

August 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19407

Investing \$2 billion of private money needed to complete the replacement program is not something that private investors can take lightly, nor is it something they can get into and get out of in a hurry. They must have some assurances of firm Government policy or we will see the entire U.S. fleet go down the drain.

Labor, too, has a heavy responsibility in this matter. The fruits of automation cannot be reaped if labor insists on unrealistic manning requirements.

I know the deep concern that many of the labor leaders feel for the industry and its problems.

I know, too, some of the internal problems they have with the reduced crews automation brings.

But, surely, as has happened in so many other industries, labor statesmanship can come forth and survive by not bucking automation and its consequences. It can, instead, take a humane view toward what is needed for the men affected by the change. Unless voluntary cooperation leads to labor peace, stronger measures are bound to be demanded.

I call on my friends in the maritime labor unions to get together and look at the needs of the membership in adjusting to change rather than thinking in terms of resisting the change which is mandatory if the industry is to survive.

And, industry, too, has a deep responsibility to its employees so effected.

Industry initiative of the kind the railroad industry demonstrated would go a long way toward easing the pain that change brings to men and their families in any industry.

Labor, industry, and Government—all have a tremendous responsibility, not only to their immediate interests, but to the overall national good, to see to it that we remain a strong maritime nation.

Surely, no one would advocate that we abandon our foreign trade to the mercy of rates fully set abroad, nor would anyone advocate that we again go through the agony of having to recreate a merchant marine every time there is a national emergency.

In peace and war, the arguments for a strong and vigorous merchant marine are compelling.

Let us then face up to the task and move to an early and courageous decision which will permit stability and progress in our increasingly important maritime industry.

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF OUR DUCK POPULATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Fish and Wildlife Service gave to the press on August 10, a statement that saddened the heart of every duck hunter and every lover of the out of doors. That statement was headed: "Interior Department says duck breeding populations reach record low."

As some of my Senate colleagues know, I have been interested in hunting and the out of doors for more than half a century. In 1916, I helped to draft and put through the Virginia Legislature, a bill creating Virginia's first fish and game de-

partment. For years, I was a member of the old American Game Conference and on the Migratory Bird Advisory Board of the predecessor to the Fish and Wildlife Service, called the Bureau of Biological Survey. For a number of years, I served on the Federal Migratory Bird Commission that passes on the acquisition of migratory bird refuges. As a Member of the House, I served for 12 years as chairman of a Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation, during which time I sponsored the Pittman-Robertson Act; the Duck Stamp Act, and the Coordination Act of 1946, which requires the consideration of wildlife interests in all water impoundment projects by the Federal Government.

Since I have known a period when there would be rafts of canvasback and red-head ducks on the Potomac River below Washington, estimated from one-half to 1 million in number, and have heard those rafts take flight with a roar comparable to a passenger train entering a tunnel at 60 miles per hour, I cherished the hope that I could do something to pass on to generations yet unborn the pleasures of the great out of doors which I had known and enjoyed. The announcement today that our supply of ducks is at the lowest period since we started making annual surveys, indicates that my ambition to preserve duck hunting for future generations will probably not be realized.

In my opinion, the greatest single detriment to an adequate duck supply has been the drainage of the duck breeding areas both in this country and Canada. Think of paying farmers \$16 an acre to drain potholes in the duck breeding areas of the United States in order to further increase the unmanageable surplus of wheat. But that is "water over the pothole," so to speak. Undoubtedly, the current situation calls for drastic action. Consequently, I sent the following telegram today to the Secretary of the Interior, who within the next 2 weeks must decide whether or not there will be an open season in the United States on ducks and if an open season, how long it is to run and what the daily bag limit will be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for that telegram to be printed in the RECORD.

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

AUGUST 12, 1965.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

For more than half a century, I have watched with distress the decline and fall of our duck population. In view of the current report that it is now at the lowest level since surveys were started in 1947, I strongly urge that you close the season in the United States for this year and ask our Canadian friends to take similar action, although the kill in Canada is relatively small. If we wait 1 or 2 more years before taking drastic action to save remnants of brood stock and then close the season, it would probably never be opened again because the brood stock would have gone beyond the point of recall. Many will purchase duck stamps to hunt geese and a substantial number will be sold to stamp collectors. In any event, revenue

from the sale of stamps this fall to hunt ducks would, in my opinion, be blood money.
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate.

HOW TO INCREASE JOBLESSNESS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 4, the Cleveland Press carried an editorial: "How To Increase Joblessness." The tenor of this editorial holds that the recommendation of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee instead of helping the economy will undoubtedly hurt it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of the Cleveland Press: "How To Increase Joblessness" be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW TO INCREASE JOBLESSNESS

We have in our country a problem of unemployment, almost solely confined to those who have little or no employable skills (consult "help-wanted" pages of the Press to see how high the demand for those who have skills).

So, how is it proposed that Congress, in its wisdom, shall cope with the problem?

A House Education and Labor Subcommittee, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman, comes out with a bill providing that the Federal minimum wage, now \$1.25 per hour, shall be raised to \$1.75 per hour.

Not only shall those now getting the \$1.25 minimum get a 50-cents-an-hour increase, but also some 6 million additional workers, not hitherto covered by Federal legislation, shall be hired at the higher wage, if hired at all.

Farmworkers, tenant farmers, sharecroppers, nonprofessional employees of hospitals, restaurants, hotels, laundry, and cleaning establishments.

Many already are receiving more than the present minimum, even more than the proposed higher minimum. And in those areas where unskilled labor is paid less, the new legislation can cause painful economic dislocations.

Thus those who can't get jobs for \$1.25 per hour (\$10 for an 8-hour day) will have even less chance of getting work at \$1.75 per hour (\$14 for an 8-hour day).

A law that tries to repeal the old proverb that a laborer is worthy of his hire may increase the relief rolls, but not the job rolls.

F. C. Church
CAPITOL CLOAKROOM DEBATE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the names "hawk" and "dove" have been much overworked in connection with the war in Vietnam. Neither label is accurate in terms of the immediate action to be taken; yet the labels do connote an underlying difference in interpretation of the war as it relates to our national interest.

The two viewpoints were evidenced recently in the CBS radio program "Capitol Cloakroom," in a discussion between Senators GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, and GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be printed in the RECORD.

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

19408

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12, 1965

From the Nation's Capitol, CBS radio brings you the 864th presentation of "Capitol Cloakroom." This week's guests are Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming and Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota. Now, here is CBS correspondent Martin Agronsky.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara came back to Washington this week from a 5-day survey in South Vietnam with a depressing estimate of the state of the Vietnamese war. The overall situation continues to be serious, he said. In many aspects it has deteriorated since 15 months ago when I was last here, the Defense Secretary continued. Then he documented his pessimism with these reasons. The size of the Vietcong forces has increased, he said. The rate of operations and size of attacks have been expanded, the disruption of lines of communications by rail, sea, and road become more intense, terroristic attacks have increased. Mr. McNamara's estimate is in the same unhappy vein as the recent observation of President Johnson last week. That it must be expected that the war in Vietnam will get worse before it becomes better. These grim evaluations by the President and his Defense Secretary are twined with the statements that U.S. forces in Vietnam must be increased, that reserve call-ups will become greater and that the draft will be stepped up. All of this is expected to precipitate a renewal of congressional debate on the Vietnamese crisis and the conflict between the so-called Hawks who want the war effort intensified and the Doves who want the peace effort intensified. With us today is one of the Senate's most dedicated Hawks, Wyoming Democrat GALE MCGEE and the equally determined Dove, South Dakota's Democrat GEORGE MCGOVERN.

Gentlemen, I think Senator MCGEE, since you express in a sense the administration viewpoint and defend it, I would like to hear your reaction to Secretary of Defense McNamara's estimate of the deterioration of the situation in Vietnam.

Senator MCGEE. Secretary McNamara's "deterioration" to which he makes reference refers to the status in Vietnam over a year ago. And the reason that we have had these debates, the reason for the President's new dimensions of his policy stem from the sharp change beginning in the late fall of last year so that this is not necessarily a new dimension that the Secretary is making reference to at all. But what the President outlined in his February speech was what we outlined in our discussions on the floor of the Senate as the serious magnitude of the conflict there. Namely, that it makes a difference to us what happens in Vietnam and southeast Asia. The successful rebalancing of power in the world depends on the outcome there and that China must be prevented from moving into that area at all costs. The national interest requires it as well as the chance for peace. So in that context, all that we're being asked for in Vietnam at the present time is to put our material and our supplies and our manpower where our words have been.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, that is your estimate, sir. What about yours, Senator MCGOVERN?

Senator MCGOVERN. Well, Mr. Agronsky, it doesn't surprise me at all that Secretary McNamara reports the situation is worse than he found it 15 months ago in spite of the fact that when he was there in 1963 he said he thought that we could leave by the end of 1965. He thought then that our job would be done by the end of this year. I thought that that estimate was wrong at the time. I think that it is not at all surprising that the Secretary has been forced to withdraw his optimistic estimates of 2 years ago. The reason for that is that we have been following in recent years a course that just will not work. We have been trying to solve

a Vietnamese political problem with increasing amounts of American military power, American military equipment, American soldiers and that formula just won't work in southeast Asia or anywhere else.

Senator MCGEE. We got into that, George. I disagree with that completely. I think that our first priority in southeast Asia, the President has repeated it, Secretary McNamara has repeated it, Secretary Rusk has repeated it, and that is that the first priority in southeast Asia is to contain the forces of militant expansionism from mainland China and its stooges and that we don't dare forfeit southeast Asia to a power bloc that stands upon a steady course of world imperialism. That is the issue, the internal politics of Vietnam comes second, not first.

Senator MCGOVERN. Well, if that is the doctrine, it represents a radical shift from what our announced position was when we first went into Vietnam in 1954, a position that has been repeated up until recent months by three Presidents. We have been told up until the last few months that this was a Vietnamese war, that it had to be won by the people of Vietnam and that the basic ingredient of victory was the popular political support of the government that we have been trying to assist in Saigon. Now the facts are that we have not been able to put together a government in Saigon that has the support of the people and that is the basic problem. We have been trying to deal with a political rebellion in South Vietnam by bombing villages, and you can't win popular support and influence people in that fashion.

Senator MCGEE. I think you are in error on such an allegation, that we are bombing villages in order to bring about political reform. We have been bombing villages, we have been bombing across the 17th parallel at the same time in an attempt to arrest or stop an infiltration that certainly by its own nature makes impossible any political advancement in Vietnam. Until the past year, there was hope that it would be possible to hold a line without such massive commitments as this entails. But the clear action from Hanoi and obviously backed from Peiping that they could run the Americans out, force them out and thus have an easier opportunity to take over the area with all of its gain, was a decision that has required our much more staunch determination to hold the line. And you have got to put first things first as we did in Berlin, as we did in Western Europe, as we did in Greece, as we did in Iran and the line that balances the world has to go all the way to the China Sea, and this is the last link in the drawing of that line.

Senator MCGOVERN. Well, Senator MCGEE, let me intervene here now. I think the press media during this present week have given us some indication again of why this war is going so badly, because the same news accounts that carried Secretary McNamara's statement that he found the situation in Vietnam much worse today than it was 15 months ago in spite of the drastic increase in America's military effort there, quoted an American captain who had walked with his colleagues into a village in South Vietnam that had been under bombardment by American airplanes and American artillery. When they got into that village they didn't find any dead Vietcong, what they found were dead, wounded and horribly scarred and burned women and children weeping in the shambles of that village. The captain's comments were very terse. He said: "This is why we are losing this stupid war. It's senseless, just senseless." The captain is right. It's a senseless operation to try to win a war by using bombs against defenseless villages, against women and children. This is not the way to win either a political operation or a military operation, and as long as we take

that formula we are just setting the stage for a bigger debacle in the end.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, Senator, Senator MCGOVERN, may I ask you "How would you win it?"

Senator MCGOVERN. I don't think the war can be won out there by American military power. I think that if it is to be won it is going to have to be won by the Vietnamese Government forces and I am not at all sure at this point that they can win a decisive victory against the Vietcong. But let me quote what President Kennedy had to say about this just shortly before he died, and I think this reflected the American position very well. He said: "I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the South Vietnamese Government to win popular support that the war can be won. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones that have to win or lose it. We can help them," he said. "We can give them equipment, we can send some men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam against the Communists." And then he added this: "We're prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think the war can be won unless the people out there support the effort."

Senator MCGEE. May I just say to that same point, Martin, that we are talking about a condition that was long ago and has long since changed, and we are faced with the hard facts that are with us now, not with the much more modest and moderate and almost quiet circumstances that prevailed before.

Mr. AGRONSKY. How has the situation changed?

Senator MCGEE. It has changed because of the rather flagrant and open substantial intervention from the north by the Hanoi government; in size and dimension that threatens any chance for the emergence of any stable government in the south. But more importantly that intervention threatens to knock over an established regime that had survived for nearly a dozen years and as a result is being watched by all of the surrounding governments who know that in this game of tempins internationally they're next. For that reason we have to stand. The Vietnamese are the second priority, not the first one. The first is the rebalancing of this section of the world and that's the dimension that was not as obvious or as clear cut as when President Kennedy made the statement that Senator MCGOVERN has just alluded to or when the situation a year ago was evaluated as not as serious as it is today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, if your answer is for, Senator, and obviously it is, an increased American force, would you then accept this as an American war now, no longer a South Vietnamese war. You keep saying the South Vietnamese are subordinate. Do you really mean that?

Senator MCGEE. Oh, I think yes I do at this stage. I think it is very clear now that the Vietnamese are never going to have a chance to emerge in whatever image they chose. I think they ought to have all the chance they can get, unless the forces from the outside can be restrained. We have made it clear. We are not going to take Hanoi. We don't want Hanoi or North Vietnam or any part of anywhere else. We want the outside intervention into the South to cease. That is the basis on which we can have negotiations. Now Senator MCGOVERN suggested to us that we can't win a war here, but we can turn that around in another way in the proper dimension, you don't win wars in this modern age of warfare, but you can lose them, and we dare not lose this part of the world under the duress and the threats and the terrorism that have prevailed. Otherwise we lose the next segment of the world and then the next. And Hitler should have taught us the folly of a piecemeal resistance

Senator McGOVERN. It is my view that the course we are now following is playing the Chinese Communists game. They are sitting on the sidelines without a single soldier committed to this war in South Vietnam and all the while we're playing into their hands by lending credence to the propaganda they have been distributing all over Asia—that this is an American war, that it is not a popular defense of their government by the people of South Vietnam but a case of a white Western power coming back into Asia on the heels of the discredited French and trying to win a war against the people of North Vietnam and against their supporters in South Vietnam. What I am suggesting here is that there is a limit to military power.

Senator McGEE. Oh, I couldn't agree with you more—and a military solution to this question in southeast Asia. (Interrupting each other.)

Mr. AGRONSKY. Military solution—you have been proposing one.

Senator McGEE. No, I have been proposing that we win the chance for a political solution and you can't win that chance if you forfeit to the other side. This is exactly what we were doing until we were determined to draw the line and resist infiltration.

Senator McGOVERN. Well, GALE, this is the formula, of course, that has steadily drawn us deeper and deeper into a military dilemma in South Vietnam. We said for a long time that we couldn't negotiate except from a position of military strength. Now, I said 2 years ago and repeatedly since then, and I repeat it now, that that's a formula for escalation, because presumably the other side feels exactly the same way, that they are not going to negotiate until things are running in their favor. I think our offers to negotiate came at least a year too late. I think a year from now it will be even worse.

Senator McGEE. GEORGE, as I see it the kind of historical perspective as you, and I appreciate since you were a historian, too, before you came to the Senate and that is the Communists have clearly reached the conclusion that if they held on long enough and created enough fuss that we were going home, and they sought to hasten the withdrawal of the Americans. They were convinced from reading our own country's history that we grow tired of these things, just as the Russians gambled we were going to withdraw from Europe at the end of World War II and the parallel here we saw in Korea, the same arguments were made that the Russians were sitting by while we tangled with the Chinese and the North Koreans. And what a mistake that was. You and I know that it was necessary to do what we did in Korea, not to win an all-out war, but to restore the 38th parallel for the sake of the U.N. and the security balance and the same issue is here in southeast Asia. We simply insist that South Vietnam have the right to be independent without influence from the outside. How they settle their internal is another matter.

Senator McGOVERN. I think we have a drastically different situation in Vietnam than we had in Korea. When we went into Korea we did it under the auspices and with the support of the United Nations. In Vietnam we stand virtually alone. In the case of Korea there was an overt, naked, identifiable act of invasion where the forces of North Korea swept across the 38th parallel into South Vietnam in large invading armies. There has been nothing comparable to that in Vietnam where there was a revolt that seemed to develop from the countryside and from the villages in South Vietnam which to be sure has been aided and abetted and encouraged from North Vietnam. But most of the outside aid has come in the last year and a half since we stepped up our effort.

Senator McGEE. Our effort has been stepped up. May I say, GEORGE, beginning in the early

spring of this year we made a massive step-up in our efforts. The step-up followed a very considerable infiltration beyond any dimensions of aid in comfort and sympathy to a common kin across the lines. In Korea, it was an American war. We were able because of an absence of mind—we were able to pull that off very deftly because the Russians made the mistake of absenting themselves one afternoon from the U.N. Otherwise, it couldn't have been done. The Communists are not static enough to fight every new exercise in the same way they fought the first one. Thus, the Berlin question was fought with the threat of an air strike. The threat in Cuba was fought with the threat of nuclear bases. In Korea, it was the infiltration of a massive assault by the troops there. Now, we have a new phase of Communist technique of imperialism from Peking and that is infiltration which makes it all the more difficult but it doesn't alter the impact. The impact is to take the area by whatever device they can try that will win. And this is the toughest one of all.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator McGOVERN, what would be your alternative? You say that they cannot bring into being in South Vietnam a government with popular support. You indicate in effect, I think, that we should pull out? Do you want us to do that or do you have an alternative? What should we do beyond intensification?

Senator McGOVERN. Before answering that question, let me say, first of all, that when you recommend that a man not jump off a 10-story building and he jumps anyway it is very difficult to advise him when he reaches the fifth floor as to what he ought to do at that point. We are now following a course of action which I have consistently advised against, and it has led us into a trap from which there is no easy way out. But I recognize that, even at this late date, those of us that are critics of our deepening involvement in Vietnam have to look at the facts as they stand today and then begin from there with our recommendations. I think one step we might very usefully take would be a serious effort to determine whether or not the people of South Vietnam really want to continue the war. Do they want us to continue our military effort? If we can establish, as I think we can, that there is little support among the Vietnamese people for this war, we ought to get out as quickly as we can. It does not necessarily follow that even if Ho Chi Minh or somebody of that type should take over the leadership of Vietnam that the country would automatically be a puppet of Red China. Senator McGEE has implied that the real enemy here is China. I don't think it follows that Ho Chi Minh or the other leaders of North Vietnam want their country controlled by Red China anymore than Yugoslavia wanted their country controlled by the Soviet Union.

Senator McGEE. Senator, first of all, Yugoslavia was able to play both sides each against the other because it was wedged between the front lines of the major opposing sides. Here in southeast Asia who stands in the way of China? Ho Chi Minh can stop China because he doesn't like the Chinese. Can South Vietnam stop China? Can Burma stop China?

Senator McGOVERN. Have we had any indication that China is moving into North Vietnam to take it over?

Senator McGEE. I think that without any case for contradiction that the intentions of the Chinese through the technique of pressure and infiltration have been clear not only now but historically. They have been interfered with sometimes in the past by the fact that the British wanted the area instead of the Chinese and the Japanese started World War II to get the area or the Portuguese got it or the Germans did, but what it does suggest is that this is a major prize in the world and it is imperative that we not let it fall into the hands of someone else.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator McGEE, can you document however the answer to Senator McGOVERN's question? What proof is there that the Chinese Communists are in there—that they are the prime movers.

Senator McGEE. The Chinese Communists are following the same technique the Russians followed in Korea that you get others to do the job, that you get the local groups—it isn't a group. The same that they were pursuing this. May I say in Greece (interruption) I think it is very clearly documented. These are the reports that are brought out at Peiping by the visitors that have gone in there to talk to them, to the reports that are brought out of Hanoi, that the tune is clearly being called from Peiping and that the dimensions of Chinese expansionism, if we can leave the word "Communist" out for the moment, are likewise historical. This is a great prize for China that has too many people and too few resources. Here is the last resource area of the world, and if this is not China's goal, if you assume the other extreme—that it is not China's goal—then China has no stake in worrying about keeping these people independent and that's the only goal we have—is to preserve the independence of this entire area without the application of force from the outside.

Senator McGOVERN. Now, Senator McGEE, I hold no brief for China, but I don't think you can assume that the Chinese are basically responsible for the troubles of southeast Asia. I think we would have revolutions in that area and in a good many other parts of the world even if China had never existed. One reason for that is the unpopular regimes that do not have the support of the people. Consider, for example, the Prime Minister of our ally, South Vietnam. This is the man who said that his political hero was Adolph Hitler. Now, how can we say that we are advancing the cause of freedom in South Vietnam when the government that we are attempting to prop up with American military power is headed by a man who says his hero is Hitler.

Senator McGEE. I can answer that, Senator, in this way. That if for the same reason that we had to back the wrong side in Greece at the end of the war. We had to back the monarchy and the black marketeers to prevent a Communist force from the north from taking over. Otherwise, the forces of freedom in Greece would never have had a chance. It is exactly that same issue that is at stake here in Vietnam. You speak of having a plebiscite there. The French left no legacy in South Vietnam where anybody could have any kind of meaningful measure. Democracy as you know it is a long way off in Vietnam and so we have to face the facts of life and those facts are that we are in the real testing period in the Minh era here that we have to survive and only through the subjection of this area to American commitment to try to hold the line.

Mr. AGRONSKY. A brief last word, Senator McGOVERN.

Senator McGOVERN. I want to repeat again that as long as we try to solve the political problems of the people of Vietnam by increasing the number of American soldiers and American military equipment, we are headed for trouble.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Gentlemen, thank you both for being with us this week on "Capitol Cloakroom."

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENAMED MELVIN J. MAAS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on yesterday, the Senate passed S. 788, a bill which designates the Veterans' Administration hospital in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas

19410

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 12, 1965

Memorial Hospital. This is a most worthy piece of legislation and will enable the example of the courageous and gallant General Maas to be an inspiration to future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill and a short biography of General Maas be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXPLANATION OF S. 788

The bill (S. 788), if enacted, would designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital.

BIOGRAPHY OF GENERAL MAAS

General Maas was reappointed Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped on March 4, 1961, by President Kennedy. He had previously served as Chairman since appointed on April 13, 1954, by President Eisenhower. In addition he served as chairman emeritus of the Committee for the Handicapped People-to-People programs, having been named chairman by President Eisenhower on May 29, 1956.

His career included 16 years as a Congressman from Minnesota; service in the U.S. Marines, rising from a private in marine aviation in 1917 to the rank of major general in August 1952. He was a native of Duluth, Minn.

CONGRESS

General Maas was first elected to Congress from Minnesota in 1926, at the age of 27. He served from 1927 to 1933 and from 1935 to 1945. In 1933 he received national recognition and the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism when he disarmed a man in the House galleries who was threatening Members with a loaded revolver. During his career in Congress, he specialized in legislation promoting aviation, national defense, and measures to improve the unemployment situation. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, General Maas sponsored several international conferences designed to bring about better relations with foreign powers. Prior to World War II he sponsored legislation to fortify Guam and was joint author of legislation setting up a promotion system for the Navy. He also was sponsoring author of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 which governed the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve until passage of the Armed Forces Reserve Act. He was also the congressional author of the legislation creating the first military women's reserve.

MARINE CORPS

General Maas entered the Marine Corps April 6, 1917. He served with Marine aviation in the Azores throughout the war. In 1926 he accepted a Marine Reserve commission prior to entering Congress. In the summer of 1941 he returned to active duty and served at sea on the staff of Adm. William Halsey and in 1942 with Adm. Frank J. Fletcher in the Solomons campaign. He also served as a Marine Corps observer with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Australia and New Guinea. He was awarded the Silver Star Medal for service with the Army Air Force at the Battle of Milne Bay in 1942. He also won the Legion of Merit in combat. In addition he was awarded 12 other ribbons. In the fall of 1942 General Maas resumed his duties in Congress but returned to active duty in January 1945. In May of that year he assumed command of the Awase Air Base, Okinawa, where he received the Purple Heart. He was promoted to brigadier general in the Marine Reserve, June 1, 1950. Blindness overtook him in 1951 and on August 1 of that year he retired and was advanced to

major general rank for having been specially commended in combat.

PUBLIC LIFE

For his untiring efforts in behalf of the Marine Corps Reserve he was known as "Mr. Marine Corps Reserve." For 6 years he served as a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board in the Department of Defense. He served as chairman of the board, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, and was a past commander in chief, Military Order of the World War, past national commander, Disabled American Veterans (1955-56), and past national president of the Blinded Veterans Association (1960-61).

In his early business career he was a salesman and sales manager. Later, he managed a manufacturing firm in St. Paul, Minn. In 1925 he organized his own insurance firm. He was assistant to the board chairman of the Sperry Corp. from 1948 until recalled to active duty in the Korean conflict. He was a director of the United Services Life Insurance Co. and of Mutual of Omaha.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE

On June 4, 1954, General Maas was awarded a degree of doctor of laws at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., his alma mater. Subsequently, he was honored by Marquette University, Goodwill Industries of America, United Cerebral Palsy, National Rehabilitation Association, American Foundation for the Blind, Tri-Organization Scientific and Rehabilitation Conference, 1961, and with the Veterans' Administration citation for exceptional service. In 1958 General Maas received the AMVETS Silver Helmet Award for his long career in public service.

On January 17, 1961, General Maas received a Presidential citation signed by President Eisenhower, noting his major contribution to the cause of the handicapped. On the following day he was presented with the Department of Defense Distinguished Public Service Medal in recognition of his contribution to national defense.

President Lyndon B. Johnson made the following statement upon being notified of General Maas' death, April 13, 1964:

"Not just the handicapped, but all the land grieves the passing of one of America's true heroes, Maj. Gen. Mel Maas.

"Blinded in the service of his country a decade ago, he taught himself a new existence without sight, traveled the world over, and inspired people everywhere about the capacities and abilities of the handicapped. Arthritis crippled his limbs, and massive heart attacks limited his mobility; yet his spirit was whole; his spirit was never disabled.

"He has shown us how to live in the face of adversity. His courage and conviction have enriched us all. His spirit marches in us and in our land."

The courageous and gallant spirit of Gen. Melvin J. Maas will live on for untold future generations through the designation of this hospital in his memory.

DEATH OF STUART URBACH

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the sudden death last Saturday of Stuart Urbach, a senior analyst on the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. All of us who are members of the Commission knew well the brilliance of his work as an expert in the law of Federal-State-local relations.

His efforts since 1961 produced two very important Commission reports. One, on the apportionment of State legislatures, has been cited by the U.S. Supreme Court and other Federal and State courts. His study of "The Problems of

Special Districts in American Government" is a landmark in its field, and some of the recommendations in it are found in pending legislation.

Further, his wise advice and counsel was very highly valued by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. He assisted in framing S. 561, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965, which was passed by the Senate unanimously just 2 days before his death.

It is a tragedy that the career of this young man, already marked by such a high degree of accomplishment, should be cut short. All of us who work in the area of intergovernmental relations will miss his perceptive analysis of the Federal system, and the Federal Government will feel the loss of this dedicated servant.

RATIFICATION OF THE HAGUE PROTOCOL

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the Senate has before it at this time two proposals which are of great importance to every American who travels abroad by airplane. Pending on the executive calendar is the Hague protocol, a series of amendments to the Warsaw Convention on international air travel. Pending in the Commerce Committee is S. 2032, a bill to require U.S. flag international air carriers to take out \$50,000 in accident insurance for each passenger who flies with them. Together these items make up a package which the administration is seeking as a means of providing more adequate protection for international air travelers than they now receive under the Warsaw Convention.

Over 2 million Americans travel annually on international flights. Assuring that they and their families are adequately protected in case of accident is, consequently, a matter of widespread importance, and it is our responsibility in Congress to take a long and careful look at the Hague protocol and S. 2032 to see if these proposals will, in fact, do the job that needs to be done.

No one questions the fact that the protection now afforded international travelers is woefully inadequate. The question is what to do about it. The governing document at present is the Warsaw Convention, which has been in operation in this country since 1934. Under its provisions the liability of international airlines to passengers for loss of life or injury due to negligence is limited to \$8,300 for each person, except where willful misconduct is established.

When Warsaw was adopted, these limitations made sense. Commercial air passenger transportation was in its formative stage and the airlines needed such protection. Without it one crash could have sent a company into bankruptcy.

Now, however, airlines are recording huge annual profits—both Pan American and TWA netted over \$35 million after taxes last year. And the financial loss to a family in losing its breadwinner and the burdens involved in hospital and medical care are greater today than ever before. The \$8,300 limitation in War-

August 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4501

Small use now to point out, as our southern Senators and Congressmen have done on every possible occasion, that each State has determined the qualifications of its own voters since the Constitution was ratified in 1789. Until the reign of L.B.J. even Southern States enjoyed this prerogative.

The Times is on record as having opposed the stiff literacy test required for registration in Alabama up to last week. It has never taken the stand that there was no room for improvement in Alabama's voting regulations.

But it cannot accept with good grace a Presidential measure that is obviously retaliatory and obviously discriminatory.

And it deplores the President's vindictiveness in rushing Federal registrars to the South and losing no time in getting poll tax suits underway.

Mr. Johnson fancies himself a latter-day Lincoln.

Yet he misses completely the essence of Lincoln's character:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all * * *"

National Selected Morticians—Code of Good Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been much discussion regarding the standards and procedures of funeral directors.

Today, it was publicly announced that a draft code of good practice containing guidelines for its members has been approved by the board of directors of the National Selected Morticians. National Selected Morticians is a society of 800 funeral directors located in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Great Britain, Europe, Ceylon, Australia, and New Zealand, with its headquarters located in Evanston, Ill.

The code, which has been forwarded to interested persons, groups, and organizations for comment and suggestions, contains 23 standards of good practice to guide member funeral directors in their relationships with the public, their clients, and the clergy.

An outline of high ethical principles to guide member funeral directors, the code was adopted by the board under the direction of its NSM president, Albert S. Lineberry. Mr. Lineberry, in addition to serving as president of NSM, is owner and president of Hanes-Lineberry Funeral Service in Greensboro, N.C.

It has been my good fortune to know Mr. Lineberry as a friend and fellow resident of Greensboro. He has served his community unflinchingly in a number of ways. He is a leader in church, civic, and social affairs in Greensboro and has earned the admiration and respect of his community. He has given freely of his time and his talents in guiding the affairs of the National Selected Morticians since assuming the presidency of that organization and it is largely through his efforts that this professional

code of ethics has been promulgated and adopted by the board of NSM.

Mr. Lineberry and his organization are to be commended for acting in the public interest in the adoption of a guide for a professional standard of conduct.

For the benefit of all, I include the code of good practice in the RECORD.

The code follows:

CODE OF GOOD PRACTICE AS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NATIONAL SELECTED MORTICIANS

As funeral directors, we are mindful that our calling involves special responsibilities to the public at large, to those we serve in time of need, to the clergy, and to our colleagues in the field of funeral service. Accordingly, we reaffirm the following standards of good practice and pledge to observe them at all times:

To the public at large:

1. To make available in advance of need full information about funeral prices and services.

2. To provide a continuing opportunity to all persons to make funeral arrangements in advance of need.

3. To offer funeral services in as wide a range of price categories as possible so that any person may select a funeral service which is within his means.

4. To be prepared to furnish, as represented, any and all services and goods which have been advertised.

5. To maintain an establishment, including a suitable selection of caskets and other merchandise, equipment, facilities, and trained personnel, fully capable of providing services and goods offered.

To those we serve in time of need:

6. To respect all religious faiths, creeds, and customs.

7. To provide dignity and competence in the conduct of all services.

8. To treat with reverence and respect decedents entrusted to our care.

9. To assure each purchaser complete freedom to exercise his preference in selecting a funeral service within his means.

10. To plainly mark the prices charged for all funeral services offered, to disclose affirmatively and in a conspicuous manner the caskets, services, and facilities comprising the funeral services so offered, and to withhold from no one the privilege of inspecting and freely considering each of them.

11. To furnish to every purchaser at the time of purchase a memorandum or other document which contains an accurate accounting of all charges including all merchandise, services, and facilities listed in the offered price, and to charge for no further or additional items of expense except with the express authorization of the purchaser.

12. To charge nondiscriminatory prices to all purchasers.

13. To avoid any representation, written or oral, which may be false or misleading.

14. In case of hardship, to accept as a community responsibility the obligation of providing a funeral service within the financial means of the family, however limited.

To the clergy:

15. To observe at all times the principle that the funeral ceremony is a religious observance and that in all religious matters the clergy shall be in charge.

16. To provide all services in a manner that complies fully with the instructions of the clergyman acting for the family.

17. To cooperate with the clergy at all times and to render such assistance as the clergy may deem appropriate.

To our colleagues in funeral service:

18. To set an example of good citizenship and business and professional integrity in all transactions.

19. To observe, promote and maintain all laws and regulations affecting public health.


20. To refrain from all unlawful acts of

solicitation, including the direct or indirect utilization of cappers, steerers, solicitors or other persons for the purpose of influencing patronage.

21. To recognize at all times the right of the public to freedom of choice in the selection of a funeral director.

22. To comply fully with the statutory or regulatory acts of duly constituted government authority, including the requirements of State licensing boards and the laws prohibiting price-fixing and other unfair methods of competition, and to exhibit at all times loyalty to the ideals of public service.

23. To conduct ourselves at all times in a dignified, respectful and professional manner, and to observe in every business transaction the principle that our responsibility to the public and to those we serve is above all others.


President Johnson Again Extends Olive Branch and Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent press announcement relating to Vietnam has brought strong expressions of support from individuals, from all sectors of our society, and from the press.

The Nashville Tennessean, in an editorial last July 29, analyzes the situation with keen perspective and approves the President's strong stand against aggression as indicating the will needed "to pluck from the nettle of danger the blossom of peace."

Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD since it is of broad general interest and directly concerns the American people.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT AGAIN EXTENDS OLIVE BRANCH AND SWORD

In his news conference comments on the war in Vietnam, President Johnson yesterday invoked both the sword and the olive branch. He reiterated this Nation's willingness to talk peace, but warned the United States cannot be defeated by force of arms.

To meet mounting aggression from the north, the Chief Executive ordered a step-up in U.S. troop numbers from 75,000 to 125,000 men. He said the draft calls would be doubled over the current 17,000 monthly figure and called for a step-up in the campaign for voluntary enlistments.

It was a less drastic move than had been expected by some observers, for the President stopped short of ordering Reserve units into service. He did indicate this might be necessary at a later date, and he left little doubt that increasing needs would come.

Unquestionably he gave less than the U.S. command forces in Vietnam had requested, and possibly less than Defense Secretary McNamara had recommended. In making his judgment, the President evidently had kept in mind both military needs and public sentiment—as well as possible congressional outcry.

It was one of the President's better press conference appearances. He spoke calmly and persuasively and indicated in every way his reluctance to step up the war in Vietnam. He injected the personal note that he does not find it easy to send young Americans to battle, "for I know them all. I have seen

them in a thousand streets of a hundred towns, of every State in this Union."

At another point, taking note of fears of a general Asian war, the Chief Executive said, "We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can perceive," adding that, "We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table."

In the interests of peaceful solution, the President said he had sent a letter to the United Nations inviting U.N. officials and any of its members to do what they could to help seize the initiative for peace. He said the Nation "asks for and welcomes the concern and assistance of any and all nations in this effort."

However, in the continued absence of any interest on the part of the Communists in peaceful negotiations, the President made it plain this Nation has no choice but to persist. His remarks laid stress on the fact that in the larger context, the alternative may not be between this war and peace, but between war in Vietnam and war elsewhere in southeast Asia.

He said: "Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueller conflict."

The President is right when he assumes that the war in South Vietnam is a test case in conflict for what has become virtually a doctrine of strategy, and a crucial link in Communist ideology for conquest. If the so-called war of liberation is successful in Vietnam, it will quickly be used elsewhere. If it can be broken, more than Red ideology will crumble.

The President is a man who gages the winds of political and public sentiment carefully. He is well aware the U.S. effort in Vietnam cannot prevail unless the people of the nation are supporting that effort. He left no illusion yesterday—the effort will be long and harsh and require great burdens in material and manpower. But he vowed to move in a careful and measured manner, not seeking to widen the war, but to win it.

The first goal, he noted, was to convince the Communists that "we cannot be defeated by force of arms." He asserted that the Nation must and will persist in seeing it through.

The President has said to the people that where there is a will there is a way, and he has left no doubt of his own will to pluck from the nettle of danger the blossom of peace.

Anniversary Salute to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 15, India will celebrate the 18th anniversary of her independence. Since the House will not be in session on that date, we wish today to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Prime Minister of India; and to His Excellency B. K. Nehru, the Indian Ambassador to the United States.

One of the paradoxes that exist in history is with us today as we congratulate the nation of India on the 18th an-

niversary of its independence, for the existence of an Indian state is not a 20th-century innovation.

Some 5,000 years ago, when the rest of the world was still wandering in the mists of precivilization, there developed on the shores of the Indus River one of the world's earliest civilizations. Speeding from the river valley to the surrounding countryside, and extending over a large area, the Indus Valley civilization proved the foundation for the subsequent development of many incoming peoples, and thus has come down to us as part of mankind's great legacy of the past. No, India is not a new land. It is steeped in valued tradition and the wisdom of ages of scholars that were but dim memories by the time of the Greeks. It possesses a culture so rich and so varied that it is almost impossible to comprehend its extent and wealth. It is a land of nearly 475 million people, a situation difficult to comprehend for those of us in the United States with our fraction of this huge aggregation of souls. It is a land of great geographic and climatologic differences, of natural channels of transportation and communication, and of equally prominent natural barriers to accessibility. It is a land of a great past, a problem-filled present, and a tremendously potential future. It is truly unique among the world's nations. It is India.

The subcontinent of India has been the home of many succeeding stages of civilization. The Indus Valley culture, Aryan—or Indo-Aryan—Greek, Maurya, Hindu, and Mogul were followed by the European, introduced by Vasco da Gama in 1498, inaugurating a 200-year struggle by the Europeans for control of the fabulous jewel of the Indies. By the middle of the 1800's, the British had achieved complete control of the river valleys and coastal plains, the sources of most of the colonial wealth Britain sought. Interior and less-accessible areas were left under the control of the local hereditary rulers, but with British supervision.

In 1947, following years of protest, consultation, and careful planning, India finally achieved her rightful independence again, under the leadership of the immortal Mohandas Gandhi, the Mahatma. Gandhi's greatest contribution to his country may have been his work and influence toward peaceful independence. There are many, however, who would prefer to regard as his greatest gift to India the legacy of spiritual truth and love that he so impressed in his people that it has become inseparable from their national character. Certainly he must be considered with Siddhartha Gautama, the Buddha, as one of the greatest of India's contributions to the spiritual well-being of mankind. He is symbolic of the India of peace and moderation, of contemplation and mercy, of understanding and cooperation for peace.

India today certainly faces great problems, yet she is not alone. The greatest cooperation has been shown, for example, by the nation of India in working with international organizations on the problem of nutrition and population growth. In the United Nations, as in other world

organizations, the voice of India has been well-regarded and carefully considered. Her contributions to world understanding and cooperation are many and valuable. That a nation with such pressing internal development and standard-of-living problems could be able to devote this much time and such careful, reasoned effort to the international problems of the world is indeed a sign of a right spirit and a dedication to the continued progress and peace of mankind.

It is most certainly with a great pleasure that I today extend my salutations and congratulations to the Government and people of India. I know, also, that my colleagues join with me in extending our best wishes for the future, as one free people to another.

Small Business Leader Joins in Tribute to Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to the many tributes that have been made to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN in connection with the 72d birthday of this great American, I would add a letter I have just received from Edward Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business who for more than three decades has been an active and outstanding champion of small business.

Mr. Wimmer's letter follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your tribute to WRIGHT PATMAN is a tribute to yourself for its inclusion in the RECORD. I would find only one fault; that is, your failure to mention that no man in public office stood so solidly behind the family farm, independent merchant and other small businesses for so many years as WRIGHT PATMAN, or was ever known to be so formidable a foe of monopoly power.

In the early thirties we worked together for passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, and his voice rang out amid unbridled attacks and heaped-up criticism against the discriminatory practices between the big manufacturer and chains, and the uneconomic growth of giantism that was resulting.

When small businessmen gathered at Constitution Hall in 1937 to support WRIGHT PATMAN and Senator Joe Robinson in their attempts to end discriminatory practices, the chain-hated Congressman from Texas called small business the backbone of America and the best hope of the youth who wanted to strike out on his own.

Had he been listened to, and if you had been listened to when we were all seeking a square deal for the family farm, small business and local bank, there would be no need today for the great waves of countermeasures against the uncertainties of the future.

You speak of Mr. PATMAN as a money expert, and he was at his best in the thirties when he said, "Money is like fertilizer; you

What requires some thinking about is why this European negativism toward the United States, so contagious among expatriates, exists in the strength it now has. If it were the result of honest, reasoned differences of opinion over foreign policy, one could not suspect it or quarrel with it, though one could disagree with it. But only in part is this the cause. It is emotional, visceral, and has become an automatic reflex among all manner of Europeans with education or pretenses to education. Almost no matter what the United States does in the world they oppose, though very few of them, Communists and true-believing Gaullists excepted, offer alternative courses.

The element of unconscious jealousy felt by Europeans who too suddenly have lost power and influence in the world is too obvious to belabor. The contempt for any form of Americana is, in large measure, a self-serving emotion; the person who derides feels a bit better about himself and his own society. But one has to look deeper and to remember, first off, that for years now the criticism has flowed chiefly in our direction, not in the direction of the Communist powers, the true imperialists, the true international law breakers and vulgarians.

Why should so many Europeans, who, at bottom, share the same concepts of life in freedom that America holds, direct their daily attacks, privately and publicly, only in our direction?

The answer is so simple that everyone seems to have lost sight of it. It is because Americans will listen to criticism and advice while the Russians, Chinese, North Vietnamese and Cubans will not.

Years of this have created a kind of habit of mind in Europe. A theme music about U.S. policy and the American society has been written and everybody recognizes it and feels at home with it. Variations on the theme are not welcomed because they demand special attention and that requires effort, i.e., the meaning of the civil rights movement is that American Negroes live in hellish conditions, not that the Great Society is demanding an end to third-class status for the Negro; the point about the Dominican Republic affair was not the danger of Communist enslavement but reckless American power-lust; the rise in American crime is entirely believable, but no one wants to hear about the immense rise in popular culture. So it goes.

There are further complications. The Communist countries are not really criticized partly because they are not really reported, and cannot be. The European press shows pictures of South Vietnamese soldiers beating up Vietcong prisoners. They never show the Vietcong engaging in the assassination of village leaders—about 20 a week by military intelligence estimates—because there are no such pictures. Results: speeches in the British House of Lords about the cruelty in South Vietnam.

One or two British television programs, reaching many millions every week, have exhibited such consistent bias that some U.S. officials have made complaints, severe rows have broken out in TV's inner circles and even Britain's security people have been concerned.

None of this is to suggest that the British people are fundamentally or decisively anti-American; they will stand with us in any final test. It is to suggest that the American case encounters severe handicaps unrelated to any inherent deficiencies in the case.

THEY SOON FORGET
(By Inez Robb)

In the Western World, a generation is going to the polls that thinks of Munich—if it thinks of Munich at all—as just another German city where the beer and the opera are first rate.

The Munich of 1938, the Munich of my generation, is something writ in water in a history book, vague and no more real than Xenophon's "Anabasis."

Indeed, even for my generation the inglorious shame and immorality of Munich has begun to dim. But that Munich recently came to bitter life for an hour on the home screen in a TV documentary, "Prelude to World War II."

This superb program, pieced together from newsreels taken at the time, spelled out in detail the story of the Munich surrender and pact. In chapter and verse, it recalled the abject submission of England and France to Adolf Hitler's every demand for the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia.

From the moment Mr. Chamberlain came, umbrella in hand, to Berchtesgaden and then Bad Godesberg and finally Munich, Hitler knew no one would lift a finger to stop him.

Now, memory is one of mankind's handiest conveniences. It is long when it wants to be and woefully short when it is expedient. That seemed painfully obvious when I came across a full-page advertisement in the New York Times headed "British Artists' Protest."

What these artists are protesting is American involvement in Vietnam and "a foreign policy grown more nakedly inhuman with each passing day," despite persistent efforts of a U.S. President to arrange "unconditional negotiations," looking toward peace, with Hanoi.

Most of the 36 British artists who paid for and signed the manifesto are old enough to remember Munich. I wonder if they protested the murder of Czechoslovakia by their Government in 1938? I also wonder if they paid for and signed a full-page advertisement in any Hanoi paper, chiding Hanoi for its refusal to talk peace.

Surely such signers of the advertisement as Sir Alec Guinness, J. B. Priestley, Dame Sybil Thorndike, Leonard Woolf, Benjamin Britten, E. M. Forster, Doris Lessing, Paul Schofield, Graham Sutherland, C. Day Lewis, and Iris Murdoch have vivid memories of Mr. Chamberlain, Munich and appeasement, and what that combination cost the world.

The same can be said for members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which has just solicited me for a contribution for an advertisement denouncing the American presence in Vietnam.

This proposed ad would demand "a ceasefire for all parties," toward which the United States continues to work.

If these women are interested in placing such a proposal in the papers of North Vietnam, I might be interested.

Herbert Tenzer
CBS Special Report—Vietnam Perspective: "The Decisions"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, August 9, 1965, millions of Americans were able to see and hear our distinguished Secretary of State, Dean Rusk and equally distinguished Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, on a CBS Special Report "Vietnam Perspective: The Decisions."

The public service which CBS contributed has made many Americans more aware of the reasons for our Nation's commitments and a better understanding of why we are in southeast Asia, the

policy which we are pursuing in Vietnam, and the efforts which we are exerting to secure peace in that corner of the globe.

No legislative or national issue has caused as much comment in my congressional district or resulted in as many letters from my constituents as our policy in South Vietnam. The questions of whether we have had sufficient debate on United States foreign policy or whether we have truly made every effort to achieve peace in Vietnam have been asked by constituents to their Senators and Representatives time and time again. These questions have been answered in my letters to constituents and in my reports from Washington. In addition to my own views on the subject, I have distributed to my constituents other materials such as the State Department's white paper and the publication entitled "The Third Face of War."

In this latest presentation to the public via national television, the President has made it clear that he wants the American people to know the facts so that their judgment concerning our policy in Vietnam can be based upon the best available information and by hearing the opinions of those who have the facts in hand.

In the August 11, 1965, edition of Newsday, a daily newspaper published in Nassau County, Long Island, the following editorial on the Vietnam special report appeared:

A CASE WELL STATED

Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, on TV the night before last (and President Johnson, talking to the press Monday) made a good, a solid and a convincing case for the American presence in Vietnam. The two Secretaries said little that was new, but they said it so well as to deserve a rousing hand. They gave cogent, lucid responses to the questions that trouble some Americans. It was a first-class presentation.

I have proposed to Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, and to the White House that they make available for the widest possible distribution—a transcript of the CBS program referred to—in question and answer form which I would like to send to my constituents in a special report on the Vietnam situation. The President said in a special briefing at which I was present on Wednesday, "Your judgment is no better than your information." I agree with the President and that is why I want to supply to my constituents the available information upon which they can base their judgment of the President's policy, which I heartily endorse.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Thursday, August 12, 1965

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill and 24 measures on calendar call, and worked on tariff schedules bill.

House passed Public Works and Economic Development Act and cleared bills on military pay increase and Presidential assassinations for the President.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 19399-19421

Bills Introduced: Seven bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2401-2407. Pages 19400-19401

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.J. Res. 95, to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith" (S. Rept. 578);

H.R. 7181, authorizing commemoration of certain historical events in Kansas with appropriate markers (S. Rept. 579);

H.R. 3320, authorizing establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz. (S. Rept. 580);

H.R. 881, to authorize establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument, with amendment (S. Rept. 581);

H.R. 1044, authorizing exchange of certain lands in Norfolk, Va. (S. Rept. 582);

H.R. 5519, to authorize language training for dependents of members of the Armed Forces overseas, with amendment (S. Rept. 583);

H.R. 7843, authorizing survivor of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for unused accrued leave (S. Rept. 584);

H.R. 7595, authorizing transportation for dependents requiring medical care who accompany members of uniformed services overseas (S. Rept. 585);

H.R. 3037, to provide for payment of cost of transporting remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces (S. Rept. 586);

H.R. 5034, authorizing the disposition of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property that comes into control of the Departments of Defense or the Treasury (S. Rept. 587);

H.R. 546, to retrocede to State of Wisconsin concurrent jurisdiction over rights-of-way of those portions of highways which are in Camp McCoy (S. Rept. 588);

S. 2381, to make the mutilation or destruction of a

draft card a criminal offense, with amendment (S. Rept. 589);

S. 683, H.R. 1291, 4024, and 5819, private bills (S. Repts. 590-593);

H.R. 3044, authorizing payment of incentive pay for hazardous duty on flight decks of aircraft carriers (S. Rept. 594); and

H.R. 4025, S. 766, and S. 1873, private bills (S. Repts. 595-597). Page 19400

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 10306, to make the mutilation or destruction of a draft card a criminal offense, was ordered to be placed on calendar. Page 19404

Call of Calendar: On call of calendar, 24 measures, of which 13 were private, were passed as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

Copyrights: H.J. Res. 431, extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases;

Veterans: H.R. 206, increasing subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation;

Veterans: H.R. 208, extending time limitations for totally disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation; and

House Members: H.R. 10139, relating to telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Youth: H.R. 3329, to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs;

War Orphans' Education: H.R. 205, increasing educational assistance allowances paid under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act; and

House Members: H.R. 9947, providing for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Private bills: 10 private bills, S. Con. Res. 49, S. 343, 505, 1397, 1647, 1651, 1678, 1736, 1775, and 1919.