will use your influence to bring about passage of such a bill. Now is the time to pass a measure such as this because after a crisis has passed the public either forgets or becomes apathetic about their debts.

I am principal of the Pecan Springs Elementary School in Austin. I have a great appreciation for the value of an education. My son Jason, dropped out of Southwest State College in San Marcos while enrolled as a freshman. I attribute this dropping out to the tensions of our times. I believe he will want to return to college when his military obligations are fulfilled, provided he returns with his present good health and confident spirit.

I am asking this request to President Johnson and will also write Senator Tower and Representative PICKLE.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED L. HILL.

Fe
L.B.J.'S IMPRESSIVE PEACE RECORD
IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the past several weeks a small number of our fellow citizens have seen fit to comment adversely upon the policy of this Government in Vietnam. The freedom to criticize the policies of their Government is the inherent right of every American. The President himself has said that he welcomes the constructive comments of all Americans.

But, Mr. President, an examination of the substance of that policy is one thing, a failure to recognize the reasoned path leading to such a policy is another. I will never understand how the small but vocal group of Americans opposed to the President's policy in Vietnam can ignore realities. The President of the United States, the man with whom they purport to disagree, is exerting every effort imaginable to secure peace in southeast Asia; peace with honor.

At every conceivable juncture the President has presented peaceful solutions to the situation in Vietnam. He never lets an opportunity pass without reminding the Communist leaders that he is willing to discuss peace at any time. He uses all the varied methods at his disposal to communicate the reasonable and honorable position of this Government to the Communists. In short, the President is maintaining a constant flow of alternatives to armed conflict in Vietnam. Those who do not accept the President's refusal to abdicate Vietnam to the Communists might well examine his detailed efforts to bring about a peaceful solution.

Mr. President, the noted columnist, David Lawrence, has outlined the truly monumental efforts of the President to effect an honorable peace in Vietnam. The various groups opposing the President's firm stand should first examine the real facts in this connection.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the column in the RECORD.

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

APPEALS FOR PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a syndicated column, not an editorial. The views are those of the writer.)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has five times in recent days addressed a direct appeal to the people of the Soviet Union to join with the American people not only in a mission of peace but in sharing the economic fruits of a better life for mankind.

While speaking, for instance, at the graduation exercises of Catholic University in Washington on June 6, the President appealed to the leaders as well as to the people of the Communist countries. He said:

"Come now, let us reason together. Our door is unlatched. Our table is set. We are ready—we believe mankind is ready with us."

But the appeals have not been answered. Mr. Johnson, evidently conscious of the silence in the Communist world, mentioned this publicly on June 8. At a ceremonial signing of a bill establishing a National Institute for the Deaf, he said:

"Sometimes it seems that deafness is not simply an affliction of individuals, but an affliction of nations as well."

The President at the same time pointed out that, while communications in space are instantaneous, communications among nations have not kept pace. As a matter of fact, communication between peoples is one of the most challenging problems that face the world today. On April 22 this correspondent wrote in one of his dispatches:

"Oddly enough, the Western countries have not realized that their most powerful weapon today involves communication—to penetrate the countries which have totalitarian governments and to make the people realize how much better their lives would be if they had some of the conveniences and advantages enjoyed by the people in the free countries."

"Millions of dollars are spent annually by Western countries to broadcast news of political speeches or highbrow arguments about ideological questions, but the simple facts of life are not hammered home to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The contrast between the life of the average citizen in Britain or France or West Germany or the United States and the life of the people in the Soviet Union has not been thoroughly publicized to points behind the Iron Curtain."

Mr. Johnson has since given plain hints that the United States would be willing to join in economic ventures which would truly benefit the people of the Soviet Union if they had the kind of government that was not a menace to world peace.

Many persons will wonder whether this will ever get through to the Soviet people. But the facts are that, when a President of the United States speaks, the radio carries the message everywhere and public discussion is thereby initiated. It is by word-of-mouth communication that messages of importance to every nation are eventually conveyed to the people even behind the Iron Curtain.

Some of the things that Mr. Johnson has said now should be broadcast repeatedly by the U.S. Information Agency. Excerpts from his speeches need to be read and reread in the Soviet Foreign Office. For instance, President Johnson said June 3 in Chicago:

"No true Soviet interest is going to be served by the support of aggression or subversion anywhere in the world. We of the United States of America stand ready tonight as always to go with you onto the fields of peace—to plow new furrows, to plant new seed, to tend new growth—so that we and so that all mankind may some day share together a new and a bountiful harvest of happiness and hope on this earth."

Mr. Johnson was, of course, expressing in polite language a disagreement with the doctrines of international communism often re-

ferred to as "Communist imperialism," which holds that peoples outside the Soviet Union must be made subject to the dictates of Soviet socialism.

This has led to infiltration and intrigue as well as aggression conducted by Communist forces not only in southeast Asia but in Africa, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and other countries in Latin America.

The Soviet Union needs to be reminded again and again that the United States stood by Russia at a critical time in her life—when, from 1941 to 1945, the military power of the United States was thrown into the balance and helped to defeat Hitler, who had already overrun a portion of the Soviet Union, causing the loss of millions of Russian lives.

Unfortunately, the appeals for a genuine peace which President Johnson has been making have thus far evoked no response from the Kremlin. Perhaps this is because the question of how to reply has caused debate inside Communist Party councils.

It could be, of course, that Russia's internal situation does not permit the kind of response that ought to be made, because there are factions in Moscow which want an even more aggressive course than has been pursued by the Soviet Government. The instinctive wish of the Russian people themselves, however, is for peace with America, and hence nothing is lost by a continuance of President Johnson's appeals to them to manifest their desires in their own way to the ruling authorities in the Soviet Union.

PROPOSAL TO DISPOSE OF ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this week the administration sent to Congress an important legislative proposal. By a letter addressed to the President of the Senate, and dated July 6, the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, proposed legislation giving the Air Force authority to dispose of such parts of Alaska's commercial communication facilities presently operated by the Air Force as it believes it would be in the public interest to transfer. The letter and its attached proposal have been referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee under the direction of its able chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Because the presentation of this proposal at this time has great significance for all Alaskans, and perhaps will be of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Secretary Zuckert, the attached legislative proposal, and a section-by-section analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, bill, and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,

Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposal would be consistent with the administration's program. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. This proposed legislation has been coordi-

July 8, 1965

15385

mentals and only occasionally add something sophisticated, something "in."

"A couple of weeks ago," Devanas said, "we had the effects of a heavy easterly wind which had blown into the sound. I noticed on an oceanographic level that the easterly had brought in a considerable amount of seaweed that is normally only found in the Gulf Stream and in other warm water currents. We had a kind of Sargasso Sea in the sound. I talked about it and a lot of people called in to say how much they appreciated that touch."

FATHER AHAPIUS HONCHARENKO

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today I received a letter from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. The letter is most informative. It deals with the life of a learned and colorful Ukrainian-American, the Reverend Ahapius Honcharenko, or Father Honcharenko, as he was popularly known.

Father Honcharenko came to America in 1865. Inspired by the democratic traditions of Western philosophy, and armed with a perceptive understanding of the American Declaration of Independence, Father Honcharenko left everyone he ever met with a bit more respect for the principles of liberty on which our Republic is founded. To millions of Americans of Ukrainian descent, Father Honcharenko is respected as the most eminent political immigrant ever to come to America from the Ukraine.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Honcharenko, Patriot, Exile," written by Irvin E. Thompson, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HONCHARENKO, PATRIOT, EXILE

(By Irvin E. Thompson)

It was a real California morning, that morning, when 19 Epworthians started on their pilgrimage to see Honcharenko. The day seemed made for the trip and the spirits of the crowd mounted higher as they rode around and over the hills 5 or 6 miles in a big bus drawn by four horses. What a view lay before them. The Bay of San Francisco with its silver expanse stretching as far as the eye could see, the acres and acres of orchards and farms, the thousands of hills covered with grazing cattle, until one of the boys exclaimed as his attention was called to it, "Why, that is in the Bible." One could use pages in describing the wonderful scenery but I started out to tell you about Honcharenko.

Who is Honcharenko. The most interesting person in northern California. You do not believe it? Wait then until I tell you about him.

He is a Ukrainian Cossack, a native of Kiev in southern Russia, a regularly ordained priest of the Greek Orthodox Church who was banished from his native land and has lived in exile for over 50 years.

What was his crime? Only that he denounced human slavery in the church and state. For this he has gone through persecution and trials such as would do credit to the early Christians. His motto is the motto of the martyr: "Tribulations are my distinction and poverty my glory."

On the morning of our visit he came hobbling out to the gate to meet us, greeting us with hearty words of welcome, "Come in

my children, come in." His long, flowing white beard, his fur cap and somewhat bent shoulders gave him a venerable appearance that recalled the patriarchs of the Bible. He is now nearly 82 years old and his sight is not so good as it once was, but here in this retreat named "Ukraina" he has lived for 41 years, laboring with his hands for food and clothing for himself and wife.

Close to the little three-room cottage with its motto "Liberty" (in Russian), over the door, is a tall pine tree nearly 3 feet in diameter, which Honcharenko brought in a little flowerpot when he came 41 years ago. He still has the flowerpot to show to visitors. Right by the house is a huge grapevine that came from Mount Lebanon, and in the house souvenirs and clippings that are priceless. Here is the table used when the liturgy of the Greek Church was celebrated for the first time in America by Honcharenko, in Trinity Chapel, New York City, by permission of Bishop Potter. This occurred on March 2, 1865. Here, too, is the printer's "stick" presented to him by Horace Greeley. One could take a long article to describe the interesting relics in this quaint old house, where he and his wife live alone.

When he found that I was the pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Hayward he exclaimed, "I am so glad to meet you. Come and I will tell you what the Methodists have done to me." And leading the way he proceeded to tell of how Dr. Long and others connected with the American Bible Society had employed him to translate the Scriptures into Slavonic, so that the poor people of his country could get God's Word at a reasonable price. Then in 1867 he came to San Francisco, where "Hallelujah" Cox, pastor of the old Howard Street church allowed him to use the Sunday school room of the church, in which to hold services for his people. Here the Methodists collected money enough to help him publish the first tract ever and as he said "to establish Russian printing in the United States." Now there are over 100 Russian papers devoted to the cause of liberty and to the Methodists belongs the honor of starting the noble work.

The first tract published was "Come to Jesus." Only one copy is extant and Honcharenko says he would not take a thousand dollars for that. He later published the "Alaska Herald" in the two languages for a period of 8 years. At the request of the authorities in Alaska he printed a Russo-American primer for the children there. Six hundred copies were issued at a cost of \$200, of which the author received \$21.75 for his labor. The lessons were original to say the least. No. 3 is a temperance lesson. There is a picture of five bottles in a row and underneath these words:

"Here you see five bottles of whisky. It is strange that wild men will not drink whisky, because they say it is firepoison. A great many men drink it and ruin themselves. Whisky corrupts people and makes them very bad. Good people never take the poison." Isn't that pretty good temperance teaching?

Father Agapius Honcharenko was educated at the University of St. Petersburg, where he graduated with honors and was sent with the Russian Embassy to Athens. He read to us in Greek and then translated for us the address which he made before King George of Greece, who died only a little more than a year ago. It was while in Athens that he was accused of treason and an attempt made to carry him off into exile in Siberia. Through the intervention of the British Ambassador he was released and given his freedom at Constantinople. Later he had a miraculous escape into Jerusalem, where he had been visiting the Holy Sepulcher. For 2 weeks he was hidden from his pursuers under a bed in the residence of

the bishop of Jerusalem. Many times his life was attempted and so he came to America to labor here for his people.

Honcharenko's connection with Alaska and its purchase is very interesting. He was the man more than any other who made it possible for the ignorant Russians to become respectable citizens. One day in Market Street, San Francisco, he was struck down by thugs who wanted so fine gold specimens from Alaska, which were in his possession only a few minutes before. He still has the handkerchief, stained with blood, which was used to stay the wounds. Honcharenko did much to call the attention of the Government to the value of Alaska and has a letter signed by Secretary Seward in regard to the matter. Holding out the blood-stained handkerchief he said, "Upon that blood \$300 million in gold has been brought to the United States." His service has been so great that the Government ought to pension him in recognition of his labors.

I wish I had space to tell you all about this wonderful man who speaks and reads 13 and 14 languages, of his connection with the great men of Europe and America, for as Honcharenko says, "I am better known in Europe than I am in Hayward, where I now live. Tolstol. Yes, I knew him intimately for many months. He was not a good man."

That day, after we had eaten our lunch, we all gathered around and listened as he told the story of his eventful life and exhibited many precious documents. Then we visited the cave in the hillside where the aged priest says his prayer and where he has baptized more than a hundred Russian children and two American children. After this there was a trip to the fine mineral water spring and last of all a visit to the spot where the final resting place of our famous host is prepared, waiting the call into another life.

Time to go home. It came all too quickly and very reluctantly, indeed, we started on the return trip, voting this the finest day's outing ever planned by the department of recreation and culture of the Epworth League.

A few days later Father Honcharenko in the regalia of his office, told the people of Hayward from the pulpit of the Methodist Church how much he and his cause owed to the Methodist people. When that grand old hymn "Faith of Our Fathers" was sung, he explained, "55 years ago I heard the same hymn sung in the Methodist Mission in Bulgaria, only in the Bulgarian language. I am so glad I am here." And we were all glad too, for the very countenance of this saintly servant of God seemed to be a benediction and many an eye was moist as the story was related in a straightforward, but simple manner. His life has been full of service for humanity and there is surely a crown laid up for him in that better land, where there is no slavery or cruelty and where truth prevails. One must be better for having come in contact with such a life.

The Reverend Agapius Honcharenko (1832-1916) first known educated Ukrainian patriot was a neighbor and friend of Taras Shevchenko (1814-61).

He came to America on January 1, 1865, and worked for the American Bible Society in New York, translating the Bible into church Slavonic, into Bulgarian, and into Arabic. He taught at St. Johns Episcopal Seminary at New York and officiated at the first Divine Liturgy at the New York Trinity Episcopal Church on March 2, 1865. Later that year on April 16th, he laid the corner stone for the first Greek Orthodox Church at New Orleans, La.

Moving to San Francisco in 1867, he established a church there. Appointed by Secretary Seward, as an editor of the Russo-English semimonthly Alaska Herald in

which he often wrote about his subjugated Ukrainian nation, and his friend, Taras Shevchenko (1868-76).

He was the first man to write a Russian-English grammar book (March 1868) "The Russian and English Phrase Book", which was used by the U.S. Armed Services in Alaska. He was influential in Americanizing Alaska.

He organized the first Slavonic St. Methodius Benevolent Society at San Francisco and helped countless refugees from Russian Siberia.

On his land, following the earthquake at San Francisco, hundreds of people, involved in the tragedy stayed at his ranch "Ukraina" near Hayward, Calif.

He had his own cave on his land, the Pechera, where he served Divine Liturgy daily. Many influential Americans including General Hallack, Secretary Seward, Horace Greeley, and J. Bennet were his personal friends, yet he worked hard, was poor, and died in poverty.

On his land he had many tents where each year hundreds of tuberculosis patients came to be cured.

TRANSFER OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO CHILDREN OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN CONFLICT VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF 442D VETERANS CLUB, OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the 442d Veterans Club, in Hawaii, is made up of veterans of the 442d Infantry regimental combat team, which fought so well in France and Italy in World War II.

As a member of that organization, I am pleased to report that the board of directors of the 442d Club has adopted a resolution in support of House bill 7531 and Senate bill 1512, which provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children.

If there is no objection, Mr. President, I ask that the text of the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE 442D VETERANS CLUB, OF HAWAII

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States of America the following companion bills, H.R. 7531 and S. 1512, both entitled "A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children"; and

Whereas although the beneficial educational opportunities under the GI bill were theoretically available to all veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, the force of circumstances for many of them upon their return to private life were such, whether because of limited educational facilities, family situations which required immediate earning of a livelihood, or other reasons of urgency, that a great number of them were unable to take advantage of the benefits to which they were entitled, and the GI bill became a meaningless document to them; and

Whereas the aforementioned bills are a great step in correcting to some degree the lost opportunity suffered by many of those

who performed so valiantly in the service of their country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 442d Veterans Club of Honolulu, That it vigorously supports said H.R. 7531 and S. 1512, companion bills in the Congress of the United States of America, 89th Congress, 1st session, and favors the passage thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUE, Senator from the State of Hawaii, and the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Congressman from the State of Hawaii, both of whom are distinguished veterans of World War II.

"WE MUST SAVE OUR NATURAL RESOURCES"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it was with great pride and pleasure that I read, in the July 4 issue of Parade magazine, an article entitled "We Must Save Our Natural Resources." The article was written by Donald E. Johnson, national commander of the American Legion.

It is heartening and inspiring when a great, patriotic organization like the Legion takes it upon itself to espouse the cause of conservation. The enlisting of Legionnaires as stewards in the preservation of this lovely country's natural beauty is evidence that we are making headway in our conservation crusade.

With the voices of leaders such as Commander Johnson crying "save our resources," we take a giant step toward the defeat of waste, ugliness, and blight. We have a great President who has pointed the way with his White House Conference on Natural Beauty; we have a dedicated and talented Secretary of the Interior, whose book entitled "The Quiet Crisis" did much to awaken the country; and now we have a ready-made army of volunteers to heed the leadership and take up the many-faceted task.

I commend Commander Johnson for his excellent message and his wholehearted commitment to the preservation of this land for ourselves and for future Americans. With that thought in mind, I ask consent to have Commander Johnson's article, from Parade magazine, printed in the RECORD.

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

WE MUST SAVE OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Donald E. Johnson)

One hundred eighty-nine years ago, on July 4, 1776, our new Nation had less than 4 million people, with millions of acres of beautiful virgin forests, clear streams, clean air and abundant wildlife.

Today we have a population of 190 million; we are a strong and prosperous Nation. But we are daily growing poor as we ravage our forests, pollute our streams, and poison our air. We must take steps immediately to conserve our areas of natural beauty so that our children can be assured that they and future generations will have their rightful heritage of outdoor relaxation. We must preserve for them healthy areas in which they may enjoy the traditions of America—"Let's go fishing," "Let's have a picnic," "Let's go for a hike."

And the demand to enjoy those activities is surging. Figures prove Americans of every

age are seeking the outdoors as never before. Visits to State parks leaped from 114,291,000 in 1950 to 254,772,000 in 1960, and outdoor devotees visiting National Park and U.S. Forest Service preserves increased from 33,253,000 to 92,592,000 in the same period of time.

Yet during that explosive period total recreational acreage in these facilities increased only from 209,744,000 to 217,148,000—a marginal increase of land area of roughly 3.80 percent while use of State parks increased over 100 percent and national park visits tripled.

WARNING FROM UDALL

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has issued this warning:

"By 1970, about 210 million Americans will be competing for the inner space of our Nation. These Americans, flexing their economic muscles, will press for their place in the outdoor parklands of this country, and Federal, State and local parks will have to bear the main burden.

"The least this Nation can do, before our land patterns become unalterably fixed, is to preserve the few remaining extensive areas of natural open space now, while there is still time."

Our ancestors left us a legacy, the great outdoors, broad lands, open seashores, clean and lovely lakes, rivers and streams. All of these are rapidly disappearing. We cannot do less for our young people than save our natural treasures.

The pattern we establish for outdoor recreation in the next few years is destined to be the pattern forever.

If we continue to permit the destruction of our Nation's natural resources tomorrow's children will never know the feel of grass underfoot, or see a bird on the wing. Even our national symbol, the bald eagle, is today threatened with extinction.

America must be for the youth of tomorrow much more than TV sets, apartment houses, crowded cities and express highways; it must be a land of beauty, a land to be loved for itself.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a champion of conservation, says: "With our country experiencing a tremendous and dynamic growth in both population and economic activities, 'tomorrow' may truly be too late to save valued resources. Not only is there a threat to our wonderful wildlife heritage, but many of our other precious natural resources such as woodlands, seashores, lakes and streams can fall victim to unwise uses or abuses."

If our national legacy of wide open spaces is to be meaningful to our children and their children we must act now—with all the power at our command.

Joe Kennedy
RESIGNATION OF GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it was with great regret that I learned of the resignation of Gen. Maxwell Taylor. He has served ably in most difficult times. His courage and calm judgment have stood the Nation well. His service will be missed.

Long before others, General Taylor realized that America would need a much greater capacity for warfare in the jungles and the fields of far-off nations. As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he led the effort to improve that capacity. He pioneered the development of the special forces, which serve in Vietnam today. As Ambassador, he dealt admirably with the delicate political relationships in that proud and war-torn country. It is largely because of his leadership that we have been able to

mount the kind of effort needed—military, political, and economic—for the cruel and difficult war in Vietnam.

Our regret is moderated, however, by the fact that President Johnson has been able to recall Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge to this assignment. Ambassador Lodge has always answered his country's call, whether in the Senate, in the United Nations, or in his former diplomatic assignment in Vietnam. President Kennedy, who originally sent him there, always had the greatest respect for him. So has President Johnson. His willingness to serve is in the finest tradition of the name he proudly bears and of his State of Massachusetts, which has given so many leaders to the Nation.

Ambassador Lodge has been close to the situation in Vietnam, as it has developed over the last 3 years. Even when he left the Embassy, he was continually involved in the development of our strategy and tactics. He has the respect of the Vietnamese people, won in his tenure there. He has the respect of the American people, borne of 30 years of public service. Most important, his appointment will allow the continuity of leadership and policy that is so necessary to the achievement of our goals.

Our purpose in Vietnam has not changed since his tenure as Ambassador. It is to resist aggression; to negotiate, where we can; to fight, where we must. General Taylor represented that purpose with distinction. Ambassador Lodge has, and will in future months. All of us can be grateful that, once again, the gravest of dangers has called for the finest of leadership.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEAGUE SCHOOLS, INC.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, today I want to say a few words about an important experiment in international understanding which stems out of my home State of Utah. I am referring to the Foreign Language League Schools, Inc., of Salt Lake City, which comprises the world's largest international high school system.

Last year, this remarkable school, which is incorporated under the laws of Utah, sent over 2,000 students to five different European campuses to study French, German, and Spanish, and to take courses in English, in art history, and in European history and culture. This year, it is expected that over 2,500 students will be located on 15 different campuses: 2 in Switzerland, 5 in France, 3 in Austria, 3 in Spain, 1 in Italy, and 1 in Denmark.

In addition, at the request of the French Ministry of Education, the league has organized an English-as-a-second language school at the University of Rochester, in New York, this summer; and 113 French citizens, teachers and students, are now arriving in the United States, to pioneer this course. It is expected that next year about 1,000 French teachers and students will come to this country, under league arrangements.

Students in this unique high school have come from every State in the Union except Mississippi and South

Dakota. There are also students from Canada. One after another of these students has said, upon returning home, that the experience has been a "turning point" in his life, and they agree that traveling and studying in Europe have made better world citizens of them.

The Foreign Language League Schools, Inc., is the brainchild of Winnifred and James DeBry. They got the idea for it several years ago, when they visited with a group of high-school students, from 42 nations, who were studying German at a school in Austria. The DeBrys returned to Utah, and set in motion machinery to make it possible for young Americans to attend schools in Europe. Their undertaking has a double objective: that of improving the foreign-language facility of young Americans, so they can better converse and read in it, and, as a result, can achieve a better understanding of both their own heritage and that of their counterparts in European countries.

During the 6 weeks the American students are on the campuses of their overseas schools, they spend about 3 hours a day in classroom work, under the tutelage of native professors; and the remainder of the day and the evening are spent in participating in varied programs, which include lectures; hikes; films; visits in local homes; studying commercial, civil, and industrial institutions; and generally getting acquainted with the customs and people of the country in which they are studying. On weekends, rich programs of guided tours to nearby cities and countries are offered.

Chaperones are provided; and the full cost of the 6 weeks' experience for each student is about \$1,000.

Endorsements of the Foreign Language League schools have come from educators, parents, and other persons, in all parts of the country, who are acquainted with the program. One of the strongest statements came from Dr. Sterling McMurrin, formerly U.S. Commissioner of Education, who now is provost at the University of Utah. Dr. McMurrin said:

In educating for the world of today and tomorrow, a world in which the barriers that separate men and nations must be torn down, there is no substitute for involvement with another culture. To learn another language is to acquire the vehicle by which we can overcome our provincialism and cultural isolation and achieve an understanding and appreciation of the life of those who before were foreign to us. To learn a peoples' language while living among them, observing their habits and ways, studying their civic institutions, and participating in their daily activities is clearly an ideal method of cultural education.

In examining the program of the Foreign Language League schools, I have been impressed not only by its apparent educational integrity, but as well by the care with which the league has provided for the needs and welfare of the individual student. The unusual success of the league has been due to careful planning, organization, and supervision. Its eventual impact in expanding the experience, knowledge, and vision of the young people whom it serves would be quite impossible to assess.

I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to extend my congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. DeBry for their courage and far-

sightedness in establishing the league, and for the excellent administration which has made it a success. I also extend a greeting to the French students and teachers who are now arriving in the United States, to study at the University of Rochester.

I am confident that the Foreign Language League Schools, Inc., are making, and will continue to make, a substantial contribution to better world understanding and good fellowship.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT (TAFT-HARTLEY)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, few issues before Congress at this session have been submerged in as much emotion and misunderstanding as the President's request for repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. Today, I should like to discuss that issue.

Section 14(b) is the section, as all of us know, which awards to individual States the power to enact what have been called right-to-work laws. The effect of these laws is to deny to management and to labor the right to negotiate collective-bargaining agreements which contain a union-shop provision—that is, a stipulation that every worker in a bargaining unit or in a plant shall become a member of the union chosen by a majority vote of the workers.

I have made a long and searching study of the effects of section 14(b); and I deeply and sincerely believe that repeal of this section is in the overwhelming best interest of both management and labor in Utah and in the Nation.

Repeal would not, as I see it, abridge personal freedom. Instead, it would give workers a greater control of their personal destiny, as befits every American.

Retention of section 14(b), on the other hand, will continue to restrict collective bargaining in the 19 States which have enacted right-to-work laws, and will make more difficult the achievement of good relations between labor and management.

Many persons do not seem to realize that in order to be established in the first place, a union must have the support of a majority of the workers. The National Labor Relations Board, a Government agency, is charged with the duty of supervising elections by secret ballot, when workers petition to have union representation at a plant or place of employment. By law, strictly enforced regulations surround the election, and prohibit coercion of workers by either labor or management. Only by the free-will expression of a majority of the workers is a union chosen to represent them in bargaining with management. It should be pointed out, as well, that workers may, by secret-ballot, vote to discontinue union representation. At the end of any contract period, such an election can be requested.

Under the laws of the United States, once a union wins certification as the bargaining agent, by secret vote of a majority of the workers, it must represent all of the workers in that bargaining

unit or plant. It must represent both those who voted for it and those who ignore it. It secures for all of them the contract benefits for hours, wages, safety, and retirement which unions achieve through collective bargaining.

Every employee is free to decide whether he wants the plant in which he works to have a union shop, or, if the plant is already unionized, to decide whether he wants to work there. In this decision, there is complete freedom of choice. However, once a decision is made by the majority, as in any election, all the workers must then abide by that decision.

But if a State has enacted a so-called right-to-work law, workers who wish to do so can refuse to pay their share of maintaining the bargaining agent for contract benefits. Thus, they become free riders. They flout the expression of the collective will, but receive the benefits gratuitously.

Those who argue about the right of the average worker not to join a union overlook the right of a group of individuals to express themselves through their organization, and to benefit by the expression of collective will through the collective bargaining process. Collective bargaining means all members of the group. No one should hold himself as superior or unaffiliated.

Abiding by the will of the majority has never, to my knowledge, been considered a violation of the doctrine of individual freedom. But today, in the debate about repeal of section 14(b), it has become the paramount issue.

Yet, it is no more a violation of human freedom to require a worker to pay dues to a union than it is to require a student to pay his activity fees, or a lawyer to pay dues to the bar, or a doctor to belong to the county medical society before he practices in local hospitals.

The stockholders of a corporation have to abide by what the majority of stockholders decide in choosing directors who manage the money which has been invested. If a stockholder does not like what is being done, he has the freedom to sell his shares, and to invest elsewhere.

There are those who contend that a job is different from a profession or an investment. There are differences; but the basic principles abide. No worker has unlimited freedom. Every job has its conditions: starting time, work rules, job requirements, rate of compensation. Some persons object to them; but they obey them—if they want the job.

Let me make clear that nothing in the proposed legislation would force workers in plants throughout Utah to join a union. This is a decision which the workers in each plant will make for themselves, with complete freedom of choice.

The repeal of section 14(b) would not change in any respect the Federal law governing the conduct of government-supervised, secret ballot elections whenever Utah workers request to be represented by a union. Every worker has a free, unbiased vote. If a majority of the workers in any Utah plant or bargaining unit were to vote against having a union, no union would be established

there. Furthermore, if, on majority vote, a union was established, no worker would have to join that union in order to get a job in that plant. But if the employment contract contained a union security provision, then, after a period of 1 month or more, he must accept the contract conditions, including his duty to pay union dues. Of course, he has a right to work elsewhere, if he so chooses.

An interesting situation prevails in Utah: A number of the large corporations which are located there also have plants in other parts of the country. In many instances, these corporations have negotiated union security agreements in other States. I think it is significant that these employers are not opposing repeal of section 14(b). They evidently believe, as do many other corporations and businessmen, that management and labor should have the right to negotiate union security contracts if they wish to do so.

A former Republican candidate for the Presidency opposes section 14(b) on this basis. Gov. Alfred M. Landon of Kansas, who ran for the Presidency in 1936, has stated emphatically:

Every employer has the right to sign a contract for a union shop if he wants to. Yet, the so-called right-to-work legislation would deprive the employer of that right.

Opposition to section 14(b) comes from many persons in all walks of life, and of all political shades and persuasions. Business, political, religious, and civic leaders throughout the country have spoken out against the ban on union shop agreements. They have declared, in public statements, that the union shop makes for mature labor-management relations, industrial peace, and close cooperation between employers and employees. Let me quote from statements by some of them:

John F. Kennedy:

Let me make it clear once again, as I have in the past, that whatever office I shall hold—I shall always be unalterably opposed to the so-called right-to-work laws at any level, Federal or State.

W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor:

Any logic of the situation and any practical considerations require, suggest, demand, and warrant the immediate repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

James P. Mitchell, former Secretary of Labor, under President Eisenhower:

They call them "right-to-work" laws, but that is not what they really are * * *.

In the first place they do not create any jobs at all. In the second place they result in unnecessary and undesirable limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon conditions of work. Third, * * * they restrict union security and thereby undermine the basic strength of labor organizations.

I oppose such laws categorically.

Edmund "Pat" Brown, Governor of California:

I am unequivocally against legislation which would deny a freedom of choice for employees and their employer to agree or disagree on these matters (a union security arrangement) * * * Government should intrude as little as possible into free collective bargaining.

George Romney, Governor of Michigan:

These (right-to-work) laws, whether national or State, are not the answer because they deny to workers the same organization right exercised by stockholders. Management and its policies are the result of majority votes by stockholders, and minority stockholders must accept the will of the majority or sell out. In the American economy and political system, workers must have these same rights of organization.

William Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania:

I have never been in favor of right-to-work legislation, and am not now * * * I know of no leader in either party in our State who favors right-to-work legislation.

THURSTON B. MORTON, U.S. Senator from Kentucky:

It is my deep conviction that decisions relating to the union shop should be determined by collective bargaining between employers and unions and not through right-to-work laws.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, U.S. Senator from Maine:

Back in 1948, when I first ran for the U.S. Senate, I publicly stated my opposition to the so-called right-to-work proposal. It was known then as the Barlow bill. I have not changed my mind since, and I am still opposed to the right-to-work proposal.

National Council of Churches, general board:

To the extent to which labor and management act with a high degree of social responsibility in the process of bargaining, they should be given freedom to deal with issues of mutual interest. One such issue involving this freedom which has come to the forefront of public attention is the right of two parties to include in a bargaining contract the element of union security, as represented by membership as a basis of continued employment. On this point, it is the opinion of the general board of the National Council of Churches that union membership as a basis of continuing employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law; the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor, through the processes of collective bargaining.

Rabbinical Council of America:

Right-to-work (is) a camouflage * * * to weaken and undermine responsible, democratic unionism. * * * (It) makes the non-union worker a moral parasite in a democratic labor force.

Catholic Church opinion, as expressed by Rev. Benjamin Masse, S.J., associate editor of America—National Catholic Weekly Review:

The overwhelming majority * * * of Catholics justify the union shop in theory and practice, and oppose the present campaign to outlaw it. At least a dozen archbishops and bishops have publicly taken stands against State right-to-work laws.

Rev. William J. Kelly, former chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board:

Right-to-work laws are immoral according to Catholic social teaching.

John I. Snyder, Jr., chairman of the board and president of U.S. Industries, Inc.:

As an employer, and from the point of view of what is good for an employer, I am firmly opposed to any so-called right-to-work law. * * *

July 8, 1965

15391

As I mentioned earlier, my bill would provide that the traffic branch shall be open in the evenings for business.

Mr. President, this is a common procedure in many cities comparable in size to the District of Columbia.

Furthermore, the bill I am offering is not a substitute for the bill offered by the chairman of my committee earlier today, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. It is a bill that supplements the bill which he has introduced.

I feel that it is very important that this branch be open during the evening hours, so that people who are charged with traffic violations may have their cases heard in the evening after work, so that they will not lose a day's pay. I have a strong suspicion that some people are paying fines, though they are convinced they are innocent and would be found innocent by the court if they went to court, because it is cheaper to pay the fine than lose a day's work waiting for their case to be adjudicated. I see no special problems involved in having the traffic branch open in the evenings. I am informed that the Central Violations Bureau, which is a branch of the court of general sessions, is open in the evenings so that people may pay their fines.

Mr. President, one of the benefits of my bill for the improvement of law enforcement in the District of Columbia would be the diminishing—or should be the diminishing—of traffic ticket fixing in the District of Columbia. If we can supply the people of the District of Columbia with an adequate traffic court to quickly hear these traffic cases, then, it seems to me, some of the fallacious arguments advanced by way of expediency by the office of the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia would vanish. For as I have been heard to say heretofore, and will speak at some great length on in the near future, I believe that we must take further steps to stop traffic ticket fixing, even to the degree that it still persists.

Let me also point out that those who believe that my bill may result in all expenditure of public funds and no income, and that it will be an added burden to the taxpayers, had better take a good look at the statistics.

I do not like to put this problem on a money basis, but the fact is that if we have traffic courts available during the hours for which my bill would provide, including evenings, then the Corporation Counsel should have less concern about fixing traffic tickets, violators will be taken to court, and the income received from the fines and penalties imposed on those found guilty will pay many times over for the extra cost of the court which is proposed to be established in the bill.

I have been told that the amount of money flowing into the Treasury of the District of Columbia, which otherwise would have been lost as a result of my campaign to bring to an end or greatly diminish the traffic ticket fixing racket in the District of Columbia, is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300,000.

Take that figure, and we have a rather good idea of how important it was that as chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee with

jurisdiction over law enforcement problems and police administration, this abuse should be stopped.

I express my deepest appreciation to the Police Department, and, let me say goodnaturally, to my colleagues in the Senate—in giving me support, both moral and otherwise, in trying to bring about a cleanup in the traffic ticket fixing racket which had developed in the District of Columbia, with thousands of traffic tickets a year being fixed, a large percentage of them being fixed through what we call "pull"—political and otherwise.

We cannot have efficient law enforcement unless we provide the necessary law enforcement facilities to bring about that efficient and effective law enforcement.

There is no doubt in my mind that the lack of a traffic court in the District of Columbia is part of the cause—I stress the word "part"—for some of our problems in regard to traffic control in the District of Columbia.

I also believe, Mr. President, that with the establishment of a traffic court, there would be a more uniform administration of penalties administered to those persons found guilty than under the present system of rotating judges.

The present system makes possible the practice of some lawyers of shopping around for the "right kind" of judge to hear their clients' case. With the assignment of two judges to the traffic branch, the quality of their work could also be more closely observed by the press and the public. A great deal could be done by these judges in the field of traffic safety and traffic education.

I have precedents galore from other cities of comparable size which carry out the proposal I am now suggesting for the District of Columbia, of having judges on a full-time basis specially assigned to the traffic bench.

As for the need for the other additional judges provided for in my bill, I rest my case on published statistical material showing the serious backlog of civil cases as well as the fact that the jurisdiction of the court has been recently increased. There is no sign that there will be any decline in the number of cases reaching the court in the near future.

I know of the great interest that Senator BIBLE, the distinguished chairman of our committee, has expressed on the subject of adding additional manpower to the court of general sessions. I pledge my efforts to assist in every way I can to see that additional manpower is attained for this court as quickly as possible.

I wish to supplement his proposals by providing, in addition, for two so-called traffic judges, who would spend their time hearing traffic cases and seeing to it that people get quick, efficient, and fair justice in regard to traffic violation charges.


THE WAR IN VIETNAM—REPLY TO
WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published at this point in my remarks the

column written by Mr. Walter Lippmann published in today's Washington Post.

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

ORDEAL OF DECISION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President must often feel that he is between the devil and the deep blue sea—between the devil of unlimited war and the deep blue sea of defeat. The dilemma is a cruel one, and for some time now, since the rejection in April of his offer to negotiate, he has had no policy for winning the war and only a speculative hope as to how to bring it to a decent end.

He has hoped that a military stalemate would produce an acceptable negotiated settlement. Our present objective is to stave off military defeat in the south and soften up the north by limited bombing. By autumn we ought to know whether the current administration strategy is based on a true estimate of the state of the war, or whether it is, as some of us fear, a device for putting off the evil day of having to decide between unpleasant alternatives.

If the current strategy is successful, it will be a most happy surprise. If, by the autumn, Hanoi with Peiping's consent agrees to negotiate at all, it will at least mean that there is a pause in the relentless movement toward a larger war. But there will still remain the very great question of whether the Vietcong and Hanoi and China will agree to any settlement which bears some recognizable resemblance to the objective of an independent South Vietnam which the President and Secretary Rusk have been talking about.

Were this to become possible in the autumn, it would be a miracle. For we would have snatched a moral victory from the jaws of a military defeat. It seems most unlikely that it will happen. It is unlikely that the Vietcong will be ready to quit if it does not win a military victory during this monsoon season. The Vietcong and its allies have been at war for 20 years, and there is no reason to suppose that they are not prepared to go on for many more monsoon seasons.

As for inducing North Vietnam to pull back, it is significant, as we know from Secretary Rusk, that Hanoi has thus far refused even to talk about some kind of cease-fire in return for a cessation of the bombing. It looks as if Hanoi has taken into account that it will probably be bombed, has discounted its losses in advance, and is prepared to commit its formidable army to the war. From their point of view the stakes are very high.

If the hope of a stalemate to be followed by the negotiation of an agreeable settlement fades out, the President's Republican critics will demand that he win the war by devastating North Vietnam. The Republican activists, Messrs. Ford, and Lamb, have taken up where Barry Goldwater left off, that is with the simple-minded notion that this war, and virtually any other war, can be won by bombers. It will not be easy, however, for the President to refuse to try strategic bombing. For if he holds back, he has no way of proving that the policy will not work. This will be especially awkward if large numbers of American infantrymen are bogged down in South Vietnam. The evil consequences of unlimited bombing upon the whole international situation would not be visible until the policy is undertaken.

In order to resist the Republican attack and satisfy our deepest interests, the President will need, I think, to make a decisive change of policy. He needs a new policy which will override the debate about victory, or withdrawal, and will make feasible his hope of an eventual negotiated settlement. The new policy would have to be, it seems

July 8, 1965

to me, a pullback of our forces from the defense of villages and small towns to one or more highly fortified strongpoints with certain access to the sea, and then to advise Saigon that it should seek to make peace with the Vietcong and with North Vietnam.

This would not be a withdrawal from southeast Asia, such as Senator MORSE has been advocating, for the American presence would remain, providing a sanctuary against the persecution of our friends and a basis of influence while a new order of things in Asia is being negotiated. There would not be much glory in such a strategic retreat. But it would not be a surrender. It would be honest and honorable; since it would be feasible, it would be credible. It would extricate us from a war that cannot be won at any tolerable cost; it would disentangle us from a political commitment that is grossly overextended and leave us with the possibility of playing a significant part in the eventual settlement with China.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the course of the column, Mr. Lippmann, for whom I have great respect and admiration—in fact, I point out in the letter, which I shall read momentarily, that I have found him to be a very reliable source of information in connection with America's war of outlawry in Asia—he committed one of the few errors that I have found him guilty of, when he said:

This would not be a withdrawal from southeast Asia, such as Senator MORSE has been advocating, for the American presence would remain, providing a sanctuary against the persecution of our friends and a basis of influence while a new order of things in Asia is being negotiated. There would not be much glory in such a strategic retreat. But it would not be a surrender.

Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann is not the only journalist who has formed the erroneous impression that the senior Senator from Oregon, during the past years in his many speeches here in the Senate and across the Nation, advocates getting out of South Vietnam.

That has never been my position. What I have urged is that the United States change its status in South Vietnam from one of unconstitutional warmaking, which violates international law and treaties, point by point.

I have advocated that we stop our warmaking and join in a multilateral effort with other nations in keeping the peace. There is as much difference between the status of warmaking and the status of keeping the peace as there is between high noon and black midnight.

I wrote Mr. Lippmann the following letter this morning:

JULY 8, 1965.

Mr. WALTER LIPPMANN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPPMANN: I think you know the high regard in which I hold you, both as an individual and as a keen student of foreign relations problems.

Time and time again during the past 2 years, I have used your penetrating articles on the U.S. undeclared war in southeast Asia to buttress my criticisms of unilateral U.S. military action in southeast Asia.

For 2 years, I have urged that the United States, in keeping with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, formally lay before the Security Council a request that the United Nations take full and complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in Asia. In those speeches, I have pointed out that if Russia or France or any other member of the Security Council should

veto a U.S. resolution calling for United Nations jurisdiction over the threat to the peace in Asia, the United States should then call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and lay the issue before the General Assembly. At no time, have I advocated that the United States should withdraw from southeast Asia.

In your column this morning, I was very disappointed to read these words, "This would not be a withdrawal from southeast Asia, such as Senator MORSE has been advocating, for the American presence would remain, providing a sanctuary against the persecution of our friends and a basis of influence while a new order of things in Asia is being negotiated. There would not be much glory in such a strategic retreat. But it would not be a surrender."

Contrary to advocating a U.S. withdrawal from southeast Asia, I have, in speech after speech in the Senate and on platforms across our country during the past 2 years, urged that we change our status in southeast Asia from one of warmaking to one of peacekeeping and that we urge other nations to join us in a multilateral peacekeeping operation in southeast Asia in place of our present unilateral military warmaking policy.

In the early months of my rather lonely campaign against our country's military outlawry in Asia, I urged that we formally call upon SEATO to join us in multilateral, peacekeeping activities in southeast Asia. I also, in many of my speeches, urged that we formally call for a reconvening of the 14-nation conference that gave birth to the Geneva accords.

However, from the very beginning of my discussion of this crisis during the past 2 years, I have pointed out, time and time again, that in keeping with our clear international law obligations under the United Nations Charter, we should call upon the United Nations to take jurisdiction over this serious threat to the peace of the world. In speech after speech in support of my position, I discussed the precedents of United Nations peacekeeping action in the Congo, the Gaza strip, Cyprus, and Kashmir. On some occasions, I pointed out that I thought the multilateral action of the United Nations in Korea was very instrumental in bringing about the final settlement of that war.

It has always been my view that if the United States had continued the fight in the Korean war alone without United Nations intervention, that war would have dragged on for years and years, just as I think the present war in southeast Asia will drag on for many years if we continue following a go-it-alone policy. Granted that Australia and the Philippines are making a token contribution to the war effort at the present time, the fact is that their participation in the action is also completely outside the framework of the United Nations.

For a long time, Senator GRUENING and I stood alone in the Senate in our advocacy of the substituting of the rules of international law for the jungle law of military might by which the United States through its administration has besmirched its professed ideals. Recently, a few other Senators have seemed to join us, at least part way, in advocating resort to submitting the Vietnam war issues to the United Nations.

I trust that you will not consider me presumptuous in writing this frank letter to you, but I, of course, owed it to myself to correct your error in stating that I advocate United States withdrawal from southeast Asia. On this point, my major thesis has always been that the United States should stop making war in Asia, and through existing treaty obligations, call upon all other signatories to join in a multilateral effort to keep the peace in Vietnam. We will never know how such an approach will work until

we try it. We owe it, not only to our own generation but to future generations.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

P.S. I am enclosing speeches and materials of mine on the southeast Asian crisis that rebut a statement in your column this morning, attributing to me an advocacy of U.S. withdrawal from southeast Asia:

1. A CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprint of a speech I made in the Senate on January 6, 1965. You will find a paragraph marked on page 2.
2. A speech I made on January 15, 1965, at the University of Chicago, with statements marked on page 17.
3. A press release for February 8, 1965, which likewise refutes your statement.
4. A press release for May 9, 1965.
5. A speech I made in the Senate on July 1, 1965—see page 12.
6. A speech I gave at Millersville State Teachers College on July 6, 1965—see pages 6, 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there immediately follow in the RECORD excerpts from those speeches, press releases, and other material to which I referred in the letter to Mr. Lippmann.

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

[Jan. 6, 1965]

I say again that the senior Senator from Oregon has never favored our simply pulling out of Vietnam. The senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that if the only course open to us is to remain on a unilateral basis, we cannot justify staying there under international law. What I have urged, in speech after speech and article after article, is that we should make use of existing international agencies for the settlement of this dispute, if possible, by way of negotiated settlement, short of war. So I have urged, time and time again, and repeat this afternoon, that we ought to try to use SEATO; but the fact is that a majority of the SEATO nations want no part of it.

[Jan. 15, 1965]

The question now is whether President Johnson can bring himself to do the only thing that can be done in Asia to escape an expanded war: to bring other interested parties into a multilateral political agreement for southeast Asia.

This could take the form of a United Nations jurisdiction along the lines proposed so wisely by President Roosevelt; or it could take the form of seeking a SEATO action that would police South Vietnam while a political solution is developed; or it could take the form of a new 14-nation conference among the same nations that arranged the 1954 Geneva accords.

[Feb. 8, 1965]

We should have called upon the nations who signed the Geneva accords in 1954 and all the nations who signed the United Nations Charter to join with us in taking joint action under one of those treaties to enforce the peace and negotiate an international settlement of this threat to world peace.

Bombing North Vietnam is but a prelude to years of guerrilla warfare against the United States in Asia. We should stop our warmaking and call upon members of the United Nations to join in a program of united peacekeeping in Asia.

[May 9, 1965]

I am not asking, and have not asked, that we get out of South Vietnam. I am asking

July 8, 1965

15393

that our allies come on in and be of assistance to us in Asia, not to make war but to enforce the peace, just as we cooperate with other nations in enforcing the peace in the Gaza Strip, in Cyprus, and in the Congo. Don't forget that there we have insisted that the procedures of the United Nations be followed. But in South Vietnam, we are urging the substitution of American jungle law of military might for the rule of law.

I am only asking that we walk back inside the framework of our Constitution and the framework of the United Nations. I think we ought to first try to work out an honorable negotiated settlement in accordance with the principles of international law.

This is WAYNE MORSE reporting from Washington, D.C.

[July 1, 1965]

OBLIGATIONS TO SOUTH VIETNAM SECONDARY TO THOSE OF U.N. CHARTER

There is nothing in what I have discussed that would be inconsistent, either, with our commitment of support to South Vietnam.

Article 51 of the charter affirms the right of individual or collective self-defense "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

If the Security Council declines to take jurisdiction, or if it fails to take action that effectively stops the war, the United States is free to come to the support of South Vietnam, just as other nations are free to come to the support of North Vietnam.

We can continue to help South Vietnam until the U.N. acts to restore peace. But let us not forget that our 1954 commitment to South Vietnam was no treaty, and it pledged only American aid in the form of goods. Even that was to be in return for certain actions on the part of the South Vietnam Government, actions which it has not to this day carried out. Our commitment was contained not in a treaty but in a letter from our President to President Diem, and it extended our foreign aid "provided your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

The Government of South Vietnam has been unable to fulfill its obligations. Yet we have gone infinitely beyond our obligation, into cobelligerency. By so doing, we have become involved in a situation that brings us under those provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are treaty bound.

[July 6, 1965]

That is why I believe it is in our interest to stop the war, and to exhaust every possible means of doing that through the United Nations. We cannot stop the war alone. But the United Nations could, if it would, and the United States has more to gain from a U.N.-imposed peace than from a continuation of the fighting that can lead anywhere but to a victory on our terms.

We can place the issue before the U.N. very simply, by means of a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council. That is our primary duty. In so doing, we do not necessarily have to propose a specific action to be taken. But I believe the U.S. Ambassador should address to the President of the Council a letter, declaring that acting under these articles of the United Nations Charter,

the United States requests a urgent and immediate meeting of the Security Council to discuss the matter of the war in Vietnam, and the extent of the threat it poses to international peace and security.

That would put the issue where it belongs—before the United Nations Security Council. That would achieve what the Senator from Idaho calls soliciting the help of the United Nations in finding a peaceful solution.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BE PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES

It could well be that Security Council members who are not directly involved in Vietnam as yet could come up with some proposals for handling the problem that would be more successful than what the United States could promote. But we could offer some resolutions.

One of them might take the form of calling upon the Secretary General to bring together the participants in the Geneva Conference of 1954, to discuss the means by which a cease-fire may be obtained and steps which may be taken to maintain the future independence of and peace among the states of Indochina.

That would provide a means of seeking a political solution and settlement.

But it is even more important that we call upon the Security Council to take action to stop the fighting, and send to Vietnam a peace mission. We could do that through a resolution taking note that the Geneva Agreement of 1954 has been widely violated by signatories and nonsignatories alike, and that as a result a condition of war exists in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and Laos that constitutes a breach of the peace and threatens international peace and security, and which directs the Secretary General to call upon member states to furnish forces and equipment for a United Nations force to separate the belligerents and maintain a cease-fire in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and Laos pending a political settlement of their dispute.

Quite possibly the sending of a peace force, and the effort to negotiate through a reconvening of the Geneva Conference could both be proposed. They are not consistent.

OBLIGATIONS TO SOUTH VIETNAM SECONDARY TO THOSE OF U.N. CHARTER

There is nothing in what I have discussed that would be inconsistent, either, with our commitment of support to South Vietnam.

Article 51 of the charter affirms the right of individual or collective self-defense "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

If the Security Council declines to take jurisdiction, or if it fails to take action that effectively stops the war, the United States is free to come to the support of South Vietnam, just as other nations are free to come to the support of North Vietnam.

We can continue to help South Vietnam until the U.N. acts to restore peace. But let us not forget that our 1954 commitment to South Vietnam was no treaty, and it pledged only American aid in the form of goods. Even that was to be in return for certain actions on the part of the South Vietnam Government, actions which it has not to this day carried out. Our commitment was contained not in a treaty but in a letter from our President to President Diem, and it extended our foreign aid "provided your Government is prepared to give

assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied."

The Government of South Vietnam has been unable to fulfill its obligations. Yet we have gone infinitely beyond our obligation, into cobelligerency. By so doing, we have become involved in a situation that brings us under those provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are treaty bound.

Je Wayne Morse
SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, writing in yesterday's Washington Post, Columnist Roscoe Drummond is applying the theory that if one says something is so, perhaps it will be so. That is a common device among journalists whose profession is commentary, rather than reporting. Many of them slip over into the realm of trying to manufacture events or situations, instead of reporting them or commenting on them.

Mr. Drummond has consistently supported the administration policy in Vietnam. He has "commented" on criticisms of it just as though the critics were directing their remarks to Drummond's own policy. He has answered the criticism faithfully, and sought to downgrade and dismiss the critics.

Today, Mr. Drummond is trying to end the debate over Vietnam by pronouncing it ended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Debate Concluded; Defense of Vietnam Supported" to which I referred, written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEBATE CONCLUDED—DEFENSE OF VIETNAM SUPPORTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The debate is over. The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

For a time it looked like touch-and-go and many though the President's public backing was crumbling. The professional teach-ins crying, "Get out of Vietnam" were contagious. Poets writing L.B.J. about how wrong he was seemed to be getting a better hearing than Rusk and McNamara.

But it was the opposition to the defense of Vietnam that was crumbling, not the support. Although there has been no formal referendum, the national decision is amply clear. Here is the evidence:

Top Republican spokesmen—Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD, the minority leaders in Congress, who have given Mr. Johnson strong support over Vietnam from the beginning, have just renewed their bipartisan backing.

Democratic leaders in Congress—like Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT and FRANK CHURCH—who have been sharply critical of the President's course in Vietnam, are now agreeing that for the United States to withdraw or give up would be disastrous.

The public critics of the Government—like Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago, the leading professional teach-in—have talked so much and said so little that

July 8, 1965

the country could not fail to see that they had no constructive alternative.

This undermined their criticism so badly with the public that Professor Morgenthau had to shift his stance and say he was against withdrawal.

Some sincerely say, "Let's negotiate." The United States has offered unconditional discussions, the Communists have refused and you can't negotiate at an empty table.

Some sincerely say, "Quit escalating the war." The fact is that U.S. military power is being used with care and measure. It is the Vietcong who are raising the level of terror and escalating the fighting.

Some sincerely say, "The real struggle in Vietnam is economic, not military." It is both, and Vietnam cannot begin to make real economic progress until the aggression is ended and the fighting stopped. At which time, as the President has announced, the United States will provide general aid.

And what next? There is no certain answer. We don't know how long it will be before the aggressor has had enough. But there is no reason to think that the Vietcong are going to overrun South Vietnam if we are prepared to stay the course. I give you the words—and the faith—of Capt. James Spruill, U.S. Army, written to his wife in the United States a few days before he gave his life in Vietnam.

"I feel there is too much talk of despair. Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please do not let them, back where you are, sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty, and of victory—for we must and can win here.

"There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go."

Another American has said: "We will not withdraw. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated."

That was the President of the United States. It is evident by now that his goal is the goal of most Americans.

Mr. MORSE. Unfortunately, Mr. Drummond's effort is not going to have any more effect than his previous efforts, and those of so many of his colleagues, have had in ending the debate over American policy in southeast Asia. That debate is growing and spreading, and it will continue to grow and spread with every new shipment of Americans into the Asian ground war, with every shipment of coffins with the bodies of American troopers in them as they arrive at the west coast.

Like so many columnists of recent days who reflect administration policies, Mr. Drummond seeks to make much of the fact that President Johnson has the general support of the country, and of the Congress, in his conduct of affairs in Vietnam. But he, too, prefers to ignore the basic assumption of this support, which is that the American people generally do support almost any foreign policy of a President until it proves unwise or disastrous over the long run.

There is not the slightest doubt, for example, that the American people would also express support for President Johnson's handling of Vietnam if he announced that our original aims there are impossible of achievement, and undertook a general withdrawal. So would the American people support President Johnson's handling of Vietnam if he ap-

pealed to the United Nations to intervene.

The American public place great, almost unlimited, confidence in their President, largely because they have to, in his handling of international affairs because the administration does not give them the facts.

But the warnings are already visible to those who want to know the depth of this support. It is not a support of a given policy so much as it is support of the Office of the Presidency. We all know that the American people are deeply fearful of the Nation's involvement in Asia. We know they shun the prospect of another ground war in Asia. We know they doubt the validity of the argument that we are defending the freedom of South Vietnam, because they know there is little semblance of freedom for the people of South Vietnam under the procession of military governors we have more or less appointed to rule South Vietnam and have supported as our puppets. The American people at the grassroots are beginning to recognize that there has never been any freedom in South Vietnam from the time that the United States set up its first puppet government in South Vietnam back in 1954.

The American people are already beginning to hold for an accounting the spokesman for this administration who have been misrepresenting to the American people that we are in South Vietnam to uphold freedom.

I have asked for 2 years, and again tonight, what freedom? When was there any freedom in South Vietnam? There has not been an hour of freedom in South Vietnam since the United States took control of that unfortunate country by taking over the South Vietnamese exiled from Washington, D.C., and New York City, militarizing him, financing him, setting him up in power; and when Diem could not deliver, we proceeded to support puppet after puppet.

We are now supporting one of the most vicious military dictators that has ever been imposed upon South Vietnam by the U.S. Government. After I finish a bit of research on that man's horrible and shocking record, I shall address the Senate on the information I am now analyzing.

Here is one Senator who will not tell the American people that we are in South Vietnam to support freedom, because it is not so. It cannot be so, for there is no freedom there. American boys are dying in South Vietnam tonight to support a military dictatorship in South Vietnam. I am satisfied, may I say for the benefit of the apparent lack of information of Mr. Drummond or his willingness to write contrary to information that he knows, that when the American people find out the sordid facts of the kind of government we are supporting in South Vietnam, this administration will hear from them.

I say once again to my President, "Do you think the Republicans will continue to support you in regard to the war in Asia? Watch them when public opinion starts to turn. They will trample each other in trying to get off your ship of

state. Mr. President, you are already getting a little taste of what you can expect from Republicans. High leaders in the Republican Party are already publicly advocating the bombing of Hanoi and the Chinese nuclear installations in Red China, and criticizing you because you are not doing it. That is the height of foreign policy of irresponsibility being demonstrated by Republican leaders in this country in these hours."

I repeat, as I discussed at some length only a week ago today on the floor of the Senate, that I am satisfied that the bombing of Hanoi and the bombing and/or bombing of the Chinese nuclear installations would bring Russia into the war, and Russia would not confine her fighting in China.

I say to the President, "We cannot bomb Hanoi without killing Russians, and Russia has as much right in Hanoi as we have in South Vietnam. But if you wish to follow Republican advice, you will lead our country into a massive war in Asia, and the American people will repudiate you, because the American people will learn that there is not the slightest justification for your continuing the unconstitutional war that you are now conducting in Asia."

I respectfully say to my President again, "If you are to engage in making war in Asia, you should get back into the framework of the American Constitution—and you are acting outside of it now—and bring to the Congress a recommendation for a declaration of war."

Only Congress, under article I, section 8, of the Constitution can declare war. Congress cannot delegate to you, Mr. President, the power to make war in the absence of a formal declaration of war. It has almost reached the point where it would appear that Members of Congress are perfectly willing to ignore the language of the Constitution, although each of them walked up to the Presiding Officer's desk in their respective Chambers and swore to uphold the Constitution. I have no intention of violating my oath.

My view is that the war in southeast Asia cannot be supported in the absence of a declaration of war. As I said last Thursday, but wish to repeat again and shall repeat many times in the months ahead, because I want Mr. Roscoe Drummond to know he could not be more wrong than to assume that the debate on the war in southeast Asia has ended, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the debate has only started; and so far as increasing thousands of people in this country, who are being asked to express themselves on the war are concerned, the debate has only started.

There will be those who would like to end the debate. There will be those who will advocate repressive measures to silence those who refuse to rubberstamp the President in the outlawry by our country in Asia. But we are perfectly willing to be judged by history. We have no intention of being a part of the program of concealing from the American people the facts about the war in Asia.

I wish to say a word again tonight, for the Record, for the reservationists to

read tomorrow, for frequently I speak to the reservationists in the Senate. Do Senators remember them, Mr. President? Not so many weeks ago the President sent to Congress his request for a \$700 million appropriation for South Vietnam, but admitted at the very time he sent the message that he did not need the money because he had authority to transfer whatever funds he needed to supply our troops with whatever equipment they needed; and, of course, so long as they are over there, the senior Senator from Oregon wants our troops to have the equipment they need to protect themselves.

But on that occasion the President said, in effect, that he was using that bill to obtain again from Congress a vote on whether it supported his policies in Vietnam. Three Members of the Senate refused to go along with the bill. I was proud to be associated with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and seven Members of the House who refused to go along with it.

To me, the most interesting part of that debate was to hear Senators whom I referred to as reservationists claim that in voting for that bill they wanted it understood that they were not rubberstamping the President. They wanted it understood that they expected to be consulted before any decision was made by the President to send any considerable number of additional troops to South Vietnam. They expected to be consulted in regard to our military plans in South Vietnam.

I could not believe my ears. The RECORD will show that my reply was: "You are being consulted now; and this is the last time you will be consulted, if you support this vote of confidence in the President this afternoon, for it is perfectly clear in the language that he is asking for that the President has been perfectly frank, forthright, and honest with Congress in asking for these votes of confidence."

The Senate voted that vote of confidence; and several times since then, as thousands more American boys have been sent to Vietnam, I have, on the floor of the Senate, asked the reservationists: "Were you consulted?" I ask them, for the RECORD, tonight: "Was any Senator who stood here a few weeks ago and said he would vote for the \$700 million appropriation to give the President a vote of confidence, consulted? Were they consulted prior to today, when we received the announcement of the latest contingent of several thousand new troops being sent to South Vietnam?" Of course they were not. It sounded good for the record; but the fact is that when the resolution of August, a year ago, was voted, and when the bill of a few weeks ago was voted, the Senate rubberstamped the wishes of the President of the United States. That is my interpretation of the vote. I shall be glad to have my descendants read that I did not vote for it; as I did not, in 1955, seek to vote to the then President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, a power that he was not entitled to have under the Constitution in

respect to the Formosa resolution; as I refused to vote power to the President at the time of the Lebanon crisis.

But note, Mr. President, that when we considered the Cuba resolution, the Cuba resolution was completely changed. In the Cuba resolution, as to which I spoke at length in the advocacy of this change, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, no political authority was given to the President of the United States. The Cuba resolution squares with the Constitution.

The Formosa resolution, the Lebanon or so-called Middle East doctrine resolution, and the southeast Asia resolution of last August, and also the bill that was passed a short time ago, cannot, in my opinion, be squared with our obligations under the Constitution.

If Mr. Drummond thinks that the debate has been ended on this vital issue, he could not be more mistaken. I say to him that he has not heard anything yet in regard to the discussion that will take place in this Republic in the months ahead, as more and more American flag-draped coffins come back from southeast Asia. At long last, the American people will be heard from; they are not going to take it in silence. That is why I continue to plead with my President to change our status from warmaking to peacekeeping in southeast Asia, and to live up to our obligations under the United Nations Charter and stop being a violator of the United Nations Charter, as we are 24 hours of the day and night.

Lay the issue before the United Nations in keeping with the procedures of the charter and ask the other signatories to the charter—which countries have exactly the same moral and legal obligations as does the United States—to assume their fair share of responsibility for bringing a peaceful settlement to this war-torn part of the world that, day by day, increasingly threatens the peace of the world.

No, Mr. President; far from the debate being silenced, may I say for the benefit of Mr. Drummond that the debate is growing over the wisdom of the course of action in Asia that commits us ever more deeply to ground action and brings us into closer conflict with the great Communist giants, Russia and China. I do not think I tell Mr. Drummond anything he does not already know if I tell him that there is increasing debate within the administration itself over our policy. Of course, most spokesmen for any administration prefer that all debate over policy take place behind closed doors and not on the floor of Congress or among the general public.

But the public pressure is growing; the continued support for the President is more and more contingent upon his achieving success not only in curbing communism but in keeping a major war from breaking out. If the casualties rise to the hundreds, or to the thousands, then public support and congressional support for the President and his office, and his policy will dissolve overnight.

The American people put Lyndon Johnson in charge of foreign policy last November. They will give him the bene-

fit of a lot of doubts. But if he makes a mistake that costs the American people a lot of blood, they will take the first opportunity on the first election day to put someone else in charge. That means 1968.

I thought that Walter Lippmann, in a recent column, very wisely pointed out to this administration that it has no assurance of reelection in 1968, for much will depend on the course of the foreign policy that this administration takes in the months between now and November 1968.

The only thing under those circumstances that could reelect the present administration, in my judgment, would be for the Republican Party to out-war-monger the Democratic Party, and because some of the Republican spokesmen these days indicate that they would not hesitate to take us into a nuclear war.

I do not believe that President Lyndon Johnson will fall victim to that kind of bad advice. However, I say to him that if he gets an opposition in 1968 that does not advocate a massive war in Asia, but advocates the United States keeping faith with its own ideas and returning to its professed belief in the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law in military might, he will be in trouble in 1968—and, may I say most respectfully—he should be.

Mr. President, I want to help my administration avoid that eventuality. So do a great many other Members of Congress who are critical of our present policy in Vietnam because we believe it cannot succeed and that it will bring repudiation to the administration if it is pursued to its bitter end.

That is why we are trying to bring out the facts about the United States in Asia. That is why we are trying to show that the United States stands no better chance of remaining on the Asian mainland than have other Western nations before us. That is why we are urging that the help of the United Nations in seeking peace in Vietnam be sought.

As the military buildup continues, as the casualties rise, and as the participation in the war of the Soviet Union and China draws closer, the level and the extent of the debate in this country will also grow, because the American people have never yet relinquished final control over their affairs to any public official, and I am sure they are not going to start with the war in southeast Asia.

In closing this subject matter, for the benefit of Mr. Drummond, I say: "You could not be more mistaken if you think that the debate on the war in Vietnam has ended." One is going to see a growing interest and concern on the part of increasing thousands of Americans in regard to the policy of making war in southeast Asia, and the subject matter will be the subject matter of debate. In discussions in innumerable community and neighborhood groups across the land, one can go into practically no drawing room and stay for more than 10 to 15 minutes without someone raising the issue as to whether we are right or wrong in our outlawry in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, let me say for the benefit of Mr. Drummond that he will observe more and more debate in the editorial columns of this country, for more and more editors in the country are becoming more and more concerned about the justification of the foreign policy that the President of the United States is following under the advice of McNamara, Taylor, Lodge, the Bundys, and the others who have been talking in terms of a preventive war in Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Debate and Vote on Vietnam War," published in the July 6, 1965, edition of the San Francisco Chronicle.

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

DEBATE AND VOTE ON VIETNAM WAR

The depth of public division and confusion over Vietnam, even as the American troop buildup in southeast Asia escalates toward 75,000, is revealed by the following statement from the latest Gallup Poll.

"The number of people who would like to see this country stop military action is almost the same as the number who would like to see us step up our efforts—about one in four. One person in three is unable to formulate any opinion."

It certainly should not be surprising to learn that there is no consensus of public opinion on the Vietnam conflict, much as President Johnson would like to feel he has one. The Gallup Poll is merely confirmation of what has been revealed by the teach-ins, by letters to newspaper editors, and by ordinary curbside conversations.

At last Congress seems to be waking up to the disturbed public mood. As one forum where discussion of Vietnam policy ought to be vigorous and voluble, Congress up to now has been relatively and, we think, distressingly apathetic. But last week the opening guns of what we hope will be a genuine debate were heard. It could be healthy; certainly it is desperately needed.

Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, the chairman of the House Republican Conference, recently said that the Administration was "needlessly sacrificing" American lives if its objective was a negotiated settlement. Were the administration to persist in that, LAIRD said, it might lose Republican support. He urged more airstrikes and suggested Hanoi as a target.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Democratic majority leader, took out after LAIRD. He said he was disturbed by demands upon the President to follow a policy of "what can only amount to an indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese by air and naval bombardment—a slaughter of combatants and non-combatants alike * * *."

In rejoinder, Representative GERALD R. FORD, the House Republican leader, came strongly to the support of LAIRD. The President said FORD "must not yield" to some Democrats who would abandon South Vietnam, must not make any settlement involving a coalition government with the Communists, and should force the North Vietnamese to terms by bringing air and sea power to bear on "significant military targets" in North Vietnam without committing ground forces on a grand scale.

FORD's prescription was then attacked by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, second-ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee. He said that, like MANSFIELD, he was disturbed by Republican statements urging the President "to broaden and intensify" the war in Asia; he feared it might win for the Republicans the title of "the war party." He is entirely correct in this.

Congressmen and Senators returning to Washington today after the weekend celebration of the independence of the United States will best contribute to the preservation of that independence by carrying on a full-scale debate to a conclusion. The rational way to conclude would be to put the question to a vote: Is the United States prepared to declare war?

If that bald proposition were put, it would unquestionably be defeated. And it is not inconceivable that a congressional refusal to declare war in southeast Asia might provide just the impulse to bring about serious negotiations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a part of the editorial reads as follows:

The depth of public division and confusion over Vietnam, even as the American troop buildup in southeast Asia escalates toward 75,000, is revealed by the following statement from the latest Gallup poll:

"The number of people who would like to see this country stop military action is almost the same as the number who would like to see us step up our efforts—about one in four. One person in three is unable to formulate any opinion."

It certainly should not be surprising to learn that there is no consensus of public opinion on the Vietnam conflict, much as President Johnson would like to feel he has one. The Gallup poll is merely confirmation of what has been revealed by the teach-ins, by letters to newspaper editors, and by ordinary curbside conversations.

I say to Mr. Drummond that the debate is on, and it will continue as long as we follow a military warmaking course of action in southeast Asia.

Je [Signature] Morse
RESIGNATION OF GEN. MAXWELL
TAYLOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was asked an hour or so ago by the press for my reaction to the news announcement that Gen. Maxwell Taylor has resigned as Ambassador to Saigon, and that the President has appointed Henry Cabot Lodge to take his place.

I paraphrase what I said to the press. I said that it is good news to learn that Gen. Maxwell Taylor has resigned as Ambassador to Saigon, for he should not have been appointed in the first place.

I spoke and voted against him in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I spoke and voted against him here on the floor of the Senate.

I pointed out before that he was one of the assistant architects, the chief architect being the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who drew the blueprint for the escalated war in North Vietnam that has violated one tenet after another of international law. I said before that I knew of no qualification that fitted him for the ambassadorship in Saigon.

The predictions I made at that time have been proven true over and over again under his unfortunate work as Ambassador in Saigon, for the political situation and the military situation have deteriorated under this American Ambassador who at one time was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Defense Department.

A military person should not have been put in that position, and his appointment aroused great criticism and suspicion in many capitals of the world. But, Mr. President, the appointment

really in effect telegraphed to the world what our plans were, for this was a military appointment. I have not been surprised at a single military escalation that has taken place under Taylor's ambassadorship.

Mr. President, it was bad news to read that Henry Cabot Lodge was appointed as Ambassador to Saigon to succeed Taylor, because he was one of the triumvirate who was another assistant architect in drawing the blueprint for an escalated war in southeast Asia.

This appointment is most unfortunate, and I shall vote against it when the confirmation vote is called for in the Senate.

As I have said so many times, I do not feel very happy when I have to express these great differences on foreign policy with my administration. But I wish to make very clear that I owe it to the President.

It was said to me the other day, in all good nature, by a very distinguished American that Prime Minister Wilson has his back benchers, but the President of the United States has his Wayne Morses. My reply was that the best friends Prime Minister Wilson has are his back benchers, because if one has sincere and honest differences of opinions with the policies of his government and he sits in a position of trust, such as a seat in the U.S. Senate, he owes it to his President and to the people of his country to express the differences of opinion and let the facts be his judge and let history render the verdict.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer of Monday, July 5, had an editorial which I would suggest that Mr. Drummond and other journalists who seem so bent on getting us into an escalated, massive war in Vietnam read. It is entitled "The Bolero Dance In Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE BOLERO DANCE IN VIETNAM

On February 18, 1964, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara declared that the struggle in Vietnam was a "counterguerrilla war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves."

He said, "our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese but to train them * * *." The United States, he asserted, "will pull out most of its troops by 1965 even if the anti-Communist drive there falters."

At the time, the United States had 17,000 "advisers" in Vietnam. Today, there are 53,500 U.S. troops there substituting themselves in a counterguerrilla war they presumably cannot win.

This is war, and complete candor cannot be expected from the Defense Secretary or from President Johnson. Military security forbids any revelation of decisions.

But the jump from the 685 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam at the beginning of 1962 to the 53,500 troops there now must come through as a loud and clear announcement to the public that the United States is moving steadily toward a second Korea in which, as Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has mentioned, 150,000 American troops may soon be embroiled.

While McNamara continues to baffle his news conferences with military jargon and

vague implications of success, dispatches from the front are telling of the unsuitability of U.S. weapons for jungle fighting, of the inability of U.S. troops to locate the enemy and of the deadly science the Vietcong have made of the ambush.

For what exact information the public has been given about the increasing throb of the terrible Vlet bolero dance, news reporters on the scene must be given most of the credit.

They have depicted the Vietcong as the master jungle fighters they are, even better than they were 10 years ago when the humiliated and routed a battlewise French Army led by the best French military brains.

They have reported the preposterous 4,000-mile flight made by 30 B-52's which plastered a Vietcong forest with thousands of bombs, apparently without a single Vietnam casualty.

Like the French, the American supply lines are overextended for this faraway war and, like St. Cyr, West Point does not specialize in jungle strategy.

While information out of Washington remains guarded and confused, the public must get prepared for involvement on a Korean scale.

Any willingness on the part of either Hanoi or Red China to negotiate is out of the question at this time. Why? Because they obviously are winning in their type of war.

These are the facts, regardless of what Washington says.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I invite the attention of Senators, very briefly, to the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the legislative appropriation bill for 1966, headed by the subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

It will be recalled that a few weeks ago I deplored in the Senate the fact that the Senate is not the best of employers. It will be recalled that I pointed out, as the chairman of the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee holding hearings on a minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia, that I had evidence that the Senate paid some employees less than \$1.25 an hour. I knew that was true of some of our service employees in the Senate restaurant.

I am delighted, and I want to highly compliment the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee that had jurisdiction in making recommendations for legislative branch appropriations this year. Listen to this:

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$246,000 for the Senate restaurants. The deficit in the operations of the restaurants during fiscal year 1966 is estimated to be \$121,000. In addition, there is a deficit from prior fiscal years of \$25,000. The balance, \$100,000, is recommended to provide for a wage increase for the restaurant employees. The General Accounting Office, at the request of the Committee on Rules and Administration, made a detailed study of the Senate restaurant operations, including the wages paid to its employees. As a result, a report has been submitted by the General Accounting Office representatives recommending increases in wages for the employees, which will result in increased cost aggregating \$134,000 per year.

Under existing law, it is the responsibility to the Committee on Rules and Administration to supervise the operation of the restaurants. The Committee on Appropriations

recommends that the General Accounting Office recommendations be adopted.

Those involved the wage increase recommendation.

The sum of \$134,000 additional was not provided since this sum was based on a full 12-month operation, and because of the late date the full amount will not be required. Furthermore, the committee believes that prices in the Senate restaurants should be increased in order to assist in financing these wage increases. The committee recommends to the Committee on Rules and Administration that price increases and wage increases be effected as soon as possible. With price increases effected, the deficit for fiscal year 1967 should be materially reduced.

In the event the Committee on Rules and Administration does not see fit to order wage increases into effect, the Architect of the Capitol is directed to return the \$100,000 to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. President, that is a wonderful report. I can well imagine that not all my colleagues, and not all the staff members of the Senate, will be too happy about the recommendation that prices of meals be increased in the Senate, but they can still buy cheap dinner buckets or dinner pails. I think it would be wonderful to see them carrying their dinner pails to their Senate offices if they do not want to pay for any increase in the price of meals.

Let us face it—those poor employees, underpaid, and exploited in the Senate restaurant, are subsidizing us in effect by working for wages below the national minimum of \$1.25 an hour. I have talked with many of these employees. I did a little investigating. One of the arguments used is that the Senate restaurant is running too large a deficit. I do not care what the deficit is. We have no moral right to pay our Senate employees a wage below \$1.25 an hour.

Let me say to those in charge of the service departments in the Capitol that I expect them to supply, through the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the facts concerning the wages they are paying.

If the reports made to me are that there are some spots in the service departments of the Senate paying less than \$1.25 an hour, I say that they should be corrected forthwith, because we cannot justify passing legislation increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and not having it apply to Senate employees, because in fact and in effect those employees are the employees of each and every Senator—all 100 of us—and I disapprove of paying below standard wages, which, I am advised, exist under the Capitol Dome and under the roofs of the two Senate Office Buildings with respect to some employees.

THE WESTERN SIDE OF OUR CONTINENTAL STORY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today, the New York Times publishes a book review about the western part of the United States, written by Earl Pomeroy, who is a professor of history at the University of Oregon. His book is entitled, "The Pacific Slope." It is an excellent book. It is a scholarly book.

I ask unanimous consent to have the book review printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOOKS OF THE TIMES—THE WESTERN SIDE OF OUR CONTINENTAL STORY

(By Charles Poore)

("The Pacific Slope," by Earl Pomeroy; 413 pages; Knopf; \$8.95.)

When he went out West in the 19th century, an indomitable old pioneer once proudly said, "I was worth nothing—and now I owe \$2 million."

That may be a pittance by our lavish modern standards. Call it a paltry, twisted status symbol if you will. Yet it gives a truly human scale to those great spacious lands Earl Pomeroy leads us through in "The Pacific Slope," a splendid, scholarly history of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada.

Here is no Wagnerian-Spenglerian decline of the West. Rather it is a jubilant pageant of new fortunes, where many things that shouldn't happen do, and many that should, don't.

Imagine an American map. Say its colors are still wet from the printing. Fold it in half, the colors touching. Now open it and see how the Atlantic urban sprawl has been duplicated, as it were, on the Pacific slope, along with our eastern spaghetti superhighway networks—mountains and deserts notwithstanding.

The West was the East's second chance. What it made of it, then, must be blamed on, or credited to, easterners in multitudes who for one reason or another went out there and grew natter than the natives in no time at all.

The West had sunshine. The East brought along cars and industries that spread what you might call a compensating smog. And instead of bringing the temperature down, that just made tempers go up. The East had big banks, big labor troubles. The West has its own plenty now, in those lines. Anyone who thinks New York's politics are a bit inscrutable at the moment can transfer a taste for confusion and fusion to Mr. Pomeroy's scrupulously documented western political chronicles.

Europe's feverish and alarmingly materialistic search for Eldorado ended triumphantly in the West. Gulches blazed with gold. Conquistadores of a new breed, however, won the big spoils. And Mr. Pomeroy never tires of reminding us that greater riches flowed from more prosaic industries out there.

A lettuce grower on a vast scale got lots of the green stuff. So did an orange orchardist. And so, of course, did the railroad builders, the cattlemen, the lumber kings, the sugar people, the maritime concerns, the incorporated shepherds, the real-estate speculators, the flying machine builders, and transplanted easterners who started as moviemakers and ended, with luck, among the oil millionaires. All sit for their portraits in Mr. Pomeroy's gallery.

The East drove the Mormons away and they found their empire in Utah. Nevada turned out silver in quantities and gave the laws of chance a spectacular demonstration ground at Las Vegas.

Without discernible preliminary planning, the Beats found homes away from home, or, if you like, villages away from Greenwich Village, all up and down the sunset coast. They became even more numerous than Nobel physicists at Berkeley, UCLA, Palo Alto and other famous centers of teaching in and teaching out.

Mr. Pomeroy, descended from wanderers who went West more than a century ago, is Beekman Professor of History at the University of Oregon. He has won the Beveridge Award of the American Historical Association.

He takes pride in mentioning that once complacent eastern universities are becoming "uncomfortably aware that bright young scholars on the coast" no longer regard invitations to serve even temporarily around here "as a command from the throne." Such, ladies and gentlemen, is a significant manifestation of upmanship in the glorious company of learning.

The main fact about the West, Mr. Pomeroy notes, is that its place "as an area separate and different from the rest of the United States is disappearing." Another point he stresses, time and again, is that the West was always rather more urban than heedless people thought: it has from the beginning clustered into towns. But then, I suppose, that is equally true for Sicily.

Writing about the West has decidedly matured. All scholars know that the Wild West began to lose luster a long time ago. But think of the electronic gadgetry, the technological art the urban sprawl called Hollywood pours into the production of its simple, homespun, deadly hippic operas.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the unanimous-consent agreement entered into earlier this evening, the time limitation will not make it possible for me to make my major address on the medicare bill tomorrow. Therefore, I shall do it tonight—and I hope as quickly as possible—for it is a matter which I wish to have in the Record for future reference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the end of my speech an article written by a doctor from my own State, Walter A. Noehren, entitled "Now is the Time—a Proposal Concerning Prepayment Medical Care."

I also ask unanimous consent that a sheet headed "Reference No. 1a," from a debate manual written from Sandy High School debate team 1964 be printed in the Record along with the article to which I have just referred.

I ask unanimous consent that at the same place in the Record there be printed another article entitled "Special Article—Medical Care for Everyman—a Proposal," written by Dr. Walter A. Noehren and Jack R. Hegrenes, Jr., in the Record.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have conferred with Dr. Noehren over the years many times. We have not seen eye to eye in regard to medicare. I have sought to be of help to him, and he has sought to be of help to me as we have tried to clarify our respective thinking in regard to the subject matter.

In fairness to him, it should be said that he is very much opposed to the bill now pending before the Senate—

which I shall vote for, because I believe that it represents a great step forward, that it is in keeping with the teaching of the Good Samaritan, and that it is a bill which seeks to put into legislative enactment the principles of Golden Rule.

The pending bill carries out what I have stated so many times is one of our primary obligations as Members of Congress; namely, to work for legislation which will promote the general welfare of all the people, and not permit the selfish interests of any group with our citizenry to prevent the passage of legislation which as a matter of public policy all the people are entitled to have enacted in their best interests.

Nevertheless, I thank Dr. Noehren for his sincerity of purpose, and for his sincere attempts to win me over to his point of view.

However, I believe that the preponderance of the evidence is clearly against him, and, therefore, tomorrow I shall vote with no hesitation for the medicare bill.

Mr. President, in 1958, I introduced the first Senate companion bill to what was known as the Forand bill, providing insurance under social security for certain medical expenses of people 65 and over.

How well I remember the day on which I offered that bill, because I stood alone; but, as Members of the Senate started to contemplate the import of the bill, I gained some support. That support has snowballed. To show what can happen in a 9-year period, we are now about to witness the basic principles of the Forand bill, which was introduced in the House and introduced by me as a companion bill in the Senate finally being adopted and enacted into law.

Since then, the Forand bill gained steady support among the American people. It was revised as to its coverage of expenses and individuals and, in fact, has been revised and amended many times.

But the principle of the bill has remained, and today we are taking one of the final steps toward its enactment into law. It would be hard to find a better example of the necessity, in a democratic system, for new ideas to be offered and discussed, voted on, revised, and debated, until the public is familiar with them and is afforded an opportunity either to accept them or reject them. It has taken approximately 7 years for the Forand bill to be enacted. That is about average for a proposal that breaks as much new ground as this one does. It takes time for politicians to be counted on a given issue, for the voters then to pass upon the judgment exercised by the politicians. Yes, medicare became a political issue. But that is how nearly all changes come about in a political democracy. Before they can succeed, they must first be expounded by the few in order to convince the many.

Now we are very close to achieving success with this measure. I shall always cherish the contribution I made to medicare when it was still in its political infancy, meaning when it was supported by only a small minority of Representatives and Senators.

I believe that the public and most

Members of the Congress are persuaded that medicare's benefits are both rational and meaningful in terms of the needs of the elderly. I believe that the public and most Members of the Congress are persuaded that the financing of the program is sound and equitable.

But, I also believe that there is another aspect to this program—apart from meaningful benefits and sound financing—whose implications and opportunities merit the most careful consideration. We have a duty to see to it that the administrative mechanisms employed in implementing medicare are completely consistent with the "public interest" and the principles of public responsibility.

Obviously, to the extent that the administrative functions of medicare are rendered by Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, the overriding public interest is well served. Conflicts of interest may arise, however, where administrative responsibilities may be delegated or assigned by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to non-public agencies. These are nongovernmental agencies whose basic commitment is not to the beneficiaries of the program but to whom medicare is an incidental, profitable, and subordinate supplement to other business.

My concern with the need for properly focused and oriented public administration and accountability lies primarily with the administrative arrangements authorized under part A, the basic medicare portion of H.R. 6675.

The Social Security Administration will have overall responsibility for the program. That agency would maintain records of eligibility; notify providers of services of the status of persons eligible under the program; issue identification cards, answer inquiries, etc. In other words, social security would perform the central recordkeeping function along with its other responsibilities.

It has been suggested that a private agency or agencies such as Blue Cross should control the data-processing equipment, records, and eligibility-determination process in order to insulate the providers of services from direct dealings with Government. The means suggested to attain this goal are, however, incompatible with efficient and economical administration in the public interest.

The size of the investment required to establish a proper system and the need to coordinate the various uses of the computers employed, make it imperative that the datakeeping equipment and operation be handled by the Federal Government. It is only under such auspices that the various agencies concerned with the program—such as the Social Security Administration, and the Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health—can obtain the kinds of information they need to fulfill their responsibilities. These new responsibilities include administration of a complex set of benefits, deductibles and coinsurance features, and benefit ceilings that may require repeated determinations of eligibility. At the same time a vast amount of epidemiological,

local registration official if he states, under oath, that in his belief to have done so would have been futile or would have jeopardized the personal safety, employment, or economic standing of himself, his family, or his property. Such examiner shall in the same manner as provided in section 4(d), certify and serve lists of eligible voters and any supplements as appropriate at the end of each month, upon the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with reports of his findings as to those persons listed.

"(b) Challenges to the findings of the examiners shall be made in the manner and under the same conditions as are provided in section 5.

"(c) The Civil Service Commission shall appoint and make available additional hearing officers within the voting district as may be necessary to hear and determine the challenges under this section.

"(d) Any person who has been placed on a list of eligible voters shall be entitled and allowed to vote in any election held within the voting district unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with section 10. If challenged, such person shall be entitled and allowed to vote provisionally with appropriate provision being made for the impounding of their ballots, pending final determination of their status by the hearing officer and by the court.

"(e) Examiners shall issue to each person placed on a list of eligible voters a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

"(f) No person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of the provisions of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

"APPLICATION AND PROCEDURE

"Sec. 9. (a) Consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, persons appearing before an examiner shall make application in such form as the Civil Service Commission may require. Also consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, the times, places, and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

"(b) Notwithstanding time limitations as may be established under State or local law, examiners shall make themselves available every weekday in order to determine whether persons are qualified to vote.

"(c) Times, places, and procedures for hearing and determination of challenges under sections 5 and 8 (b) shall be prescribed by regulation promulgated by the Civil Service Commission, provided that hearing officers shall hear challenges in the voting district of the listed persons challenged.

"REMOVAL FROM VOTER LISTS

"Sec. 10. Any person whose name appears on a list, as provided in this Act, shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list. A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in sections 5 and 7, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (a) not to have voted or attempted to vote at least once during four consecutive years while listed or during such longer period as

is allowed by State law without requiring re-registration, or (b) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote: *Provided, however*, That in a State which requires reregistration within a period of time shorter than four years, the person shall be required to reregister with an examiner who shall apply reregistration methods and procedures of State law not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

"QUALIFICATIONS OF EXAMINERS AND HEARING OFFICERS

"Sec. 11. Examiners and hearing officers appointed by the Civil Service Commission shall be existing Federal officers and employees who are residents of the State in which the Attorney General has issued his certification. Examiners and hearing officers shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 16 of title 5, United States Code. Examiners and hearing officers shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work as examiners and hearing officers shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of sections 835 to 842 of title 5, United States Code. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

"TERMINATION OF LISTING

"Sec. 12. The listing provisions of this Act shall be applied in a voting district until, within any twelve-month period, less than twenty-five persons within the voting district have been placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners.

"ENFORCEMENT

"Sec. 13. (a) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under the provisions of this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not properly counted or not counted subject to the impounding provision, as provided in section 8(d), the examiner shall notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegation, in his opinion, appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may forthwith apply to the district court for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including orders directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote, (2) to count such votes, or (3) for such other orders as the court may deem necessary and appropriate.

"(b) No person, acting under color of law, shall—

"(1) fail or refuse to permit to vote any person who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act; or

"(2) willfully fail or refuse to count, tabulate, and report accurately such person's vote; or

"(3) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any such person entitled to vote under any provision of this Act for voting or attempting to vote; or

"(4) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for urging or aiding voting or attempted voting by persons entitled to vote under any provision of this Act.

"(c) No person, acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for exercising any powers or duties under section 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 of this Act.

"(d) No person shall in any matter within the jurisdiction of an examiner or a hearing officer, knowingly and willfully falsify or conceal a material fact, or make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to contain

any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry.

"(e) Any person violating any of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(f) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1955).

"(g) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

"INTERFERENCE WITH ELECTIONS

"Sec. 14. (a) No person shall, for any reason—

"(1) fail or refuse to permit to vote in any State any person who is qualified to vote under the provisions of the law of such State which are not inconsistent with the provisions of Federal law; or

"(2) willfully fail or refuse to count, tabulate, and report accurately such person's vote; or

"(3) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any such person for the purpose of preventing such person from voting or attempting to vote; or

"(4) intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for the purpose of preventing such person from urging or aiding voting or attempted voting.

"(b) No person shall, within a year following an election, (1) destroy, deface, mutilate, or otherwise alter the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alter any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise.

"(c) No person shall knowingly or willfully give false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in a voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspire with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or pay or offer to pay or accept payment either for registration to vote or for voting.

"(d) Any person violating any of the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(e) The foregoing provisions of this section shall be applicable only to general, special, or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, Members of the United States House of Representatives, or Delegates or Commissioners from the territories or possessions.

"RELIEF FROM ENFORCEMENT OF POLL TAX

"Sec. 15 (a) Congress hereby finds that the constitutional right to vote of large numbers of citizens of the United States is denied or abridged on account of race or color in some States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in State or local elections. To assure that the right to vote is not thus denied or abridged, the Attorney General shall forthwith institute in the name of the United States actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax, or other tax or payment, which, as a condition precedent to voting in State or local elections, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

"(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such actions which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the

July 8, 1965

United States Code. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

"(c) Appeal from judgments rendered under this section shall be to the Supreme Court in accordance with section 1253, title 28, United States Code.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 16. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEPARABILITY

"Sec. 17. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. McCULLOCH (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the so-called McCulloch substitute and all amendments thereto be limited to 2 hours, and that such time be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6400) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF
WYOMING'S STATEHOOD

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, as this year marks the 75th anniversary of Wyoming's statehood, I wish to present the first of several profiles of outstanding Wyoming citizens who, through years of dedicated service, have helped to establish Wyoming as the Equality State, a State with a progressive outlook on a bright future but with an acute awareness of the independence and integrity of its earlier leaders.

JOSEPH M. CAREY

Such a leader was Joseph Maull Carey, born in Milton, Del., January 19, 1845, died in Cheyenne, Wyo., February 5, 1924. He attended the common schools, Fort Edward Collegiate Institute, and Union College, New York; was graduated from

the law department of the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia in 1864; and was admitted to the bar in 1867. He practiced law in Philadelphia for 2 years and then was appointed by President Grant as the first U.S. attorney in the newly created territory of Wyoming. He served on the Supreme Court from 1872 to 1876 and, upon retirement from the bench, engaged in the cattle and ranching business as the owner of the original CY ranch near Casper.

EARLY STOCKMAN

Judge Carey aided in the formation of the Stock Association of Laramie County, which later became the Wyoming Stock Growers Association. He brought to the organization the legal mind it needed in its formative days, helping to hold the group together in trying times, and was president of the association from 1883 to 1887. Judge Carey served as a member of the U.S. Centennial Commission from 1872 to 1876; a member of the Republican National Committee from 1876 to 1897; and mayor of Cheyenne 1881 to 1885. He was elected as a Republican to the 49th, 50th, and 51st Congresses, serving from March 4, 1885, until July 10, 1890, when the territory became a State.

FATHERED WYOMING

Judge Carey introduced the bill providing for the admission of Wyoming as a State, defending ardently and successfully the constitutional clause which conferred suffrage upon women. He was chosen as the first U.S. Senator from Wyoming. During his single term, he secured the passage of an act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to patent lands to States containing desert areas, provided they would cause such lands to be reclaimed and irrigated. The terms of this act, commonly known as the Carey Act, were accepted by Wyoming in 1895 and large areas were patented to companies.

Although most of his constituents favored the free coinage of silver, Carey supported President Cleveland in securing the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1878, sacrificing his chances of reelection. He then resumed the practice of law in Cheyenne. During President Theodore Roosevelt's administration he became a Progressive Republican, and again paid dearly for his independence, failing to obtain the nomination of the Republicans for Governor in 1910. He was offered the nomination by the Democratic Party and was elected, serving as Governor of Wyoming from 1910 to 1912.

A PROGRESSIVE

He was one of the organizers of the Progressive Party in 1912. Thereafter, he was vice president of the Federal Land Bank and a member of the board of trustees of the University of Wyoming. Judge Carey became a promoter of a development company which by extensive irrigation projects at Wheatland threw open large areas to cultivation. In this undertaking he had in mind a great Wyoming with agriculture as its cornerstone.

In 1877 he married Louise David. The elder of their two sons, Robert D. Carey, also served as Governor of Wyoming and as a U.S. Senator. Robert Carey was the

father of the late Joseph Carey II and the late Sarah Carey. Judge Carey's younger son, the late Charles D. Carey, was the father of Elizabeth, now Mrs. Willits Brewster, with sons William and John, of Cheyenne; Louise, now Mrs. Francis J. Bon, with daughter Louise, of Washington D.C.; and Charles D. Carey, husband of the former Margaret Barnes, with children David, Louise, and Elizabeth, of Cheyenne.

Judge Carey never feared to venture into new areas of endeavor. His willingness to serve the common good, despite injury to himself, and his humanitarian ideals are qualities which made Joseph M. Carey one of America's outstanding citizens. His ruggedness, self-sufficiency, independence, and individuality are traits typical of the spirit shown by the people of Wyoming in building a great State over the last 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, the second sketch in this 75th anniversary series of outstanding Wyoming citizens will present Senator Francis E. Warren.

Francis E. Warren
LIST OF ALLIED-FLAG SHIPS TRADING WITH THE VIETCONG

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include certain tables and figures with reference thereto.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, stepped up efforts are needed to halt allied shippers trading with the Vietcong.

The construction of missile sites protecting the port of Haiphong, where the bulk of allied merchant ships call, is proof that the Communists feel shipping is important.

It will be necessary to watch shipping figures into North Vietnam very closely in the near future. Recall that during the Soviet buildup of missiles in Cuba, during the summer of 1962, those missiles were transported in Communist ships. However, the normal supply traffic was diverted for hauling aboard vessels of the allied flag. This morning's reports of possible missile-bearing Red-flag ships being spotted in waters around North Vietnam underscores the need to curb free world ship trade with the Vietcong.

Latest estimates by the State Department assess allied ship trade with the Vietcong to account for approximately 17 percent of all nonstrategic goods flowing into North Vietnam. This figure is based on the most recent information available to the Department, as I am advised. Also, the State Department last Friday confirmed a 20-percent drop in the overall free world ship traffic to North Vietnam, however the indication was given that such trade is of little significance.

Clearly, more diplomatic efforts must be made to discourage this trade, whether it goes on now or in the future. From January to June 28 of this year the latest Pentagon figures show 191 American troops killed in battle against the Vietcong. Under these circumstances of rising military action, one allied ship working for the Vietcong is one too many.

July 8, 1965

15471

I am including in the RECORD a list of those allied ships and shipowners who have engaged in Vietcong trade for the first 6 months of this year. An analysis

of this list will show that many of the same ships or owners repeatedly haul Red goods. It should be easier to crack down on these repeat offenders, particularly when many of the cargos are be-

ing shipped from the same ports in or near Red China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge greater efforts to end this assistance being supplied the Vietcong by certain of our allies.

Free world shipping to Communist North Vietnam January to June, 1965

JANUARY

Ship	Flag	Ostensible owner	Port of departure	Arrival
Cardross	British	Cronulla Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Haiphong.
Jinsan	do	Jin Hoe Co., Ltd., Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia	do	Do.
Longford	do	Peninsular Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Port Campha.
Santa Granda	do	Verder & Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Haiphong.
Wakasa Bay	do	Viking Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Port Campha.
Elbow River	do	River Line, Ltd., Hamilton, Bermuda	Kokura (Japan)	Do.
Golden Zeta	do	The Keystone Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Do.
Hakuyo Maru	Japanese	Taiyo Gyogyo K. K., Tokyo	Hong Kong	Do.
Saronis	Greek	Morania Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Tokuyama	Haiphong.
Alolos II	Lebanese	Poseidon Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Rangoon	Port Campha.
Panagos	do	Patlem Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Hong Kong	Haiphong.

FEBRUARY

Ship	Flag	Ostensible owner	Port of departure	Arrival
Bidford	British	Hemisphere Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Port Campha.
Cardross	do	Cronulla Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Haiphong.
Dartford	do	Peninsular Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Hongay.
Elbow River	do	River Line, Ltd., Hamilton, Bermuda	do	Port Campha.
Fortune Wind	do	Continental Navigation & Enterprises, Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Haiphong.
Jinsan	do	Jin Hoe Co., Ltd., Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia	do	Do.
Longford	do	Peninsular Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Do.
Newglade	do	Panuloo Shipping Co., Ltd., London	do	Do.
Rochford	do	Peninsular Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Do.
Stanwear	do	Stanhope Steamship Co., Ltd., London	do	Do.
Wakasa Bay	do	Viking Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Tokyo	Port Campha.
Wishford	do	Ocean Tramping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Haiphong.
Cardamalitis	Greek	Strovill Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Yokohama	Do.
Syros	do	Hunter, M.C. Fred (London)	Antwerp	Hanoi.
Melwa Maru	Japanese	Nitto Shosen K. K., Tokyo	Kobe (Japan)	Port Campha.

MARCH

Ship	Flag	Ostensible owner	Port of departure	Arrival
Bidford	British	Hemisphere Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Hongay.
Cardross	do	Cronulla Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Haiphong.
Golden Alpha	do	Corithian Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Port Campha
Longford	do	Peninsular Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Do.
Santa Granda	do	Verder & Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Do.
Elbow River	do	River Line, Ltd., Hamilton, Bermuda	Yokohama	Haiphong.
Dukat	Norwegian	A/S Arne Sveen's Rederi	Hong Kong	Port Campha and Hongay.
Nissos Paros	Greek	Georgopulos, F. C., Piraeus	do	Port Campha.
Rahlotis	do	Strovill Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Constantasa	Haiphong.
San Sprydon	Lebanese	Olistim Nav. Co., Ltd., Monrovia, Liberia	Moji	Do.
Hollands Diep	Dutch	Hollandse Vrachtvaart Maats., Amsterdam	Whampoa	Do.
Sambas	do	Koninklijke Paketvaart Maats., Amsterdam	Hong Kong	Do.

APRIL

Ship	Flag	Ostensible owner	Port of departure	Arrival
Santa Granda	British	Verder & Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Yokohama	Port Campha.
Sletford	Norwegian	Paulsen, Egil, Fredrikstad, Skibs-A/S Karlander, Oslo	Hong Kong	Haiphong.
Mul Heng	do	A/S Arne Sveen's Rederi	do	Do.
Greelan Isles	Greek	Cia. Mar. Villa Nova S.A., Panama	Shanghai	Port Campha.

MAY

Ship	Flag	Ostensible owner	Port of departure	Arrival
Antartica	British	Tat On Shipping & Enterprises, Ltd., Hong Kong	Havana, Cuba	Haiphong.
Cardross	do	Cronulla Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Do.
Fortune Wind	do	Continental Navigation & Enterprises, Ltd., Hong Kong	do	Do.
Kawana	do	Willow Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Nagoya	Port Campha
Nancy Dee	do	Red Anchor Line, Ltd.	Yawata	Haiphong.
Shirley Christine	do	St. Meryn Shipping Co., Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Port Campha.
Hemisphere	do	Hemisphere Shipping Co., Ltd., Hong Kong	Cienfuegos, Cuba	Haiphong.
Sletford	Norwegian	Paulsen, Egil, Fredrikstad, Skibs-A/S Karlander, Oslo	Hong Kong	Do.
Gina	do	A/S Turid	Shanghai	Do.
Herborg	do	Vaboena Rederi-A/S	Hong Kong	Do.
Nymfea	Greek	United Sea Transports, Inc., Panama	Yokohama	Do.
Phoevos	do	Amphion Shipping Corp., Panama	Gela	Do.
Irena	do	Ollsippo Cia. Nav. S.A., Panama	Hong Kong	Do.

BRIGHTER BUDGET

(Mr. KREBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Brighter Budget," from the Newark News of June 21, 1965.

To those of us who look forward to the days when our Federal Government can

boast of a balanced budget, the recent editorial from the Newark News was indeed good news. I am sure my colleagues will find this editorial of interest. The Johnson administration not only has forecast a surprisingly low budget deficit of \$3.8 billion, the lowest in 5 years, but actually is working toward a balanced budget in the not too distant future. I agree with the Newark News that such a prospect is magnificent.

The editorial follows:

BRIGHTER BUDGET

It is becoming increasingly evident that last year's \$11.5 billion income tax cut was not as great a risk as defenders of orthodox fiscal policy feared. With the reduction, which the administration designed to stimulate the economy, it was felt the revenue loss would result in a still larger deficit unless Federal spending were substantially reduced.

In April, President Johnson disclosed the budget deficit for the current fiscal year would be \$5.3 billion in the red, not \$6.3 billion as he forecast in January. When he

July 8, 1965

15472

sent the excise tax reduction proposal to Congress the deficit was dropped to \$4.4 billion.

And now, only a month later, Mr. Johnson has come out with the comforting news the deficit may drop to \$3.8 billion. If this becomes a fact, the deficit will be at a 5-year low. In the last fiscal year the deficit was \$8.3 billion.

Mr. Johnson's figures, of course, are projections. The actual financial statement will be issued after the books are closed the end of this month. Nevertheless, his Budget Bureau officials have a remarkable record for making predictions on the side of understatement.

The changed budget picture is the consequence, of course, of an unexpected flood of tax collections and the fact that Mr. Johnson has restored some respectability to Government economy. In the case of tax collections, the President estimated they will total \$92.8 billion, or \$1.6 billion more than he estimated in January and \$3.3 billion more than the Government collected last year. As for spending, it will be about \$900 million under the \$97.5 billion in the current budget and \$1.1 billion less than last year's expenditures.

From Mr. Johnson's figures, the Government would still be \$3.8 billion from a balanced budget. But now at least we have a basis for looking forward to balance.

Speaking of the budget's prospects, the President happily remarked, "We expect a very unique thing to happen to us."

Unique? The word is magnificent.

SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR ANSWERS STUDENTS WHO DESTROY DRAFT CARDS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, I wrote to the Director of the Selective Service to inquire as to what course of action has been taken with regard to registrants who have deliberately destroyed draft cards.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., June 3, 1965.

Lt. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
 Director, Selective Service System,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Reports that college students are deliberately destroying their draft cards is highly disturbing. Would you please tell me what action has been taken against the guilty?

If you feel that the selective service law needs revision to discourage such violations, you may be sure that I will be happy to cooperate with you in this matter.

With every good wish,
 Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
 Member of Congress.

I have received the following letter, dated June 23, from Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey in reply:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
 Washington, D.C., June 23, 1965.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
 House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I have your letter of June 3, 1965, concerning the destruction by some registrants of their selective service registration certificates.

Where it can be established that a registrant has deliberately destroyed his registration certificate he may be declared a delin-

quent by the local board and his processing for induction accelerated.

The determination of whether an indictment should be sought in any such instance rests with the appropriate U.S. attorney.

In the cases of the reported destruction of registration certificates in California this Agency has suggested that the Federal Bureau of Investigation interview and obtain signed statements of the registrants allegedly involved for the use of local boards in determining whether these registrants should be declared delinquent and their induction accelerated.

I appreciate your offer of support for any legislation which may be necessary in this area. However, adequate authority exists to enforce compliance with the law either through accelerated induction or by criminal prosecution.

If I may be of further service, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
 Director.

Mr. Speaker, because of the serious nature of the actions of those defiant of the selective service law, particularly since the infractions have taken place at a time when loyal American servicemen are exposing their lives to enemy fire in Vietnam and to the guerrilla tactics of die-hard Dominican Republic factions, Congress will be insistent upon checking the progress of the actions of responsible officers and authorities against the guilty parties. For this reason I have today written to General Hershey asking for a full report on what has transpired since his letter of June 23 as well as on future plans and developments as they take place.

I have informed General Hershey that Congress is interested not only in the California cases but in all related instances where violations have occurred. If the selective service system has no record of violations other than in California, then I have promised to cooperate in attempting to determine whether reports of profanations of the draft law elsewhere in the country can be substantiated. I am also interested in learning whether the "appropriate" U.S. attorney automatically undertakes to determine whether an indictment should be sought or if the request for such course of action must come from the selective service system or other appropriate agency of the Government.

Finally, does referral to local boards "in determining whether these"—California cases—"registrants should be declared delinquent and their induction accelerated" indicate that selective service is not considering criminal prosecution as an alternative to accelerated induction?

The answer to the latter question will be important to Congress because it is highly probable that some of the individuals involved would not qualify physically or morally—for military service. If any of the involved offenders resemble some of the degenerates that appear at many of the demonstrations where patriotism and the flag are scorned, a period of incarceration directed at rehabilitation could well be preferable to accelerated induction.

REAFFIRMING SUPPORT OF THE 10TH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a concurrent resolution which upon passage by the House of Representatives and the Senate will reaffirm our support of the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which in clear, simple, and precise words states:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This amendment, 1 of the 10 amendments which comprise our bill of rights, is as important today to the fundamental structure of government upon which our Nation is founded as it was when first proposed by the Congress in 1789.

The resolution which I have introduced is needed now because of the safeguard to individual freedom and the balance which the 10th amendment extends to our Nation and to our people in every part of our land, and the misunderstanding that has been generated in our time as to the purpose and intent of this amendment in relation to the basic principles of liberty which we as Americans hold so dear.

There have been, from the outset, two opposing schools of thought in the United States as to the relative importance of strong centralized government at the Federal level as opposed to the rights of the States to self-government with the primary responsibility for the solution of local problems remaining in the State and local governments.

The strength of our Nation has been forged through the interlocking authority of Federal and State Governments which, while establishing national guidance for our expanding country, at the same time gave to our individual States the means to develop in accordance with their diversified interests and requirements.

Our national character became that of a people courageous, self-reliant, independent, confident, progressive—a people that could not be intimidated nor persuaded to trade individual liberty for security through dependence upon the Federal Government.

In recent years since World War II we have seen a continuing expansion of Federal power with attendant encroachment into the sphere of State authority as defined in our Constitution.

We exist in an ever-changing universe and accept necessary expansion of Federal functions to keep pace with our population growth and economic development within the limits of authorized constitutional power. But such expansion must not become an instrument to abrogate or nullify the rights of the individual States as guaranteed by the 10th amendment.

The reservation of certain rights to the States has permitted a continuous

His idea seemed a bit farfetched at the time, but it doesn't seem so unrealistic when you see what has happened with the farm programs we now have. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, says that the USDA's budget has risen from almost \$5½ billion in fiscal year 1960, to nearly \$8 billion in 1964. At the same time, net farm income has increased less than \$1 billion, in return for the extra \$2½ billion spent on farm programs.

It seems quite a waste to pay \$2.50 for each extra \$1 brought to the farmer. That extra cost could be so much better used to buy inputs the farmer needs to increase his production efficiency and profits. Those kinds of dollars can return him \$2 or \$3 apiece, when spent among local farm suppliers.

We also expect that the farmers would prefer spending their own tax dollars the latter way, rather than sending them to Washington to be diluted.

New Open-Door Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the days before World War II, in England, there was a small but noisy faction of young people constantly asserting that under no circumstances would they fight "for King and country." It is true that when war did come many of them renounced this view and served king and country in the armed forces. Many of them died for a cause they had seemed to renounce just a few years before. But many historians believe that Hitler was encouraged in the pursuit of his aggressive policies under the mistaken belief that this minority reflected the sentiment of England as a whole and that the English national will to resist had deteriorated.

Today we see this in the United States. A noisy, unwashed collection of beatniks makes noise and gets publicity out of all proportion to its size and influence, and reports reaching the West from the Communist bloc indicate that some of our adversaries believe these protests and demonstrations against U.S. foreign policy indicate the American will to resist has been undermined.

Of course, this vocal minority does not in any sense speak for the majority of American youth, and I have been encouraged to read of counterdemonstrations pledging support to this country and backing its foreign policy of standing firm against Communist aggression. Still, in its misguided ignorance, this beatnik minority has the capacity to work much harm to the United States. The following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of July 7, 1963, points out what would have happened if these people had had their way in past crises, and it carries a somber warning of what could happen if this sentiment were to prevail in the present:

NEW OPEN-DOOR POLICY

It has become a ritual of today's beatnik political youths to tear up their draft cards and let the confetti flutter defiantly onto the pavement.

This act of rebellion is in line with the old-fashioned Bohemian custom of "epater la bourgeoisie," which translates "flabbergast the middle class," or more aptly, "bug the squares." More erratic denizens of the Paris Left Bank or New York's Greenwich Village would stir up the merchants, bankers, clergy and other elements of nonbeat society by tattooing their shaved heads with obscene pictures, walking lobsters down the street on leashes and ribbon, dyeing their hair lavender or promenading in togas or breech-clouts.

Tearing up draft cards is less bizarre but more sinister. It is supposed to make patriotic Americans, who are considered "suckers" and "squares," froth at the mouth. At the same time it is a symbolic protest against war as a policy, and a notification by the card shredders that they would not serve in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Many of these rebels are members of a growing leisure class of youth, basking in a prolonged childhood made possible by liberal allowances from fathers who earn their livings in crass occupations which their bearded, self-indulgent sons deplore.

But the supreme irony of the draft card ripping ceremonies is that these militant pacifists are giving the word that they will not fight to defend the freedom which makes their rebellion possible in the first place. They assume that freedom, if they think about it at all, is a gift of nature, like air and sunshine, eternal and indestructible. They are wrong.

Societies remain free, only when they produce men and women who value freedom highly enough to fight for it. Our country won our freedom by fighting for it and has kept it by fighting for it.

If the draft card ripping complex had prevailed in 1776 and since there would be no United States today, only a group of colonies. King George III would not have been chastened and sobered in his autocratic drives by the loss of such valuable possessions, and the cause of freedom would have suffered in the British Empire and everywhere else in the world.

If the draft card shredders had had their way in 1942, the country might now well be divided into an East Zone ruled by Japanese warlords and occupation troops as a subdivision of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere, and a West Zone under the heel of Nazi gaulleiters and SS troops busy with duties including, among other things, the shipping of undesirables—persons with unfavorable opinions and the like—to death camps.

And if it prevails in the America of the remaining decades of this century, the official language of this country by the year 2000 may be Chinese and children of the draft-card shredders may be pulling well-upholstered Red Chinese tourists in rickshas through New York, Washington, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, New Orleans, Dallas, and Indianapolis, which will have strange-sounding names like New Chengtu, New Yungning, New Tsangwu and New Chungtien.

This would be the result of a new Open-Door policy, one that said, "Mao, the door of America is open. Come on in."

Winner of State Driving Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the

RECORD an article that was recently published in the Lewistown Sentinel dealing with the safe driving contest that is being conducted on a national scale:

SECOND YEAR FOR COUNTY: LEWISTOWN YOUTH WINS STATE DRIVING CONTEST

For the second consecutive year a Mifflin County youth has copped the State Jaycee State Driving Road-e-o.

The 13th annual contest hosted by the State College Jaycees and the Pennsylvania State University was won by Jerry North, son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. North of R.D. 2.

Jerry will represent the State of Pennsylvania in the national contest in August.

Winners from 43 local contests from throughout the State competed in this event. Jerry scored 466 points from a possible 550.

Competition was held Saturday with a written test in the morning and skill and road test in the afternoon.

An awards banquet was held at the Nittany Lion Inn at the university Saturday at 6 p.m. Guest speaker for the event was Amos Neyhart, retired director of the institute of public safety at the university.

FOUNDED IN 1952

Joseph Intorre of the institute of public safety served as honorary chairman. It was under Mr. Intorre's direction that the Teen Age Road-e-o was founded in 1952.

Nelson Hartranft of Hatfield, president of the Pennsylvania Jaycees, presented the awards, Michael Potochney, representing Hall Motor Freight, presented a rotating trophy to the Jaycee chapter sponsoring the State winner. This trophy, given this year for the first time, will rotate to other winning chapters in coming years.

The State contest was cosponsored by the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania Jaycees. The national contest, which will be held in Washington, D.C., will be cosponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Lincoln-Mercury Division of Ford Motor Co.

The local sponsor was McCardie's Motors, Inc., which also provided the use of a new automobile for the State contest.

Jerry was accompanied to State College by David Loudenslager, local Jaycee chair for the Road-e-o.

David McBride, of Highland Park, a student at Chief Logan, last year's State winner, was present at the banquet, as were Jerry's parents.

Fe On Holifield
Debate Concluded: Defense of Vietnam Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the July 7, 1965, Washington Post:

DEBATE CONCLUDED: DEFENSE OF VIETNAM SUPPORTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The debate is over. The verdict is in. By now President Johnson knows he can count on the decisive support of Congress and the country behind his decision to defend South Vietnam.

For a time it looked like touch and go and many thought that the President's public backing was crumbling. The professorial teach-ins crying, "Get out of Vietnam" were contagious. Poets writing L.B.J. about how

wrong he was seemed to be getting a better hearing than Rusk and McNamara.

But it was the opposition to the defense of Vietnam that was crumbling, not the support. Although there has been no formal referendum, the national decision is amply clear. Here is the evidence:

Top Republican spokesmen—Senator **EVERETT DIRKSEN** and Representative **GERALD FORD**, the minority leaders in Congress, who have given Mr. Johnson strong support over Vietnam from the beginning, have just renewed their bipartisan backing.

Democratic leaders in Congress—like Senators **J. W. FULBRIGHT** and **FRANK CHURCH**—who have been sharply critical of the President's course in Vietnam, are now agreeing that for the United States to withdraw or give up would be disastrous.

The public critics of the Government—like **Hans Morgenthau** of the University of Chicago, the leading professional teacher—have talked so much and said so little that the country could not fail to see that they had no constructive alternative.

This undermined their criticism so badly with the public that Professor Morgenthau had to shift his stance and say he was against withdrawal.

Some sincerely say, "Let's negotiate." The United States has offered unconditional discussions, the Communists have refused and you can't negotiate at an empty table.

Some sincerely say, "Quit escalating the war." The fact is that U.S. military power is being used with care and measure. It is the Vietcong who are raising the level of terror and escalating the fighting.

Some sincerely say, "The real struggle in Vietnam is economic, not military." It is both, and Vietnam cannot begin to make real economic progress until the aggression is ended and the fighting stopped. At which time, as the President has announced, the United States will provide general aid.

And what next? There is no certain answer. We don't know how long it will be before the aggressor has had enough. But there is no reason to think that the Vietcong are going to overrun South Vietnam if we are prepared to stay the course. I give you the words—and the faith—of Capt. James Sprull, U.S. Army, written to his wife in the United States a few days before he gave his life in Vietnam.

"I feel there is too much talk of despair. Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please do not let them, back where you are, sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty and of victory—for we must and can win here.

"There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go."

Another American has said: "We will not withdraw. We will not grow tired. We will not be defeated."

That was the President of the United States. It is evident by now that his goal is the goal of most Americans.

Derogatory Allegations Concerning the State of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as in yesterday's RECORD our colleague,

PAUL A. FINO, saw fit to make certain derogatory allegations concerning the State of Maine, I believe the House may be interested in this rebuttal in the form of a letter to the gentleman from New York:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1965.

HON. PAUL A. FINO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: I noted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday that you have repeated your allegations of the existence of organized crime in Maine supported by illegal gambling.

If you have arrived at this wild conclusion merely through prorating Maine's population against the total estimate of illegal gambling in the Nation, this is the height of irresponsibility. Surely there is a better way for you to promote your campaign for a national lottery than to make such unsubstantiated charges.

You may remember that I wrote you in a similar vein during the last session of Congress after you had made a similar charge against my State. At that time I requested you to bring to the attention of Maine's attorney general any evidence you had supporting your charges. In checking today with the Honorable Richard Dubord, attorney general of Maine, I find that you have offered nothing whatsoever to back up your allegations.

This hit-and-run technique may be admired in your congressional district, but it is not in mine.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. TUPPER,
Member of Congress from Maine.

What Are We Doing to Our Youth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the riots, violence, destruction of property and contempt for law enforcement officers in areas all over the country during the July 4th weekend should be of concern to every thinking American.

Is it not time we asked ourselves why well-educated young people from supposedly good family backgrounds show such contempt for law and orders? Certainly some responsibility must be borne by over-indulgent parents. It is true that too many of our youngsters have been coddled and spoiled. But these factors are not the sole reason for such outbursts as we have seen all too often in recent months.

A major contributing factor is the lowered moral standard we have been willing to accept. High Government officials and even some of our leading churchmen have condoned violence and the defiance of law and order for any who believe that it is right to disobey laws which they feel are unjust. You cannot tell young people one day it is OK to riot, to defy the police, to break up property and destroy communities for one cause and then convince them the next day

that they cannot do the same thing to satisfy their desires no matter how depraved these desires may be. We cannot instill in the youth of America a sense of duty, honesty, integrity, and moral character when every issue of our newspapers exposes corruption, dishonesty, and immorality in high places. Only when we demand of our national leaders a strict code of ethics and morality may we expect the rising generation to respect the law and to act with integrity and honesty.

This point is made in the following editorial from the Birmingham Post Herald of July 6 and I include it as part of these remarks:

OUR FLAMING YOUTH

Dating back to Biblical times, the older generation has been disturbed by acts of the younger folk.

"We didn't do that when we were young" is the universal complaint.

But all of us should be concerned with the obvious disregard for authority and the destructive tactics of youths over the holiday weekend in many parts of the country. Don't these young people know what Independence Day means—how many people have given their lives to see that it survives?

National guardsmen were forced to seal off a town in Ohio and to use tear gas on 1,500 rioters.

In Iowa tear gas was used and guardsmen volunteered to help subdue the mobs.

Police dogs were employed in Missouri where there were more than 2,000 rioters.

There were other spots also, where youth got out of hand, enough to make this a case for national concern.

Said one policeman "If the parents were only on hand to see how their children are living and behaving down here, this wouldn't happen."

This brings the question—where were the parents and did they know what their youngsters are doing?

Most of these rioters, we judge, are from middle or upper class homes. They have enough money to bring in cases of beer and whisky.

Stern treatment by authorities, including fines stiff enough to impress parents, could do some good.

But most of all, it seems to us, is the need for a higher code of living for us all.

What is the good of a Great Society, with money and comforts for everyone, if our standards are lowered to allow barbaric behavior?

Primarily this is a matter that parents and local authorities should handle. But we need also to look to our moral and spiritual standards nationally.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Midwest Democratic conference at its meeting in Chicago on June 26 adopted a very significant resolution in opposition to any effort to nullify or dilute the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decisions on apportionment of State legislatures.