

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

10-3-1967

Copper Strike 1967 -Congressional Record Reprint Page 14039

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Copper Strike 1967 -Congressional Record Reprint Page 14039" (1967). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 676.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/676

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

My able friend from Indiana has said nobody is fighting in the North. Precisely. The fighting is in the South. As I asked in my comments, does any Senator deny that the North is the aggressor? I think the answer is "No." Nobody denies it.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my friend from California that that is exactly why I was driving at the point so hard. It is well known that the invasion plans for invading the North have been drawn up for a long time. Whether they will be implemented is another question; but everyone knows those invasion plans are ready.

I ask my friend from California, is that what he was advocating? Is he advocating, as the military clique of this country has been advocating, that North Vietnam be invaded? Is he advocating, that by these little hints and innuendos, such as we have heard before every step of this escalation as it has gone forward? First comes the hint. Now we have the statement of the former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, speaking in Pittsburgh, seemingly sending up another trial balloon. Is that what the Senator from California is telling the Senate, that now we must be prepared to take on the aggressor in the north, in his own territory?

While 15 million people, with the help of the most powerful nation on earth, cannot defend themselves on their own territory is the Senator saying, by inference, that we should invade the north?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall not ask the reporter to read back all that I have said during the last 2 hours, but I do ask the Senator from Indiana to take a look at the Record tomorrow, and examine the words and phrases I have used, based upon which he can answer that question for himself. Meanwhile, I shall merely state that the answer is "No."

Mr. HARTKE. As I read the statement of the Senator from California, he says that as far as they are concerned, if they cannot achieve victory, "America must not sully her commitment to the security of free Asia by groping for a nameless settlement." The Senator says we must hold for a military victory until we have attained it.

I have repeatedly asked the Senator why those 16 million people of North Vietnam are able to keep the 15 million people of the South on the defensive, when they have 500,000 Americans over there fighting and dying. Why are they not able to protect themselves? I leave that question with the Senator.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious question. I think this is why so many Senators are concerned today. We seem to be hearing hints that there is about to be another turn of the escalation screw, such as we have heard before every one of these turns. Again we hear it said, "We are into it now, and we cannot withdraw."

All I can say is, I hope we never take that next turn of the screw, that we do not move again up that escalation ladder, from which there seems to be no return. The bombing of the north, the Tonkin Gulf resolution—each one of those things was a gradual step which

followed little hints, little side statements, little inferences, with denial after denial that the situation in which we find ourselves would be the result.

I say to the Senator from California, before we invade North Vietnam, before that course is taken, the administration ought to think twice, three times, four times, or as many times as necessary, before it takes us down the road to utter ruin.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I most sincerely suggest that my able friend block out a couple of weeks and visit Southeast Asia, and take a look for himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are approaching the 80-day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire, or at least no effort, on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various Members of the Senate from copper-producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time, and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not now being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the Nation to find employment, and many of them will not return to Montana. The States affected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head.

I am hopeful that he and his advisers can come up with the means to cope with this long-drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 90 days, and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States affected by the strike as well as the Nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward Government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principle of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter, and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana as it has already been given in Utah, of the Anaconda Co. and leaders of the respective unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, very few legislative items which reach the floor of the Senate raise such high emotion and feeling, year after year, as does the poverty bill.

And with good reason. The programs in the poverty bill are different in concept and in execution from ordinary Federal programs—and they are different because they are aimed at no ordinary problem. They are aimed at the problem of loosing the bonds of poverty.

For some people, these differences mark a bold and needed departure from traditional notions of Federal assistance programs. For other people, however, the differences pose a threat—the threat of the unfamiliar.

I find it strange that those who criticize the Government for not doing anything, or of not doing enough, for the poor, are very often the same ones who