

August 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18363

of both capital investment and consumption in the economy.

PRAYER AMENDMENT NOT NEEDED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, presided over by my junior colleague from Indiana, has been holding hearings this week and last on the Dirksen resolution to send to the States for ratification an amendment dealing with school prayer.

It was my privilege to testify on that resolution on Monday, at which time I pointed out that in three successive Congresses I have offered a Senate resolution to clarify the misunderstanding surrounding the Supreme Court ruling, and to state that it is the sense of the Senate that any public school system may provide time during the school day for prayerful meditation, if no public official prescribes or recites the prayer which is offered. To do so, I am convinced, is perfectly proper, and it has so been held by a considerable number of constitutional authorities, relying upon the views of the Supreme Court itself. I commended to the subcommittee consideration of my resolution, Senate Resolution 248, and stated, "I do not believe there is a necessity for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to permit 'voluntary participation by students or others in prayer'" in our schools.

The Evansville Courier, in its August 7 issue, discussed the same question and took the same point of view, heading its editorial "Amendment Not Needed." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and my testimony before the Judiciary Committee may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NOT NEEDED

There is no need for an amendment to the Constitution permitting voluntary prayers in the public schools. On the contrary, there are most persuasive arguments against thus meddling with the sound doctrine of the separation of church and state.

That doctrine has served the nation well. It has safeguarded against both state interference in religion and church interference in the affairs of government. Religious freedom has been assured by the provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Senator DIRKSEN's proposed amendment would imperil this historic freedom by weakening the First Amendment guarantee. Specific authorization for prayer in the schools would undermine the Supreme Court's ruling on this subject, which upheld the First Amendment guarantee by banning use of state institutions and facilities—that is, the schools—to foster religious worship.

This position is not tantamount to being against worship, against religion. Not at all. It is every American's constitutionally guaranteed right to worship as he pleases, and not to worship if he pleases. He can pray at home, in church, at his job, in the street—in short, anywhere. But to authorize prayer or other religious exercises as a part of the public school routine would be to inject the state into this private matter of conscience and belief.

This is not to say that Senator BAYH's judiciary subcommittee should not hold its scheduled hearings in August; of course it should hold them. Those on both sides of this issue should be given full opportunity to be heard. It is hoped that, once this has been done, the wisdom of preserving the historic doctrine of the separation of church and state will be more widely appreciated.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, AUGUST 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to come before this subcommittee, presided over by my colleague from my own state of Indiana, in order to speak briefly on the question of prayer in the public schools.

I share with Senator DIRKSEN and with most Americans not only our common American heritage of religious traditions but a personal religious faith. I believe in the values of religion, and I believe those values should be inculcated in the young. I also believe in the wisdom of the framers of the First Amendment, in the correctness of the Supreme Court's interpretation of it in the decisions which have inspired the Senate Joint Resolution now before you, and in the desirability of prayer, each in his own way.

The first of the so-called school prayer decisions came during the 87th Congress. Following it, I first introduced a Senate Resolution, S. Res. 356, expressing the sense of the Senate that the Supreme Court's decision in no way interfered with the right of public school systems to set aside a time during the school day for prayerful meditation so long as no public official prescribes or recites a prayer which is offered.

In the succeeding 88th Congress, I again offered substantially the same resolution, S. Res. 164. Since no consideration was afforded it by the Judiciary Committee in either case, I again presented it as S. Res. 248 of the 88th Congress. Thus I have taken the same position on this matter consistently and officially since 1962.

I realize that this resolution is not before this subcommittee, since it is not a constitutional amendment, but rather a simple resolution expressing the sense of the Senate. However, I note that after four years since its original introduction an increasing number of persons, including witnesses before this committee, have taken essentially the same view. In particular, James V. Panoch, who also happens to come from Indiana but with whom I have not consulted on the matter, devoted a good deal of his testimony to support of the principle that a period of meditation, such as my resolution speaks of, is not only permissible under the Supreme Court interpretation, but a desirable option which avoids the pitfalls of the proposed amendment.

Likewise, Professor Paul A. Freund, who teaches constitutional law at Harvard University, testified here on August 1 directly in line with the Senate Resolution which has now been before the Judiciary Committee in three successive Congresses:

"But in any event, if a period of brief prayer is wanted, there is a simple way to have it: A moment of silent meditation, during which each pupil may commune either in prayer or other form of solemn thought, as his upbringing and his spirit may prompt. This would be a truer form of religious voluntarism than any schoolroom prayer in unison."

Other distinguished lawyers, such as Dean Willard Heckel of Rutgers Law School, in the 1964 hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, have held that a time for silent prayer or meditation is not a violation of the Constitution or the Supreme Court's rulings.

At least three State Attorneys General have expressed themselves as in agreement with the position my resolution sets forth. Robert

Matthews, Kentucky, has found nothing objectionable in a student saying a prayer, either silent or vocal, "during a period of meditation." Pennsylvania's Attorney General Walter E. Alessandrini finds no restraining upon "unorganized, private, personal prayer" in school, such as brief meditation period would give a minute for doing. Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke found that there is no constitutional bar to the law passed by the Massachusetts state legislature earlier this year, under which at the beginning of the school day every Massachusetts teacher "shall announce that a period of silence not to exceed one minute in duration shall be observed for meditation."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a necessity for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to permit, in the language of the Dirksen resolution, "voluntary participation by students or others in prayer" in "any school, school system, educational institution or other public building." Rather, as others have pointed out before this body, the wording of the proposed amendment, and particularly the words "providing for" such "voluntary participation" on the part of school authorities, may well cause confusion and violation of the traditional separation of church and state.

Consequently I commend to you as an alternative recommendation by the Judiciary Committee of S. Res. 248, whose text I would like to have appear in the hearings at the end of this statement.

CHINA AND VIETNAM

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished scholar and author, Mr. Edgar Snow, has written a significant piece entitled "China and Vietnam" which appears in the July 30, 1966, issue of the New Republic. The article opens with the arresting statement:

The United States is at war with China—a proxy war now but perhaps a war of irreversible expansion.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Snow's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHINA AND VIETNAM

(By Edgar Snow)

GENEVA.—The United States is at war with China—a proxy war now but perhaps a war of irreversible expansion.

I hope this view may be proved mistaken, but it seems that history may date the onset of a Sino-American war from President Johnson's fateful decision, soon after his inauguration in 1965, to reject a neutral Saigon (then in the offing) and to forestall it by an air invasion of North Vietnam, covering a large-scale U.S. occupation of Vietnam's hinterland.

Hanoi and Peking regard American leaders as rational, though wrong, so they concluded that the American objective was political hegemony over Vietnam. It was logical for them then to anticipate eventual bombing of metropolitan Hanoi and Halphong, which events in June confirmed. The June bombings in turn have probably sealed off remaining possibilities of intervention by noninvolved powers to bring about a cease-fire. There is no known way to restore broken eggs or remake history. With the crippling of North Vietnam's main industrial bases, Ho Chi Minh has little alternative other than commitment to a protracted war of resistance.

Increasingly, Ho must perforce integrate his efforts with Chinese strategy, and China itself now has no choice but to provide Ho with support bases to compensate for continuing American attrition and devastation. That means that the political and military center of resistance is shifting to China, as earlier it shifted from South Vietnam to the North.

Finding the United States to be an aggressor in Taiwan, in Vietnam, and in other "neo-colonial" positions in Asia, Peking has formally proclaimed a doctrine of moral and legal rights of "counter-aggression". No early dramatic swooping down into Southeast Asia of "hordes" of Chinese troops is likely, however. Just as there has been no single moment when the American people understood that they had gone to war against Vietnam, the war against China may be with us for months or perhaps years before direct combat occurs between the two forces. For the present China will probably concentrate on improving logistical means: the development of new feeder roads into Southeast Asia, the supply and replenishment of food and weapons, replacement and expansion of technical personnel, and volunteer manpower on demand. U.S. sanctuaries in Thailand, Laos, Taiwan, Korea, Hongkong and perhaps Japan, may all be faced with the new problems of a political or para-military character. China will do what it can to demonstrate that the American task is not simply to "seek, find, and destroy" those who resist, but how to reduce the mounting demands of an unending occupation. Not how to get more troops into Asia but how to limit the commitment. And not how to win military victories but how to locate a center of political decision to contain Asian history under American control. The American problem will be a great magnification of what is already today: in brief, how to disengage.

Mao Tse-tung probably has no illusion that effective "counter-aggression" may not, in the end, result in an extension of Johnsonian punishment to China itself. China's participation in the war will therefore continue to be cautious, with maximum effort withheld until or unless Chinese territory comes under direct American attack.

Above all, Ho and Mao probably count on Practical Politics (much as Russia relied on Old Man Winter against Hitler) as their best ally in the long pull. The unpopular war is costing, according to Secretary MacNamara's understatement, a billion dollars a month, or about \$400 a second, yet 90 percent of South Vietnam is still unoccupied by the Americans. The North's human reserves have scarcely been tapped; behind them lies a sea of Chinese manpower.

Britain cannot—not even to save the pound—go along much longer, Wilson having been obliged to remove the "Anglo" sign before new American escalations. A swollen U.S. war budget, accompanied by inflation, a steady gold drain, and widespread public fear of a dollar-pound devaluation, are paralleled by political second thoughts in the homes of unwilling draftees and a nervous down-trend in Wall Street. Even if the war can be confined to Vietnam during the next two or three years, ever rising costs necessary to begin to stabilize the occupation and keep the satellite generals in nominal power in Saigon will total somewhere between 50 and 100 billion dollars—quite enough money to bring to a standstill what remains of the Great Society operation, just at the time Mr. Johnson must once more appeal to the national electorate.

True, some wry satisfaction may be derived from the ruins of North Vietnam's industrial beginnings. But inherently well-intentioned Americans must feel uneasy at the thought that these "successful strikes" are achieved in a gamble that at any moment could provoke cataclysmic reprisals on American aircraft carriers by Soviet bombers, that only the absence of pressure on a button in Mos-

cow prevents that retaliation, and that, if it came, no law exists to condemn such action which has not by now been repeatedly violated by the United States.

Cruel as the punishment has become for all Vietnamese, bleak as the outlook is for any early surcease of pain, illusory or distorted as their analyses of Mr. Johnson's internal difficulties may prove to be, they would seem to have not more to lose now by waiting for time either to reveal an eventual American repudiation of the whole disastrous adventure by voting in a change of Administration, or for the harassed President to fulfill his threat to carry on a protracted war for years rather than withdraw.

And yet, China would have had it otherwise. As late as January, 1965, both Ho Chin Minh and Mao Tse-tung probably still believed that a protracted war with the United States could be avoided. In that month Mao himself told me that he recognized the possibility of convening an international conference to enforce terms of the Geneva Treaty of 1954 without the prior withdrawal of American personnel then in South Vietnam. A neutral independent Saigon government would then have been acceptable to Peking. Mao's expectations were upset when the United States transformed Vietnam's civil war into international war. Since then the Chinese Communist leadership has engaged in a deep and bitter debate.

In December, 1964, Premier Chou En-lai had promised the National Congress that China's draft Third Five Year Plan would be submitted for public examination early in 1965. That plan was already being discussed among higher party echelons before and after China tested her first nuclear device, and it was known that no great increase in the defense sector was indicated. After February, however, press references to the Third Plan ceased to appear.

Apart from revamping the economy to devote a major sector to defense industry, great questions faced Peking's leadership. What should be the character of China's military strategy against the United States? If war was unavoidable, would it not be prudent to mend fences with Russia? China's own defenses were not adequate to protect her urban industrial bases against heavy American air attack. What would be Russia's price for providing an air defense umbrella? To submit to Moscow and revisionism was unthinkable; to subject to American destruction the results of nearly two decades of sacrifice to modernize China was also unthinkable. Yet both had to be thought through.

Acceptance of the Russian line would mean a compromise in Vietnam which would leave the United States firmly planted in Southeast Asia. If Vietnam were surrendered, why not Taiwan? And if Taiwan were abandoned, why not concede American dominance in general, accept a secondary role for China, and seek aims from the United States, like India? This reverse view of the dominoes, collapsing inward on China, could lead to the conclusion that capitulation to Russian pressure was synonymous with capitulation to the United States, abandonment of the revolution as well as vital national interests—and suicide for the Chinese party leadership.

Between such extremes, however there exist various possibilities of limited Chinese compromise with the Russians in order to secure minimum guarantees of support against the United States. Marshal Lin Biao has emerged as the spokesman for the dominant view, which simply invokes all the experience of the Chinese revolutionary wars to prove Mao's old thesis, man is more important than weapons; the only kind of war China could fight and win, alone, is a protracted war dependent essentially on manpower, space, and resolute social revolutionary leadership based on unrevised Marxist-Leninism. The presence of large American armies in Asia makes Mao's kind of war pos-

sible, and the more Americans the better. China would suffer, there could be no doubt about that, but there could also be no doubt (according to Lin) about the ultimate victory.

Today one sees in China a process called "the great cultural revolution." Its aim is completely to unify theory and mass practice based on the thought of Mao-Tse-tung. Those who took up losing positions during the critical debate concerning correct policy toward the US and Russia must now submit to a remolding of their thinking. They embrace party members. How many? Not more than five percent, according to the official press, and yet already these include two members of the Politburo. The charge is "revisionism." Used against veteran Communists long indoctrinated by Mao's teachings, and with a lifetime of practice in the politics of the Chinese revolution, "revisionism" can only be regarded as a euphemism to describe an intra-party opposition defeated on a major decision, which could have involved a transfer of power.

An American victory in Vietnam for want of aid from Russia and China would not only impose a profound loss of prestige from which the whole world socialist movement might never recover, but conceivably it could lead to wars between socialist nationalisms. China could blame Moscow for a defeat in Vietnam, but that could not alter its shattering effects not only on Mao's prestige as a world revolutionary leader and doctrinaire, but also on the future of China as a major power with vital national interests at stake. That is why, even without Russia, China probably cannot permit the United States to decide the fate of East Asia by intensified bombing of Vietnam—or, for that matter, of China itself. In the latter event the war would indeed "know no frontiers," as Ch'en Yi has said, and the Chinese understand that in the end the Russian Communists themselves could not survive the destruction of China. The outcome of that brutal dilemma could be world war.

Meanwhile, what of the many peace plans advanced to prevent further "widening of the war"? The trouble with them is that those liked by President Johnson are conditioned by negotiations to be conducted while American troops occupy large areas of Vietnam, while those liked by all Vietnamese leaders in the unoccupied areas require an unconditional guarantee of United States withdrawal and respect for other terms of the Geneva Treaty of 1954 violated by the American presence. For the Vietnamese to accept Mr. Johnson's conditions would concede legality to the American occupation, while for Mr. Johnson to accept Vietnamese conditions would mean abandonment of the objectives of the intervention. That is why the war goes on and will likely expand.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the close of last session, I submitted a progress report on the development of educational television in which I set forth the problems and progress as well as the facts and figures relating to educational television.

The Educational Television Facilities Act, which I sponsored and which was enacted in 1962, has made possible direct Federal support for educational television stations. Grants have been made on a matching basis with States for developing new stations and for expansion of existing facilities, and almost 100 applications have been accepted since that time.

I stated then that educational television had passed through two important

Their argument was, in part that it would cost more than high school training for young men of high school age. My reply then was the same as it is tonight: "What do you think it costs to keep a young man who is not rehabilitated in prison? How much do you think it costs to take care of years of public welfare? How much do you think it costs as a result of the loss to society of the economic contribution he can make to our economy if he has developed into a sound, wage earning citizen?"

I am not moved by the argument that some of these job training centers to rehabilitate young men to make them useful citizens cost more in some instances than it would cost if they did not need rehabilitation and went to a standard high school.

Mr. President, this happens to be a serious social problem that confronts us. I insist that it is a wise investment to put these young men through the type of job training centers, under the program being developed, of which Sargent Shriver is the head. Regardless of the cost, it is an economic investment, and it is one that we should be willing to invest in.

My answer to these critics is that every cent we invest in a worthwhile project which gives true recognition to human values and which prepares these young people for useful roles in our society is worth the cost even though it may be higher than that which is computed in educating young people who enjoy the good fortune of not being afflicted with poverty, and who have not lived in an environment that has produced the problems that have been produced in these young people we select to put through these job training centers.

It is becoming more and more evident that the Tongue Point Training Center, although confronted by enormous problems at the outset, is now beginning to demonstrate its real value to our society. In that connection, Mr. President, I was pleased to read an article which appeared in the July 26, 1966, issue of the Los Angeles Times, entitled, "Hopes Look Up for Job Corps Camp in Oregon." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues because I think it points up the importance of the fine work that is being done at present at Tongue Point and the extremely encouraging prospects for even greater contributions from this Job Training Center in the future.

In addition, I would not wish to let this occasion pass without paying tribute to the fine staff of educators and administrators who are performing such dedicated and outstanding work at the Job Corps Training Center.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

HOPES LOOK UP FOR JOB CORPS CAMP IN OREGON—SECOND YEAR OF OPERATION FINDS DECLINE IN DROPOUTS, MORE QUALIFIED GRADUATES

(By Ed Meagher)

TONGUE POINT, OREG.—The first-year record of the Job Corps Center here could hardly

No. 133—13

have been worse—162 boys were graduated, compared with 534 who quit or were thrown out as too tough to handle.

Racial violence broke out at the center, and in nearby Astoria, student brushes with police were all too frequent.

But now, halfway into its second year, the record is a little brighter. Costs, which in the first year amounted to about \$12,500 a boy, are dropping, and the ratio of graduates to dropouts is rising.

However, the center, one of eight established by the Office of Economic Opportunity, still has a long way to go before breaking out of the experimental woods.

HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYABLES

Operated under government contract by the University of Oregon and the Philco Corp., the center was envisioned as a place to provide school dropouts with basic education and a vocation to move them out of the ranks of hard-core unemployables into the respectable mainstream.

The trouble is, thus far, fewer than a third of the students have made the leap. Not only that, critics say, but the center's costs are out of line.

Douglas V. Olds, director of the Tongue Point center, believes the program is worthwhile.

"We expect," he said, "soon to be graduating from 75 to 100 students a month. They will thereafter be off the welfare rolls, with prospects good that their children will not be on them later as adults.

"Usefully employed graduates will have an estimated life expectancy of \$100,000 in earnings. Some of this will be returned to society in taxes."

MANY BUILT-IN PROBLEMS

Any program that could effect such a social transition in a substantial way would seem to be a bargain, regardless of cost.

But Tongue Point and the other Job Corps centers, investigation indicates, have so many built-in problems that critics believe they should be returned to the drawing board or scrapped entirely.

The Office of Economic Opportunity's determination to bring about instant integration to the centers may be blamed for one of the problems.

The Tongue Point center (and the others as well) was established as an interracial, intercultural and interregional melting pot.

Students come from all 50 States. Almost half, 43%, are Negroes. Seven per cent comprise Mexican-Americans, Indians and Hawaiians.

FROM DIVISIVE BACKGROUNDS

They arrive from such divisive backgrounds as city slums and the hills of Appalachia, from small towns and isolated farms.

The only things they have in common—poverty, ignorance and too often a festering problem of immaturity—are hardly the ingredients to promote togetherness.

Other built-in problems, in center director Olds' view, have to do with the minimum age of 16, which he believes is too low, and the screening of applicants which, while improving, still leaves much to be desired.

The screening is done at youth opportunity centers and state employment offices throughout the country.

"Screening seems to be improving generally," Olds said, "but recently we were sent a youth on parole following his conviction on auto theft and assault charges. Another came from a mental institution."

Trainees are supposed to have had at least a fifth grade education, but, according to Olds, a number of illiterates have been sent to Tongue Point.

SOCIAL OUTLETS

Still another problem inherent to this center is the unavailability of social outlets normal to young men.

Astoria is a small town of less than 10,000. Most residents are fishermen and their fam-

ilies are of Scandinavian and Finnish descent.

No Negroes live within its boundaries.

Thus, out of necessity, social affairs for the trainees are centered almost entirely in Portland, about 100 miles away. Because of the distance, students are restricted to one weekend visit there a month.

Transportation and lodging at the YMCA are provided by the government and dances and other mixed social gatherings are arranged under auspices of the Portland Urban League and other organizations.

However, center officials admit that opportunities for the students to make outside contacts are too limited.

DRAWN FROM SCHOOLS

Olds was recruited by the university from the Springfield (Ore.) School District, where he was assistant superintendent. Most of his staff were drawn from Oregon schools. Few had experience with students such as those who came to Tongue Point.

"Academic and vocational training of the students is comparatively routine," Olds said. "Trying to make responsible men out of some of them is what takes most of our time and understanding and patience."

"There is no doubt, however," he continued, "that most of these boys are well worth saving. It is tremendously satisfying to see young men develop skills and exhibit definite leadership qualities within a matter of a few months."

Dale Owen, head of the center's art department, agrees. One of his students, Paul McCaskill of Miami, is an inspired professional painter, to be taken seriously right now, according to Owen. The University of Oregon invited McCaskill to exhibit his works at a one-man show.

Neither Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon, nor Olds denies that the first year's costs seem unreasonable. But both have pointed out that substantial amounts were needed to meet nonrecurring expenses and predicted that expenses per boy will be more than halved during this fiscal year, to about \$5,300, when enrollment reaches capacity of 1,250 students this fall. "Although this may seem too high," Olds said, it must be remembered that we operate the year around and pay all of the students' expenses, including medical and dental."

But reducing the center's other problems to a reasonable size remains to be accomplished.

The age minimum should be raised, Olds recommends, and students should be assigned to centers in their own region.

Olds does not see Job Corps centers as the ultimate answer to the problem of salvaging school dropouts.

"In time," he said, "I think their function should be turned over to the nation's public schools. But, meanwhile, the centers are building up a body of knowledge and experience that will be invaluable to any program that follows."

"I believe they are worthwhile," Olds said.

CAMBODIA AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last week I received a cablegram from the head of the Cambodian Government, Prince Sihanouk; and I ask unanimous consent that the translation of his cablegram, together with my reply to him under date of August 10, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

I would like to express, Mr. Senator, my very sincere congratulations for the statement full of commonsense, courage, and justice which you gave on the occasion of the

departure of the Americans Want to Know Mission to Cambodia. I hope that thanks to you and some of your colleagues who, like you, have a clear view of the problems of the Asian Continent, the great American Nation, which was not so long ago in conflict with colonialism and imperialism, will return to its noble tradition. In the dark times in which we live, your advice is comforting to hear.

With all my gratitude,
 NORODOM SIHANOUK,
 Chief of State of Cambodia.

AUGUST 10, 1966.

HIS EXCELLENCY,
 PRINCE SIHANOUK,
 Phnompenh,
 Cambodia.

DEAR SIR: Your cablegram commending my statement of July 25 was deeply appreciated. Be assured that I greatly admire your efforts to maintain the sovereignty and dignity of your country, and the safety of your people, amid the trespasses and provocations being committed against Cambodia.

It remains my hope that the nations of the world still on the sidelines will step in to stop the war in Vietnam before it engulfs more people. The parties to the war seem no longer to have the capacity either to stop it or to limit its scope.

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Both documents speak for themselves, but in view of the fact that the head of the Cambodian Government referred to a public statement that I made at a press conference, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the press release which I issued on July 25, when that group of American citizens who call themselves "Americans Want to Know" held a press conference before they left for Cambodia.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON "AMERICANS WANT TO KNOW" TRIP TO CAMBODIA

"Americans Want to Know" are to be commended for undertaking a fact-finding mission to Cambodia to determine whether the war is spreading to that country, and if so, at whose instigation.

We have the tragic picture in Southeast Asia of American financial and military power being brought in in massive quantities on the ground that the United States must stop Chinese aggression on the borders of China. How many millions of people and how many nations are to be made party to this endeavor is a question no American outside the inner councils of the Administration can really answer.

We hear daily rumors of intrusions into Cambodia by the Vietcong and by American forces in pursuit of them. We already know that Thailand is for all practical purposes swallowed up in the American encirclement of China. We know that the 1962 Accord on Laos is a thing of the past, observed only in diplomatic lip service.

The tragedy of Belgium, which twice was trampled in contests between great powers, is being repeated in Southeast Asia. Fortunately, there are still some Americans who believe that the many countries who rank below the great power level are entitled to exist without serving as steppingstones for great powers.

The record of the last five years demonstrates that far from preserving the right of these Asians to live their own lives and run their own countries, we are competing with the Communists in trying to take them over before the other does. We and the Com-

munist have dragged Laos into the war; we and the Communists are dragging Thailand into the war; we and the Communists are endangering the Philippines over the war; and we and the Communists apparently are determined that Cambodia will not fall to the other if her sovereignty and soil have to be destroyed to prevent it.

The pious cloak of humanitarianism with which the Administration seeks to disguise our nationalist aims in Southeast Asia is belied by the facts. The facts are that we are not bringing any Great Society to Asia; we are destroying the societies of Asia, great and small, that existed long before our own.

A nation that has not yet created a Great Society at home, nor produced progress by alliance in Latin America, is hardly the country that is going to remake Asia except through air power and artillery.

Many of us hope that Cambodia can yet be saved from the fate of South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. I commend these Americans for their effort to preserve the truth in a welter of nationalism, jingoism, and flag-waving. I congratulate them and I wish them well in their journey.

Mr. MORSE. I await with great interest the official report of this group of American citizens upon their return to the United States. I have been reading the newspaper stories about their visit to Cambodia, and what some of them have said, or allegedly have said, in various interviews in Japan and elsewhere. But I shall await their official statements upon their return to the United States with great interest. Apparently their visit to Cambodia was approved by the head of the Cambodian Government, and I judge that they were given complete access to take trips wherever they wished within that country while they were there.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Still No Planes," published in the New York Times of 2 days ago, and an article entitled "Are Mechanics Overpaid?" written by Stanley Levey, and printed in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, August 11, 1966.

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

STILL NO PLANES

The chance that strikebound airliners might get back aloft on the wings of a voluntary arbitration agreement seems to have been shot down even before the union rank and file is asked to pass on it. Strike leaders, still staggering under the membership's overwhelming rejection of the wage agreement they joined President Johnson in endorsing, obviously have no appetite for going back to the strikers now with the arbitration proposal made by Chairman Staggers of the House Commerce Committee and accepted at once by the employers.

Putting the disputed wage issues up to an impartial board for review represents the soundest road now open for resolving a conflict in which layer after layer of governmental intervention has effectively eliminated any possibility of return to "free collective bargaining." The union has already turned down a Presidential emergency board's recommendation of increases that exceeded the old anti-inflation guideposts. It has spurned a pact calling for much higher increases negotiated at the White House. In turning its back on arbitration, it plainly counts on the

Administration to use its influence with the tightly regulated airlines to go higher still—no matter how much of a shambles it makes of the whole stabilization program.

The only defense against the success of this tactic lies in passage of the back-to-work bill now awaiting action in the House. Acceptance of voluntary arbitration would have averted the need for another step toward compulsion in labor relations, but the union preferred economic muscle to reason.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News,
 Aug. 11, 1966]

IT'S NOT A NUMBERS GAME TO AIRLINE STRIKERS: ARE MECHANICS OVERPAID?

(By Stanley Levey)

The current rage here is playing the numbers game with wage rates. Depending on your point of view, you can prove that striking airlines mechanics are overpaid, underpaid, or paid just right.

But to members of the International Association of Machinists it's not a game. And because they rejected the White House settlement 2 weeks ago and will service the planes when they fly again, their sentiments carry clout, in the Washington idiom.

Airlines mechanics believe they are underpaid—not in general, not on the average, and not statistically. Specifically, they feel they are getting less money in cities where they are concentrated than workers with comparable or lesser skills and responsibilities.

Of the 35,000 striking workers, 19,000 are mechanics. Of the latter 12,000 are licensed by the Federal Aviation Agency and must sign out (or certify) the engines, electrical equipment, and frames of planes they repair.

FIGURES CITED

These employees—the most vocal and militant in the union and in short supply—cite the following figures to prove they are underpaid at the present rate of \$3.52 an hour, or would be under the rejected White House settlement which would have raised their hourly rate to \$4.08 by mid-1968.

In New York City, garbage truck mechanics for the Sanitation Department receive \$4.53 an hour. In Denver the rate for city auto and truck mechanics is \$4.05; in San Francisco it is \$3.91. Greyhound mechanics in the West now get \$4.61, and in 1968 will get \$5.09. Greyhound machinists rates will go to \$5.21 in 1968 from the current \$4.74.

San Francisco auto and truck mechanics are paid \$4.33 an hour. Electric utility maintenance mechanics in Chicago earn \$4.10. The same classes of workers receive \$4 in New York, \$4.14 in Detroit and \$4.10 in St. Louis.

UNION FEELING

The union contends there has been a sharp rise in wages for construction workers in major population centers where its members perform comparable duties at generally lower rates. In Denver, for example, the current hourly rates for seven unionized building crafts, not including employer-paid fringe benefits, are:

Bricklayers, \$4.70; carpenters, \$4.41; electricians, \$4.77; painters, \$3.97; plasterers, \$4.55; plumbers, \$4.51; laborers, \$3.02. In other cities, such as Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis, New York, San Francisco and Washington these rates are even higher.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE (D., Ore.), chairman of a presidential Emergency Board which recommended other settlement terms in the airlines dispute that were rejected by the union, recently had printed in the Congressional Record a memorandum comparing airline rates with those of comparable industries. The report sought to counter IAM claims that airlines workers are underpaid.

LOWER FIGURES

Noting new high rates for Greyhound mechanics in the West, the memorandum cited

August 12, 1966

18437

lower figures, ranging from \$3.32 to \$3.39, for bus mechanics in Miami, Chicago, Washington-Baltimore, New York, Boston, Atlanta, Pittsburgh and Minneapolis-St. Paul. It also noted the small number of western bus mechanics assigned to top-rated jobs.

The same memorandum noted that under the Emergency Board recommendations (for an 18-cent increase for mechanics this year) these workers would have been "far ahead of the majority of their colleagues working in truck repair around the United States."

The figures painted a similar picture (except for the West Coast, a high-wage area) for wages paid truck mechanics under IAM contracts:

In Albuquerque, the present rate is \$3.33, in Cincinnati \$3.55, in Cleveland, \$3.37; in Columbus, \$3.37; in El Paso, \$3.68, increasing to \$3.82 next May, and in Pittsburgh, \$3.52.

"I am surprised as I read the newspapers," said Sen. MORSE, "to read the impression created by some of these articles that the workers in this industry are an underpaid group."

"They are not underpaid workers in comparison with wages prevailing in comparable industry generally. This does not mean they are not entitled to a wage increase. I have always said they are. It is a question of how much they are entitled to."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the ticker carries the information this afternoon that the House committee, by a vote of 17 to 13, has reported to the floor of the House a resolution which, if the ticker is accurate, follows the major premises of the Senate resolution. There apparently are some differences in details, but the House resolution appears to have supported, as did that of the Senate, the principle that under the interstate commerce clause, it is the duty of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, and not the President; and that in fact the President does not have the authority to regulate interstate commerce, but only Congress.

I hope, Mr. President, that one of two things will occur by the first of the week: Either that the House will pass the legislation, and the two Houses will reach a common agreement in regard to the final form of the legislation in Congress, so that there will not be any need for any newspaper to write an editorial such as the one I have just put in the RECORD under the heading "Still No Planes"; or that the end of this strike against the public interest, to which the American public is entitled, will be forthcoming. It is a strike, now, against the public interest and not against the carriers; that feature is only secondary. It is a strike by a union working in a regulated industry, and in that industry the public interest is paramount. It calls for legislation that does not break a strike, in spite of all the propaganda of the unions, and I am surprised at the politicians who seem to fear if they vote for an extension of the Railway Labor Act for x number of days—and our resolution would make it 180 days, if that becomes necessary—they are voting to break a strike.

That is utter nonsense. The Railway Labor Act provides that men cannot strike for 60 days when the act is applied to them. Do my fellow Members of Congress think that when that act is applied, more parties to breaking a strike? More nonsense, I say.

The resolution which we passed in the Senate simply says to the employees, "Go

back to work for 180 days." It provides for procedures for mediation during the 180-day period. Not only do the best interests of the public call for that course of action on the part of the union, but the best interests of labor call for it also.

Of course, we have labor leaders who seem to feel they must encourage their union members to stay out on the picket line until they break the will of both the carriers and the public. In my judgment, that is not labor statesmanship. In my judgment, those labor leaders who are following that course of action and not only giving that advice to the members of this union, but seeking to induce members of other unions to put the political heat on Members of Congress in an endeavor to block the passage of legislation, are only injuring the best interests of labor and tarnishing its image.

For I say to the labor leaders of America: We are at war. We are at war, and increasing numbers of American boys are dying in Asia. In my judgment, no union has a right, in the midst of that war, to strike against the public interest in a regulated industry, when there are plenty of peaceful procedures available to the union leaders and the members of that union to carry out the precious right of collective bargaining.

Mr. President, in this case the designated officials of the union, the men selected by the union members to represent them in a collective bargaining session, agreed on a collective bargaining agreement. I wish to say that the members of no union can justify, after such an agreement, in time of war, engaging in a strike against the public interest.

Oh, I know. I was called off the floor of the Senate yesterday by a couple of labor leaders who were incensed at my position.

"Why," they said, "we have supported you in every election, the four times that you have run for Congress."

My reply to them was:

Do you think you bought me? You can tell the leaders of your unions that they have declared political war on me and that I accepted the declaration. I intend to put the public interest first. When I think you fellows are wrong, I shall vote against you, as I have voted against you for 32 years in my involvement in major labor disputes in this country, and I shall continue to vote for you when I think you are right. That is the only thing you have a right to receive from me.

I represent all the people of my State, and not just the members of organized labor. In this instance, I think you are dead wrong, and I hope you will recognize, before it is too late, that you have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship to stop this strike against the public interest.

Mr. President, there is no other alternative to the passage of legislation which, in my opinion, the Members of Congress have a clear duty to pass early next week, unless this union returns to the collective bargaining table and settles on the basis of a fair and reasonable adjustment. The agreement that their negotiators agreed to just a few nights ago was such an agreement.

This union would change its image and role in the minds and eyes of millions of Americans if it reconsiders its

action in refusing to accept that agreement, for that agreement eliminated the wage issue as far as the hourly rate is concerned. This union never asked for more than \$4.04 for its highest paid employees. They got \$4.08 the other night.

I know it is said that they want certain fringe benefits such as an escalator clause. Again, I want to say that we are in the midst of a war, with increasing numbers of American boys dying in Asia, and it is well known, as my remarks on another subject will show momentarily, that I have not supported our getting involved in this war.

I think it has been a great mistake, but we are in it and as long as we are, then let me say here on the homefront, where we are perfectly safe and secure, for we do not run any risk of getting shot in a jungle, we at least have the public obligation of seeing to it that we do not tear asunder the economic fabric of this Republic.

Any proposal to use naked, economic power on the part of any union in a regulated industry to have its will forced upon the public because it has the economic muscle is not a public service, to put it by way of understatement. So, I hope that over the weekend the lights of industrial statesmanship will return to the eyes of the union leaders and the members of this union and that a good-faith collective bargaining agreement will be entered into that will make it unnecessary to pass legislation.

My last sentence in this regard, in reply to the wires I am receiving from labor leaders in my State, as to where I stand on this legislation is: "I stand for its early passage next week, unless you people in labor carry out your responsibility to the public by agreeing to the type of a fair settlement that the labor leaders for this union agreed to with the carriers and with the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor not so many nights ago."

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Services Feud Over Vietnam News," written by William Tuohy, and published in the Washington Post on yesterday, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Aug. 11, 1966]

SERVICES FEUD OVER VIET WAR NEWS (By William Tuohy)

SAIGON, August 10.—The long simmering feud between the U.S. Military Command and the Air Force over military information policy in Vietnam broke into the open today.

The intramural quarrel between jealous services, in the view of many observers here, involves the deeper question of the degree to which the Pentagon is practicing "news management" in releasing information about the war.

The controversy surfaced when it was learned that the highly regarded Air Force information chief, Col. William J. McGinty is being summarily transferred from Saigon to a non-information post in Washington.

His information policy ran afoul of the Military High Command information office in Saigon, where frankness and efficiency are in chronic short supply.

In Vietnam, the Marines have been as helpful as the Air Force in providing correspondents access to information. The Navy has been woefully erratic and inept, and the Army, excellent in the field, defers to the Saigon command—whose top information officers in the past 18 months have been Army General Staff officers.

Currently, the chief information officer in Vietnam is Army Col. Rodger E. Bankson, who came to the job from the Pentagon office of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

Bankson's office is charged with holding the daily military briefing for correspondents, which, in the view of many reporters, are often inaccurate, misleading, and valueless.

There is a widespread feeling that the responsibility lies not so much with Bankson as with his boss, Sylvester, or with Sylvester's boss, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Sylvester has said he favors government "news management," including lying to the press in times of crisis. On a trip to Vietnam, he declared the press ought to be the "handmaiden" of the Government, as far as reporting the war went.

It is generally believed here that the Defense Department tries to call all the shots from Washington. Information officers privately complain they spend so much time trying to determine sources of unfavorable stories that they haven't time to do their job of assembling and disseminating a coherent account of military activities.

The Command Information Office invariably gives "military security" as the reason for its reluctance to give out information, but many veteran correspondents suspect that much of the information is given or withheld not for security reasons but for domestic political gain.

In Operation Double Eagle earlier this year, the U.S. Marines landed the largest number of troops in an amphibious operation since Korea. Even after two days the region commander refused to release the news, although the Marines had no objection. Saigon claimed release would violate security even though every Vietcong within ten miles of the beach head could tell by the number of ships, planes, and helicopters what was going on. The Saigon Command, say the Marines, was waiting for a favorable kill count to go with the news of the landing.

In any event, the Air Force's free-wheeling policies of giving out as much information as possible ran head-on into the Saigon Command's reluctance to disclose facts.

Col. McGinty refuses to comment on the situation, but it seems clear that he is taking the rap for a "maximum" Air Force disclosure policy at odds with the establishment's rule of "minimum disclosure."

In Saigon, Air Force information specialists feel their whole effort to give fast news to the public has been jeopardized by McGinty's sudden transfer.

But in the view of many observers here, in and out of Government, the real victims are the Johnson Administration and the public itself.

The Pentagon, these observers say, has so often mismanaged the news that the Administration's credibility on the whole subject of the Vietnam war has suffered. And it often seems, they add, that the American people are entitled to more accurate information about a complex, crucial war than the Pentagon is prepared to give them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this article bears out what I have said so many

times during the last 3 years about this war in southeast Asia.

The American people are getting managed news. They are getting censored news. They are getting slanted news. That is why, if we want to know what is happening in southeast Asia, we cannot get it from the American press. We have to read the foreign press. We have to read the French press, the Canadian press, the Great Britain press and the press of the Low Lands of Scandinavia. We have to read the press of the non-combatant countries that have correspondents in Asia. It is quite a different thing. For example, that press leaves no room for doubt as to whether we are killing civilians.

It is a shocking thing that this administration continues to misrepresent to the American people that our bombing in the Hanoi area within 3 miles of the center of the city is not killing civilians.

The foreign press tells us quite to the contrary. Not only that, but the foreign press also depicts the tragedy which is shocking and should be shocking to moral men and women. We cannot do what we are doing in the bombing in the Hanoi and Haiphong area and claim that we are moral, for our actions spell out immorality. All Asia knows it. All Europe knows it. Criticism falls upon us from Africa, Latin America, and all over the world.

Mr. President, I raise my voice once again to make this plea to the administration: "You tell the American people the truth and all the truth about the course that we are following in prosecuting the war in southeast Asia."

I want them to know the truth also concerning the shocking brutality and cruelty and atrocity of the enemy, but that does not justify our immorality.

It does justify that, before it is too late, we make perfectly clear to the other nations of the world, through some international body, preferably the United Nations, that we are ready to have them take over. We are ready to have them declare a cease-fire. We are ready to have them declare that they will carry out their obligations to enforce the peace.

That continues to be my answer to the repeated misrepresentation of this administration that those of us who criticize the policy have no alternative to offer. We have been offering the alternatives in detail for 3 years.

We have been offering the alternative of a General Ridgway, a General Gavin, a George Kennan, and the others who are warning us and have been warning us that we cannot escalate this war, as we are escalating it, and not end up in a massive war that undoubtedly will engender the beginning of the third world war.

Oh, Mr. President, I want to say to the American people: "If you want to know what your Government is doing in southeast Asia, you had better start subscribing to the foreign press."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, relating to what I have just said on another facet of the problem, an

article entitled, "Pentagon Readies More U.S. Troops for War in Vietnam," published in the Washington Post of August 11.

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

PENTAGON READIES MORE U.S. TROOPS FOR WAR IN VIETNAM

(By John G. Norris)

Several additional American divisions, still in training but rapidly nearing combat readiness, will be sent to Vietnam under tentative plans that are virtually certain to receive top level approval.

Authoritative Pentagon sources forecast this action after Gen. William C. Westmoreland told newsmen yesterday during a visit to U.S. Pacific Headquarters at Pearl Harbor that more troops will be needed in Vietnam.

Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, made the statement when asked about reports of mounting North Vietnamese troop infiltrations into the south and recent press reports of rising troop requirements.

WON'T GUESS ON NEEDS

Westmoreland declined to speculate on the number of additional troops that ultimately may be needed. He said that U.S. troop requirements depend upon enemy action, but stressed that there is "no magic ratio" that would tell how many American troops are needed to offset any given number of Communist troops.

"It is difficult to compare power by relating people, because we have the firepower and the mobility that the Communist troops do not have," said the General. "I believe more troops will be needed. We have increments arriving almost every month, such as elements of the 4th Division last month."

There now are about 290,000 American servicemen in Vietnam, plus about 60,000 in the U.S. Seventh Fleet offshore and 25,000 or more in Thailand and elsewhere taking part in the war. It is understood that another 20,000 to 30,000 troops are under orders to move to Vietnam, including the remainder of the 4th Infantry Division.

PREDICTION BY STENNIS

Sen. JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said yesterday that an eventual 500,000 to 600,000 men will be needed to win in Vietnam.

Last January, STENNIS predicted that U.S. troop strength might reach 400,000 by the end of 1966. Pentagon sources indicate that if pending plans—expected to be approved—go through, the total by the end of December will be between 360,000 and 380,000 men.

Where will the troops come from? The Army divisions at home that were converted temporarily into training divisions for Vietnam replacements last summer have ceased taking recruits and should be combat-ready this fall.

That will make available the 5th Mechanized Infantry Division at Ft. Carson, Colo., along with the new 9th Infantry Division at Ft. Riley, Kan., sizeable portions of the 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions not now committed, as well as three new brigades—a division equivalent—and one or two older brigades.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another trial balloon following the most recent ascent of our trial balloonists in South Vietnam. To keep this little tyrant military dictator Ky in power, we are killing American boys. What a shocking page of American history that

August 12, 1966

a single American boy is being sacrificed to keep that little tyrant in power.

A few days ago—in fact, the very day after Ky sent up that trial balloon—and I have been heard to say for many months past that if one wishes to know what the Pentagon is up to, he should keep his ears and eyes open for what Ky says—when Ky made that statement in South Vietnam, in Saigon, including his interview with the correspondents for U.S. News & World Report, and urged the sending of troops into North Vietnam, he was talking about American troops.

The interesting thing is that the American troops have replaced South Vietnam troops to a striking degree. The South Vietnam troops have been too busy quarreling among themselves. But he is talking about our sending American troops into North Vietnam.

There was a press conference some days ago with Mr. Dean Rusk. Again I say that if one wishes to know what Rusk says in a press conference, one should pay more attention to what is between the lines than what is on the lines, for one always has to be ready for double-talk. In that press conference the Secretary of State refused to exclude the possibility of sending American troops into North Vietnam.

May I say to the American people that that is the beginning of this administration's propagandizing you to get ready to put American ground troops into North Vietnam.

If we do, Mr. President, we increase the danger of an all-out war in Asia. I do not intend to support it. It is not justified. It is immoral, obviously illegal.

Mr. President, we have to get back to the framework of international law. We cannot follow this unilateral aggressive course of action. When I say unilateral and aggressive, I mean with respect to the great powers of the world who are more and more isolating us in connection with this war. We cannot follow this unilateral course of action, we cannot send American troops into North Vietnam, without getting ourselves involved in a war with China and Russia. If that happens, then history will record that the nation responsible for the beginning of the third world war was the United States. I do not wish to leave that heritage to future generations of American boys and girls.

Read between the lines of that article—because that is an official reporting of our Government. Read between its lines. It is an article that seeks to get the American people ready for a great increase in American troops into southeast Asia. In my judgment, when they get those troops over there, the 17th parallel will become meaningless. We will be marching across it, and I believe we will be on our way to world war III.

Again I wish to say that it never makes me happy to express these differences of opinion with my Government on foreign policy; but in the absence of a declaration of war. I shall continue to plead that we stop this butchery in Asia, that

we recognize that the jungle law of military might cannot produce a peace. It may produce a surrender; but it will only cause millions and millions of Asians, who hate us already with an intensity of fury, to continue to hate us as we maintain hundreds of thousands of troops in Asia for half a century, if necessary, before they finally throw us out.

So, Mr. President, I wish to raise my voice in opposition to what I am satisfied is at the present time a covert plan to get enough American troops into Asia so that we can give a rationalization to the American people, by way of propaganda, for marching into North Vietnam.

I hope that the leaders of my Government will recognize that, after all, we ought to place our professions about religious principles above the immoral course of conduct that, as a nation, we are following in Asia.

(At this point Mr. MORSE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

LAKE MICHIGAN POLLUTION MUST BE HALTED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the last few days, a matter of serious concern has been brought to me as the Senator from Indiana; a matter of concern to the people of my State; and certainly to all the people of the Great Lake States. The Army Corps of Engineers is dumping at least 75,000 yards and perhaps as much as 160,000 cubic yards of polluted filth into a 70,000 acre area of Lake Michigan. This recent "sludge" has been dredged from the North Branch of the Chicago River. The corps, for navigation purposes, is removing it to increase the depth of the channel from 9 to 12 feet in some areas and 21 feet in others.

The dumping of this "sludge," some 13 miles off the shoreline into Lake Michigan further increases the pollution level of the lake and creates a menace to health and welfare of millions of people in the Chicago area and endangering Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago, all in Indiana—and neighboring Wisconsin and Michigan communities. This dumping may lead to further contamination of water supply and closing of beaches. It can plunge us, who are trying to work out ways to clean up the lakes, into a situation so catastrophic that it will require billions of dollars to remedy.

The reason for dredging is understandable. Several years ago the city of Chicago reversed the flow of the Chicago River, in order to provide flow for treated sewage. The Chicago treatment plants operate on the so-called 90 percent basis, which represents a high degree of treatment, for the removal of BOD—the biochemical oxygen demand. However, over the years the sediment has built up on the bottom of the river and must be removed to accommodate barge traffic. The systematic pollution of the vast fresh water supply that is Lake Michigan is tragic.

It is tragic because this latest incident

aggravates dumping sludge derived from the Calumet and Chicago Rivers, which has been continuous from 1955. Estimates of as high as 2.5 million cubic yards of filth have been dumped from dredging by the corps.

In the course of these dredging activities the corps is harvesting materials which sanitation experts call "nutrients"—sludge which has a high level of nitrogen and phosphates, even after treatment. The nutrient-sludge feeds aquatic life, such as algae, and continue to do so when moved to another environment—such as Lake Michigan.

The release of nutrients causes the algae to grow so rapidly that the growth is similar to an explosion—creating what ecologists call algae bloom. These algae die, sink, and form more sludge which in turn regenerates the cycle. Thus, we have a self-generating unit of pollution. Any given body of water can, under these circumstances, quickly come to be described as "pea soup" or what people from the area describe as "the lake is greening."

The situation is so grave that we must take immediate action to reverse the course of pollution. We have all lagged behind in this duty. No one element is specifically responsible for our total problem of pollution. However, we can move quickly to stop this one situation. I call upon Chicago to do so.

As to the total problem of water pollution, since we are all responsible—the Federal agencies will have to gear-up to move faster. The Department of Interior, with its new responsibility, is moving slowly. The Enforcement Division of the Federal Pollution Control Agency is possibly undermanned. We have no effective regional commission of the Great Lakes States, which would make certain that situations such as the dumping from the Chicago River into Lake Michigan could not occur. Separate State agencies seem reluctant to cooperate even when faced with such a serious problem.

I urge that we work swiftly toward formation of long-range plans for the Great Lakes pollution reclamation, but I call for the following steps to be taken immediately:

First. That the Army Corps of Engineers immediately cease dumping in Lake Michigan and the corps no longer concern themselves only with navigation and flood control. They, too, are responsible for the public welfare as they operate from the public funds and consequently in the public interest. The Congress may be called upon to create a special section of the corps with skilled sanitation engineers. I would support such legislation, although the Executive Order No. 11258, issued November 1965, should have been sufficient to charge the corps with this responsibility.

Second. The Chicago Sanitary District and responsible officials be called upon to come up with more efficient disposal of waste materials derived from the vast population they serve; and

Third. The Federal agencies responsible for the public welfare must move

faster in this area. Significant research in this complicated field must be undertaken to determine new methods of sewage treatment and water reclamation.

If we are not to be short of usable water by 1980, if we are to insure the recreation of the public and the safety of our beaches—and I include our Indiana dunes which I support—and if we are to insure the future prosperity of the Midwest, then we must stop pollution of Lake Michigan and augment current abatement and reclamation work.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 12, 1966:

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review:

For the term expiring July 15, 1969:

Edgar F. Talbott, Sr., of Virginia. (New position.)

For the term expiring July 15, 1970:

Harry R. Pauley, of West Virginia. (New position.)

For the term expiring July 15, 1971:

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania. (Reappointment.)

VN

Appendix

Dismal Swamp Plays Vietnam Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1966

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article published in the Baltimore News American on Friday, July 29, 1966, entitled "Dismal Swamp Plays Vietnam Role." This article was written by Ruth Montgomery of the Hearst Headline Service.

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

DISMAL SWAMP PLAYS VIETNAM ROLE (By Ruth Montgomery)

GREAT DISMAL SWAMP, VA., July 29.—In this primeval jungle once partly owned by George Washington, paratroopers are now being trained in survival techniques before tackling the similarly swampy terrain of Vietnam.

This 750-square-mile swamp, consisting of dense forests, an eerie mirror-lake and feeder canals, is unique on the North American continent. Within its mysterious confines, some of it so impenetrable that it has never been explored by men, are ancient trees which were probably alive at the time of Christ.

The cypress and juniper trees which abound in the swamp and even grow in Lake Drummond itself make the waters too acid for bacterial growth to develop. Thus the dismal swamp is one of the few still-developing peat bogs in the nation.

Among the more curious aspects of this wilderness is the huge lake, which is like a round dimple in the earth's crust. Higher than the surrounding land on three sides, and totally isolated from the fashionable tidewater area by dense jungles, it was probably formed 6,000 years ago when the eastern continental shelf sank beneath the sea for the last time.

Its water is the color of dark topaz but so pure that in the days before refrigeration seamen filled their casks from the lake because the water remained fresh for months at sea.

Reached by boat from the Intercoastal Waterway, through a tree-shaded canal surveyed by George Washington, Lake Drummond is no more than three feet deep at any point. Its water is said to have such therapeutic qualities that during early Virginia history serious thought was given to development of the swamp as a health resort.

In 1763 Washington and five partners formed a company called "Adventures for Draining the Dismal Swamp," and acquired 40,000 acres of the best land.

Credit for digging an access canal goes to Patrick Henry who, as governor of Virginia, persuaded the assembly to finance the building of the waterway, with locks to lift boats to the higher-lying lake.

Today, as then, Great Dismal teems with black bears, deer, foxes, bobcats, opossums, rattlesnakes, cottonmouth moccasins, bats, heron, other wild birds of every description,

and grey moss. It is a hunters' paradise—and a veritable Garden of Eden for ornithologists who gather each spring and fall to observe the bird migrations.

As is inevitable in today's world, the serene wilderness is threatened with despoilment by avaricious man. A company which bought a four-square-mile portion of the swamp has recently stripped it bare, felling all the juniper trees to make fence posts—and destroying the cover for wild life.

Sportsmen and bird watchers are fighting a commercial attempt to build a track and grandstand for stock-car racing. Business interests are hungrily probing Great Dismal Swamp with an eye to potential industrial development, and some land companies are draining and developing acreage for farming, recreation and housing projects.

Such encroachment by spectator sportsmen, industrialists, hot dog operators and litterbugs would endanger one of our few remaining unspoiled areas which has inspired many romantic legends and lyrical writings by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Sir Thomas Moore.

Among the hardy conservationists, who hope to save the virgin wilderness is Mary Tayloe Gwathmey of Virginia Beach, a direct descendant of the distinguished Tayloe family which built Octagon House, the historic mansion occupied by President James (and Dolly) Madison after the British burned the White House.

The rescue of Great Dismal Swamp from the developers would be a worthy project for Lady Bird Johnson, whose laudable beautification program is trying to restore beauty already debased by men.

Surely it would be even better to rescue a natural wilderness before it is despoiled.

No. 1 Efficiency Rating Awarded to VA Office, Waco, Tex., Jack Coker, Manager

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom do our public officials receive the recognition they deserve. For that reason, I was delighted that one of the best, Mr. Jack Coker, manager of the VA Regional Office at Waco, Tex., and his outstanding staff, who serve over 700,000 veterans, were recently awarded the No. 1 efficiency rating for achieving the highest productivity rate of any VA office in the United States. The fine work that the Waco office performs daily in behalf of veterans is well known to me and other Members served by this regional office, and we have long been grateful for the services of Mr. Coker and his excellent team.

The Waco Tribune-Herald of July 31

took note of this award-winning performance, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article at this point:

WACO VA OFFICE MOST EFFICIENT

WASHINGTON.—The Waco Regional Office of the Veterans Administration has achieved the highest productivity rate of any VA office in the United States, it was revealed today by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE.

The top productivity rating, which means greatest efficiency in operation, was for the fiscal year which ended June 30.

Representative TEAGUE, chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, wired his congratulations to Waco VA Manager, Jack Coker.

"Your efficient and effective management of matters pertaining to benefits to veterans, their dependents and war orphans, is to be highly commended," TEAGUE's message to Coker said.

"This achievement is all the more significant because of the unique and difficult problems the Waco office has faced in the past several years, not the least of which were a major consolidation and a move to new quarters.

"Your effectiveness in better serving the veterans of Texas at less administrative cost to the taxpayers is especially appreciated by your elected representatives who must answer to the people for the efficiency of their government. You have established an outstanding example of efficiency and economy for all in government to follow. Please extend my personal congratulations to every employee of your operation in making the Waco VA Regional Office the outstanding office in the country," TEAGUE's telegram said.

The congressman added: "I have always harbored a belief that Texans can do almost any job better, and your outstanding performance despite major handicaps, strengthens that conviction. Keep up the good work."

Congressman W. R. POAGE of Waco wired Coker:

"The Waco VA office long has had a fine record of productivity. I was not therefore surprised to learn that your office was selected as the outstanding office in the United States having the highest productivity rating in the nation. I congratulate you and I look forward to the establishment of even greater records. Please extend my congratulations and best wishes to all your employes . . ."

The productivity rating of VA offices is based on the amount of work turned out in every phase of operation, from top management to messenger service.

The Waco Regional Office, which covers one of the largest land areas (two-thirds of Texas) and administers one of the heaviest loads of benefits (over 700,000 veterans) of any VA office, is ranked No. 1 in competition with all VA offices in the United States.

William J. Driver, administrator of veterans affairs in Washington, announced the top rating earned by the Waco VA Regional Office. "The result of efficiency of operations is better service to the veterans of this nation, who so ably served their country in time of need," Driver said.

Waco Manager Jack Coker said that "I am extremely proud of our employes and their achievements and the top productivity rating.

A4273

"This record resulted from the dedication of every employe in the organization to do a better job. They have a great capacity for excellence and recognition."

Since 1963 the Waco VA office has consolidated regional offices formerly located at Dallas and Lubbock, both of which were larger than the original Waco VA office.

The Waco VA office only this year moved into new quarters on Valley Mills Drive, a building which was dedicated formally by Administrator Driver.

The man-hours of work required by consolidation and moving were not subtracted in the efficiency calculations, Driver said, but were included in computing the rating, which makes the achievement even more outstanding.

The Waco VA Regional Office administers to 164 Texas counties, extending from border to border. VA offices in Dallas, Lubbock, El Paso and Midland are supervised by the Waco staff. Contact offices at Veterans Hospitals in Waco, Dallas, Amarillo, Big Spring, Marlin, Temple and Bonham also are under Waco regional office supervision.

More than 500 employes staff the regional office, according to Ray Todd, assistant manager. He said the new GI Bill, adding Viet Nam and those who served after Korea, has increased the workload which is being handled by the existing Waco work force.

David Goodwin, management analysis officer, said many new management techniques instituted by the Waco VA office have helped to increase productivity.

John R. McCarroll, chief, administrative division, said that there are more than 675,000 veterans' files utilized in the work of the Waco office.

Coker said copies of Congressman TEAGUE'S telegram will be forwarded to all VA offices in the region.

Glyndon Hague, former manager of the Waco office and now special assistant to the chief benefits director, praised Manager Coker and the employes of the Waco office.

There is no doubt about it," Hague said, "Jack Coker is one of the outstanding executives in the federal government and the employes of Waco VA have virtually performed miracles during the past four years. If every government office did its job as well as Waco VARO the administrative problems in government would all but disappear. These people are tremendous."

Firearms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1966

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there appeared in the Saturday, August 6, 1966, issue of the Charleston News and Courier an editorial entitled "Firearms Control." In view of the increased public interest in this area, I wanted to call attention to this editorial, as it strikes at the heart of this issue in a brief and concise way. This is a subject which concerns all of us, and I cannot help but feel that these comments by News and Courier editor, Thomas R. Waring, are worthy of consideration by all Members of the Congress, as well as the American public. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

FIREARMS CONTROL

Gov. John Connally has very sensibly, in our view, declined to add his voice to those demanding a control law on firearms.

No sooner had the massacre occurred at the University of Texas campus than advocates began to plead their cause. But Gov. Connally, who was seriously wounded by Lee Harvey Oswald when President Kennedy was assassinated, said that none of the laws Congress is considering would have kept Charles J. Whitman from getting the weapons he used in his rampage.

Had a firearms registration law been in effect in Texas, Charles J. Whitman would have qualified for the purchase and possession of weapons. He was a good shot, having been trained in the Marine Corps. He was instructing Boy Scouts in the use of a rifle. He was a university student with a good record.

If supporters of a firearms control law could demonstrate that legislation would keep weapons out of the hands of psychopaths, they would be heeded. The slaughter in Austin does not buttress their case. Like prohibitionists who insist that sin is in the bottle, these advocates blame the gun instead of the finger on the trigger.

Constructive Peace Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion for exploring the possibilities of peace in Vietnam was made some 6 weeks ago by Mr. Charles H. Percy of Illinois.

On July 2, 1966, Mr. Percy stated in part:

America's escalation of the war in Vietnam in recent days makes it imperative that we now quicken and intensify our efforts to seek a just peace . . . If we must accelerate the war—as the Administration believes we must—then let us also accelerate the pursuit of peace.

As we all know, the enemy has indicated that he is not prepared to negotiate directly with the United States. Therefore, I urge a new approach to end this tragic war.

I earnestly suggest that a conference of all Asian nations be called to work toward a settlement of the Vietnam war. I further suggest that such a conference could be called by U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations. Himself an Asian, U Thant enjoys the confidence of both East and West, and would exert an influence clearly free of national self-interest.

No one could guarantee the success of such a conference, but it is an approach worth trying.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of Mr. Percy's suggestion has since gained the support of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, Foreign Minister Thanat of Thailand, Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON of Kentucky, and various other leading Americans and foreign diplomats.

I offer for the RECORD comment on the Percy peace proposal by Columnist Charles Bartlett as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 11, 1966]

SEPARATING STATECRAFT, POLITICS

(By Charles Bartlett)

The outsider's predicament in separating statecraft from politics and gimmickry from diplomacy in the public dialogue on Viet Nam will become acute before the 1966 congressional campaign grows much older.

The problem is illustrated by events that have flowed from a July 2 statement by Charles Percy, the Republican candidate for the Senate in Illinois. Percy gave voice that day to an idea developed by him and his staff. He proposed a conference of Asian nations to work towards a solution in Viet Nam.

"No one could guarantee the success of such a conference," Percy declared, "but it is an approach worth trying. Perhaps an Asian conference would be only a beginning. But let us begin."

The Percy proposal did not create any immediate stir. His opponent, Sen. PAUL DOUGLAS, brushed it off as "half-baked." But on July 8 Dwight Eisenhower, contacted by intermediaries, wrote Percy a short letter in which he praised his idea as "worthy of serious consideration."

At the last minute on July 12, President Johnson expanded a scheduled speech to the American Alumni Council in West Virginia into a national telecast. He talked at length of building political and economic strength among the Asian nations and declared that these nations "must pull together in the same broad sweep of history."

On July 20, Sen. THRUSTON MORTON, persistently concerned with the fortunes of Republican candidates, put Percy's proposal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the comment that an Asian initiative towards peace might bring Hanoi to the negotiation table.

On Aug. 3, Thanat Khoman, the foreign minister of Thailand, called on the Asians "to take our destiny into our own hands" and to convene a conference, in Asia not in Geneva, to thrash out a settlement of the war. This will be the first time in history, Thanat said, that the Asians have taken "full charge and responsibility for their affairs."

On Aug. 6 Secretary of State Dean Rusk described Thanat's proposal as a "constructive suggestion" whose development the United States will follow with interest. On Aug. 8, the Democratic leader in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, said the idea was "admirable."

On the same day the Percy camp released Eisenhower's letter and the Republicans moved toward making the Percy proposal a party position.

It is impossible to assert flatly that the administration persuaded Thanat to take this initiative in order to blunt the political effectiveness of Percy's proposal. One point can be made, however. Nothing like this has ever come out of Bangkok before. The Thais are deeply committed to a thesis that the only way to win the war is to wage it.

The Percy-Thanat proposal was put forward at a time when there has been absolutely no hint from Hanoi of a readiness to negotiate. The uselessness of convening a conference at this stage has been implicit in the response to Thanat's invitation by most of the Asian nation's, especially North Viet Nam and Communist China, who rejected it flatly.

Percy's timing had obvious motivations. His statement coincided with the intensification of his political campaign and the acceleration of the bombing in North Viet Nam. Thanat's timing did not seem to concur with any particular developments in Asia. Off-

August 12, 1966

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "The Silence Is Deafening," written by Mr. Charles S. Collins and published in the Keowee Courier of Walhalla, S.C.

Editorial entitled "Firearms Control," published in the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, August 6, 1966.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia.

Article entitled "Dismal Swamp Plays Vietnam Role," written by Ruth Montgomery and published in the News American, of Baltimore, Md., on Friday, July 29, 1966.

By Mr. MURPHY:

Article entitled "Safety of Corvair Upheld by Court in Car Death Trial," written by Rudy Villasenor and published in the Los Angeles Times of July 30, 1966.

By Mr. MONDALE:

Article entitled "You Can Be a Conservationist," written by Dr. G. B. Farrar and published in the publication American Forests of April 1966.

THE TRAGEDY OF WAR

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the record of Communist terrorism against the innocent in Vietnam is appalling, and the casualty figures of helpless men, women, and children multiply daily. This is a part of the tragedy of war.

On August 9, however, it was American planes that attacked the Vietnamese village of Truong Thanh killing 26 civilians and wounding another 114. This is also a part of the tragedy of war.

In a news report yesterday, an American spokesman was quoted as calling the mistaken bombing incident an "unfortunate occurrence." This is the most understated reaction I can imagine.

The killing and maiming of noncombatants underscores the horror of the conflict we are in. Of course, our attack on Truong Thanh was not an intentional slaughter of civilians. But it happened.

It is simply the case that the Vietnam war is taking a high civilian, as well as a high military toll. There is terrible irony in our involvement. Americans are dying in growing numbers, ostensibly for the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. But while our intentions are noble and our men valiant, the conflict seems to be headed on a course destined to produce massive destruction and death among the very people we have sought to save.

We have irrefutably demonstrated our determination to resist Communist aggression and support the cause of freedom in South Vietnam. I do not see how there can be any doubt about our resolve to prevent a Communist military takeover there. However, to date our resolve has produced no significant lessening of Communist infiltration nor any apparent weakening of Communist determination.

Where, then, do we go from here? A predominantly military approach has

produced only more war. The more brutal and destructive the war becomes, the more concern increases as to just what will be left of Vietnam when the fighting stops. The larger the war becomes, one wonders what, if any, limits there are to escalation.

Last January a group of Senators led by Senator MANSFIELD and Senator AIKEN returned from Vietnam with a very disquieting assessment of the likely future of the conflict. They said then:

Despite the great increase in American military commitment, it is doubtful in view of the acceleration of Vietcong efforts that the constricted position now held in Vietnam by the Saigon government can continue to be held for the indefinite future, let alone extended, without a future augmentation of American forces on the ground. Indeed, if present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended.

The augmentation of American forces which they mentioned continues. And at this time, some 7 months after their report was issued, the situation still appears to be open ended. Military projections on the duration of the conflict are not encouraging. Some say as much as 10 years and a force of nearly three quarters of a million Americans will be needed to produce a military solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

THE SITUATION IN ASIA

Mr. JORDAN of Utah. Mr. President, as the war stretches out, the patience of men is stretched. The possibility grows that the last vestiges of reason may disappear and headlong slaughter take over. At this point, neither side will be able to control the course of destruction.

Most Americans—including myself—have supported our commitment in Vietnam, but this support is closely coupled with the desire for a just peace. Our leaders have expressed the dual commitment to vigorous military action and vigorous action in pursuit of peace as the American policy. It has been said again and again that while we will remain true to what we see as a commitment to guarantee the right to self-determination for the South Vietnamese, the door to discussion of peace is always open. However, I believe we have waged war more vigorously than we have waged peace. The term "escalation" does not apply equally to the conflict and to our efforts to bring about a settlement.

Last winter there was much talk during the bombing lull about how hard we were working for peace. Since then, have we mounted a peace offensive with anything like the intensity of our stepped-up war activity?

Recently there has been encouraging news of a movement for Asians to band

together in an effort to find an acceptable settlement. Certainly no one's interest in ending the war exceeds that of the Asians themselves. On August 3 Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman proposed an Asian-sponsored peace conference to be held in Asia. A similar proposal for a conference of Asian nations was made last month by Republican Senatorial Candidate Charles Percy, of Illinois. Surely such an approach merits our support. If our commitment in Vietnam is based upon the principle of self-determination in Asia, surely we cannot object to the efforts of Asians to make a determination for themselves.

Efforts toward a negotiated settlement have thus far failed. An all-Asian conference for peace may not show immediate results, but as President Eisenhower has said of Mr. Percy's proposal:

Even if such an effort should fail to uncover any new possibilities for furthering such an objective, the effort would still be a worthy one.

If, as the Mansfield report concludes, the military situation is open ended, then it becomes even more evident that we must be certain that the pursuit of a just peace is equally open ended. To me it makes no sense to talk about the specific timing of our efforts for peace. The time to work for peace is now and it is tomorrow and it is every day of every year as long as this war continues.

I believe we must keep the concept of an Asian solution open. Perhaps Asian initiative can find an answer. The thrust of American policy should be to encourage any such possibilities.

WASHINGTON WELCOMES AHEPA

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in its 44th year and representing 46,000 of the manhood, womanhood, and youth of Greek ancestry, the Order of AHEPA honors Washington as the scene of its supreme convention this coming week.

The event stimulates in all of us a recollection and recognition of what the world of today owes to the Greece of old. And in our own States each of us understands and appreciates what the energy, enterprise, and integrity of the sons and daughters of Greece and their descendants have contributed to the culture and prosperity of that part of our Nation each of us calls "home."

Through its family of 1,125 local chapters in all its branches, the Order of AHEPA is truly at home with us wherever we live.

We know AHEPA is a coined word—and means American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—and we know each letter and the word it stands for is a "coin" of culture—and a coin of courage—the coming of the venturesome immigrant from the land of literature to this land of their loyalty.

We know it to be the expression of the Greek contribution to our democracy—as, indeed, Greece gave us the term "democracy"—and it reminds us that it is only through the contribution of many races that America in our day has risen to the place of prominence that Greece possessed some 2,500 years ago.

August 12, 1966

Greece was the fountainhead of Western civilization. Drama, poetry, art, architecture, and philosophy flourished—and the great names of Greece still endure. Every American schoolboy knows and learns from Homer, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Euripides, Plato, and Socrates.

We might wonder what American names of fame will still be cherished 2,500 years from now.

Centuries of subjugation could not destroy Greek culture nor extinguish the Greek determination for freedom. That spirit has revitalized the history of Greece this past century and a half.

Nineteen years ago the ties between Greece and these United States were sealed in this Congress when the Truman doctrine came into being.

We declared it to be our enduring policy everywhere to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

In 1947 our power and our purse were opened to Greece to turn back the tide of communism that threatened to engulf that land—and we lifted a great country out of the depths of despair and set it anew on the course of its real destiny.

In some measures we repaid our centuries-old debt to Greece. So here in the Capital City of Washington there is a greeting especially warm for those who by their blood look back to that storied land—and today by their splendid citizenship help to maintain America as a land that cares—a land that dares to care for people who want to stay free. So I say again—welcome to the Order of AHEPA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to everything the Senator said.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, while the Senator from Rhode Island is still in the Chamber, I, too, would like to pay a word of tribute to the Order of AHEPA, the great organization of men and women of Greek extraction who will be meeting in Washington next week; and also to pay my tribute to the spirit of freedom in Greece today, which in the Greek-Turkish aid program of 1948, when I served in the other body, I had a small hand in helping.

I should like to tell my good friend from Rhode Island, however, that we have also modernized our interest in Greece. I have the honor to be the chairman of a committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference for Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation. I also have the honor to inform my colleague that this committee is adequately financed by a contribution from the Ford Foundation and from American business in the amount of \$300,000, and that it is working extremely effectively in cooperative projects, such as the one in Mauritius in northern Thrace which is underway. I have every hope that if the situation in Cyprus does not prevent us, we will be able to bring about a really historic institutionalization of economic cooperation between these two countries, in the great spirit of the Venizelos-Ataturk accord which, for over 30 years,

until the problem of Cyprus came along, maintained an extraordinary condition of peace and friendship between Greece and Turkey.

As the Senator from Rhode Island knows, New York State and New York City have a large community of Greek extraction. The order of AHEPA is an area in which they take the greatest pride. A very distinguished representative of the Greek community, Spyros Skouras, of New York, serves on the advisory board which has been put together to deal with this matter. I thought, in the spirit of the occasion, with the fine leadership of my beloved friend the Senator from Rhode Island, he might be interested in these facts.

Mr. PASTORE. I certainly am, and I want to thank the Senator from New York for bringing them out.

I reiterate that the Senator from New York is a great American, a great humanitarian, and I am proud to have his friendship.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the eloquent statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in paying tribute to an outstanding organization, the Order of AHEPA, on the occasion of its 44th supreme convention to be held in Washington, D.C., next week.

AHEPA, the American Hellenic Education and Progressive Association, is the leading organization in this country of Americans of Greek descent. In welcoming the members of this fine organization to Washington, I pay tribute to the millions of Greek-Americans who have contributed immeasurably to American culture, and to their ancestors who fought hard for the independence of their native land.

AHEPA is an organization devoted to 44 years of progress and accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, education projects, and charitable endeavors. The AHEPA fraternity is an object lesson in successful cooperation.

Mr. President, in Ohio there are thousands of citizens of Greek descent, many of whom are among the outstanding leaders in all fields of endeavor.

Recently, it was my privilege to recommend to President Johnson that he nomination as U.S. judge for the northern district of Ohio, Judge Thomas D. Lambros, of the court of common pleas of Ashtabula County, Ohio. He is the son of Demetrios P. Lambros and the late Panagoula K. Lambros, who both emigrated to the United States from Greece in the early 1900's. When he assumed the office of common pleas judge in January 1961, Thomas Lambros became the youngest common pleas judge in Ohio. In 1964, he was named one of the outstanding young men in America by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. He is an outstanding example of the great promise of our Nation.

Mr. President, our country's present greatness is the result of our ability to blend the aspirations of peoples from every land toward the advancement of common goals. This country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent, such as Judge Thomas Lambros, who

have contributed so greatly toward that end.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to extend a hearty welcome to the thousands of American Hellenes who will convene in the Nation's Capital during the week of August 14. Greek-Americans from all parts of the country plan to attend the 44th Supreme Convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

The Order of AHEPA and its auxiliaries, Daughters of Penelope, Sons of Pericles, and Maids of Athens, is an organization dedicated to foster and perpetuate the ideals and principles of Hellenic art, philosophy, and culture in America. AHEPA has over 700 chapters in 49 States and in Canada. I am proud to state that I have been a member of this outstanding organization for many years.

As a nation, we are indebted to ancient Greece, for it was from that civilization that our own forefathers drafted the concepts of liberty, freedom, and democracy. The style of our architecture, our theater, our literature, abounds in the tradition of Hellenism. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Pericles, Homer, Sophocles, Aristophanes, and a host of other ancient Greek names echo our linkage with the past. Even the concept of the atom was first perceived by the philosopher Democritus.

We have come to be a mighty force, but we still are indebted to the contemporary sons of Greece, who were the first to stop Mussolini and his Fascist hordes as they invaded the Balkan Peninsula. It has been stated, and properly so, that this was a feat comparable to the defense of Thermopylae by Leonidas and his 300 valiant Spartans. The Greeks for the first time had shattered the myth of Axis invincibility and, as a direct result, the Allies were given a much needed opportunity to regroup their forces.

Today modern Hellenes continue to uphold the classical tradition of excellence in the fields of science and art. Dr. Papanicolaou, one of the world's foremost authorities in the detection of cancer, and Georgios Seferis, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, are among many of the modern Greeks who have been true to their heritage. The list of those successful in all fields of endeavor is endless.

The essence of AHEPA and what its membership stands for is perhaps best exemplified in the AHEPA creed:

Promote loyalty to the United States of America;

Respect the inalienable rights of mankind;
Strive for the betterment of society;
Abhor all political corruption;
Defend and protect all oppressed people everywhere;

Cultivate the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;

Labor for the perfection of a moral sense, the spirit of altruism and true benevolence;
Champion the cause of education;

Love God and man, and hope for happiness.

Ahepans are to be commended for their use of these noble precepts and lofty ideals as guidelines for the practical implementation of their programs and activities. I am pleased indeed, therefore,