

umph. It is a fine way of symbolizing those lives that still live because so many in the community cared. It is a fitting tribute to the city's anniversary year. By setting the highest national standards for safe living, Bethlehemites have reaffirmed an important part of their heritage. They showed again they care not just about themselves, but about one another.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, Oct. 27, 1967]

BETHLEHEM: A SAFE CITY

The award Bethlehem received from the National Safety Council is more than a coveted badge of honor. It is very definite recognition that this proud and progressive Lehigh Valley city is one of the safest communities in America in which to live and work.

To win this distinction took years of doing. Good government, including adequate enforcement of reasonable regulations and meaningful city ordinances, helped. So did industrial safety programs, like those long promoted by Bethlehem Steel, and the continuing efforts of many community organizations.

But the record that won this top national award is the combination of what the people of Bethlehem have been doing on their streets, in their homes, at their work benches and while they play. To them safety no longer is simply a collection of tired slogans, warmed over speeches and columns of statistics. It has become the practiced way of staying alive in an age of increasing speed and mechanization.

PROPOSED PANAMA TREATIES AND GARBAGE COLLECTION

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, I have emphasized the vital importance of sanitation in the Canal Zone and the terminal cities of Colon and Panama in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal and its subsequent operation. From 1904 to 1955 the Canal Zone Government was responsible for sanitation not only in the zone but also in the two terminal cities; and this service was efficiently performed.

In the 1955 treaty the United States gave up its responsibility for sanitation in those cities to the Republic of Panama. The result has been a dismal failure by Panama in collecting garbage from the streets of the terminal cities; and residents in the isthmus have complained repeatedly concerning not only the accumulations of refuse in the streets but also the increase of rat population that feeds upon it. Yet our Government, in the recently published canal treaties, proposes to surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, which is unthinkable from the viewpoint of sanitation as well as that of hemispheric defense.

The latest news from the isthmus with respect to the collection of garbage is that the municipal government of Panama City is considering having this important task performed by foreign firms, one Japanese and the other Dutch. Should sovereignty over the Canal Zone be surrendered to Panama, who will perform the function of sanitation?

A newsstory on this subject from a leading Panamanian newspaper follows:

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Oct. 9, 1967]

FOREIGN FIRM MAY COLLECT GARBAGE HERE

Two foreign concerns are reported interested in bidding for the garbage collection service in Panama City under contract with the municipal government. One of these is a Japanese firm and the other a Dutch corporation.

The garbage collection problem has been before the municipal authorities for some time with complaints coming from all sides because of the deficient service being rendered. Several plans have been proposed recently, including the establishment of a special municipal tax to cover the cost of the garbage collection service. However, none of these plans have been considered an effective solution of the problem.

Now that foreign firms are reported interested, the Municipal Council at its last meeting approved a resolution appointing a special committee to make a thorough study of the question with a view to negotiating a possible contract with the foreign firm offering the most favorable conditions.

Serving on this committee will be the chairman of the Municipal Council, the chairman of the Municipal Health Board, the chairman of the Municipal Treasury Committee, the Municipal Auditor and five other councilmen to be appointed by the Council chairman.

According to reports, the foreign firms interested in garbage collection service here are planning to use refuse collected for the production of fertilizers and other industrial purposes.

NE *file* ELOQUENT SPOKESMAN FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the National Press Club on the 24th a great moving address was delivered by the Honorable Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel. Foreign Minister Eban, I believe, is the most eloquent spokesman on the world's stage today; his addresses are reminiscent of Winston Churchill. He not only speaks with moving eloquence but with persuasive logic and convincing sincerity. Today as he articulates the hopes and fears of Israel, whose almost miraculous return to a glorious place in the sisterhood of states, he rises to heights of speech which commands unmeasurable respect and acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, I include Foreign Minister Eban's address at this place in the Record following my remarks for the information and the edification of my colleagues and my countrymen:

ADDRESS OF ABBA EBAN, FOREIGN MINISTER OF ISRAEL, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 24, 1967

Mr. LEROY. Ladies and gentlemen, greetings and welcome to another luncheon of the National Press Club, to hear an outstanding speaker, and before I present this gentleman, I'd like to present the head table. Thank you.

On my left, a gentleman who spoke here earlier in the year, the distinguished Ambassador of Israel, His Excellency, Avraham Harman. On my right, the Minister of the Embassy of Israel, the Honorable Ephraim Evron. On my left, the President of the Middle East Institute, Ambassador Raymond A. Hare. Ambassador Hare. On my right, of the District Court of General Sessions, Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr. On my left, from the United States District Court, Judge Alexander Holtzoff. And, on my right, a member of this club, and the author of many books, including the "The Caine Mutiny", "Marjorie

Morningstar" and others, Mr. Herman Wouk. On my left, another member of the club, good friend of the club, the Counselor for Press and Information of the Israeli Embassy, Mr. Dan Pattir.

In the audience, two members of the House, the gentleman technically called Congressman, but often called Senator, which he was for a long time, Mr. Claude Pepper. At the same table, Congressman Michael Feighan. Also, I believe at the same table, although I'm not certain, the President of the Rabbinical Council of Washington, Rabbi Harry Silverstone.

Also, in the audience, the Deputy Assistant Secretary—Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Huntley, that gentleman to your right. Also, from the—also from the State Department, Mr. Rutgers Davies, I believe is in the audience.

Ladies and gentlemen, as you—most of you know, if you've been near a radio or TV set or wire service this morning, ground fighting has broken out on an apparently appreciable scale, at various points along the Suez Canal. A UPI bulletin, of not very long ago, said fighting has broken out between Israeli and Egyptian forces across the Suez Canal. An official army spokesman said today—he said it was continuing. There have been various bulletins during the morning.

Our speaker today has spent, I don't know how long—I think an hour or more, with Under Secretary of State, Nick Katzenbach. He came here direct from that conference. At 5:30 today, according to the AP, he has an appointment with President Johnson.

The first appearance by this gentleman at the club, according to club records, was November 21st, 1950. The State of Israel was new, only two years old.

He made, on November 21, 1950, 17 years ago next month, he made his maiden speech to this club and to the world, in his new role as U.S. Ambassador to Washington. He made it at this club at the specific request of Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. It was a great debate, apparently, in the club, at that time, between the club's officers of that year, because they wanted to be prepared for any eventuality. And the great question was: Would this gentleman speak, in Hebrew or Yiddish? They wanted to be prepared to translate in either. And, of course, the answer was, that he spoke then as he will speak today, in very excellent articulate English.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, the Honorable Abba Eban.

Hon. ABBA EBAN. Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Leroy has presented me to you in objective terms, with which I am in substantial agreement. I am grateful for this because it is no small matter, for a working politician to emerge unscathed from an encounter with the press. After all, the relationship between pressmen and politicians is at best, a relationship of unilateral belligerency. Our chances of survival are not equal, and there is much more beneath the surface than meets the eye. For example, you are my friends and my hosts, on the other hand, each one of you harbors, in the secret recesses of his heart, the hope that I will commit some sensational and ruinous indiscretion. Let us, therefore, know clearly where we stand, and sustain our friendship in the spirit of realism.

Certainly, your presence here in such large numbers this afternoon bears witness to the deep interest which Israel's struggle for survival and peace, has evoked in the public sentiment of this country and the world. It has been my vocation in recent months, to interpret, to international tribunals and to world opinion, the recent dramatic stages of this struggle. Let us remember with what suddenness and with what drastic speed, the crisis developed. If you had taken a photographic record of our thinking in the early part of May, this year, you would have found us still dedicated to the hope and belief,

that the relative stability that had prevailed for 10 years, could continue to exist.

It is true that there was always a fragile impression in Israeli-Arab relations. It is true that none of the normal safeguards of international coexistence had yet been secured by these states of our region. It is true that we had established our life for 10 eventful and dynamic years upon slender political foundation. Yet, the decades that elapsed between 1957, when the Sinai Campaign came to an end, and May 1967, was a decade in which Israel's preoccupation was not concentrated on survival and defense alone, they were years of swift progress in the development of the country's economy, society and culture. They were years during which Israel became deeper and deeper in the affection and trust of the international community.

It was a decade in which beyond our existing relations of friendship with the republics of the American continent and most of the states of Europe, we developed Israel's most modern and significant vocation, that of illustrating for the emerging and developing nations of the world, the processes of accelerated development.

Many small nations throughout the world drew courage from the example, by which a small state proved its capacity to reach a respected level in intellectual, scientific progress and in social innovation. And, thus, we kept a close eye on Arab aggression without being obsessed by it. Resisting it only, when failure to resist would have brought about its intensified renewal. Hoping, that the sheer prolongation of the relative stability of that decade would open the way to more affirmative relationships.

There was every evidence that the avoidance of confrontation with Israel in an out and out attempt to destroy its sovereignty prevailed at certain times in the minds of neighboring statesmen, President Nasser, especially, had shown a capacity to combine rhetorical violence with practical prudence. We heard, of course, from across the frontier, the speeches, by which he announced that at the first opportunity, he would bring about our complete extinction. But, speeches do not always break bones, after all, only once in all human history has a wall crumbled at the sound of a trumpet, and that incident was not to Israel's disadvantage.

The situation became substantially and gravely different when rhetoric was translated into action, when it became plain that the vision of Israel's elimination was not merely a mystic hope, but had suddenly become an element of practical political intention. Thus, in mid-May, the clouds began to gather, thick and fast, and within a period of less than three weeks, our country had passed from the impression of relative security to the deadliest of all the dangers that it has ever confronted, the danger of its physical extinction, and the total and irrevocable elimination of its independence.

Nobody who lived in Israel throughout those dark and turbulent days will ever forget the air of apocalyptic doom. Here were 90,000 Egyptian troops in Sinai, the greatest army ever gathered in that peninsula since the beginning of history. Nine hundred tanks, of which the advanced units were less than two hours from Tel Aviv. Airfields whose commanders had been, as was subsequently revealed to us in documents, instructed precisely in the targets which they were to attack; Israel's pathetically few airfields, and the dense concentrations of population in the coastal plain. Two hundred tanks were poised in the South against the port of Elath. The design was clearly to cut off the Southern Negev from the main body of the state. Forty five thousand Syrian troops, glowered from the hills down upon the Israeli farming villages in Atta, Galilee and the Jordan valley.

The Jordan Government, which on the 30th of May, had concluded a treaty of encirclement with Cairo, had deployed its

forces with a capacity to strike swiftly, both against Jerusalem's population and across the entire torturous and vulnerable coastal front. An illicit blockade had been imposed in Southern waters, cutting Israel off from all maritime contact with two thirds of the world, a lifeline that Israel had constructed for friendship and peace and commerce across the Red Sea to the nations of East Africa and Asia, had been cut and with it, ninety percent of our vital fuels had been prevented from reaching us.

From Algeria to Kuwait. From Saudi Arabia to Morocco. Across the entire Arabic speaking world, contingents were converging upon us, in order to take part either militarily, or at least, symbolically, in this great event, which as President Nasser confessed at the end of May, had beyond all expectation, and in advance of all prediction, come suddenly into the realm of fulfillment.

Now, this was the peril that we faced, and we faced it alone. At least it was obvious that we had nothing between ourselves and the prospect of annihilation, except the sacrifice and the discipline and the defensive resolve of our people.

International commitments were, because of the world power balance, given their most restrictive interpretation. The specific promises of the maritime powers were clearly not going to lead to any effective action, in time to prevent Israel from being encircled and overwhelmed. Some of the maritime powers, as you will remember, disappeared across the horizon in varying degrees of prudence, and rapidly, most of them refusing even to join with a United States proposal, reaffirming the international character of the waterway. Few are still willing to join with you in effective action to bring that commitment to fulfillment.

The United Nations was revealed, unfortunately, at the very lowest depths of incapacity in the Middle East itself; it fled from the arena like a fire brigade running away at the first smell of smoke. At United Nations Headquarters, there took place a debate of such inconclusiveness as to constitute a mockery of our impending disaster. For nothing during those days of discussion was done, and very little was said, which could hope to sustain or even console Israel in the forthcoming ordeal.

Thus, international commitment, maritime promises, United Nations' responsibility, all in the testing hour, proved to be either, fragile, illusory, or far less effective, than could ever have been imagined. The same was true of, what was called, the hope of Arab moderation. By this, we meant the hope that certain regimes, and especially that of Jordan, would refrain from associating itself with President Nasser's sudden reckless design. This hope was frustrated, when on May the 30th, the Jordan monarch concluded a treaty of encirclement with Nasser. And when, on June the 5th, he ignored and rejected one message after another, which offered him the chance of remaining aloof from the conflict then being waged on the Egyptian-Israeli front.

I bring these memories back to your consciousness, not in the spirit of academic research, but because they are the very foundation of Israel's thinking and of Israel's policy today. The public mind in our country is dominated, not only by the memory of military victory, but far more, by memory of the peril and the solitude which preceded it.

Out of this there emerges our steadfast resolve to insure that never, never shall Israel again find itself in such a position of danger and vulnerability. This is the consideration, which in our policy, takes precedence over all others.

I should not, of course, discuss the military solitude, in which we found ourselves, without reference to some elements of solidarity and consolation. Rarely, in all history has world opinion been so agitated and tormented as it was in those weeks by the

serious prospect that a state would be destroyed. From New York to Tokyo; from Montevideo to Amsterdam, in the cities of Scandinavia, and in remote parts of Africa, thousands of people stood in silence outside Israel's embassies and legations, expressing a deep, if sometimes impotent identification with us, in the ordeal that had been threatened, for what was at stake was not only the destruction of a state, but of the state, whose name evokes the deepest spiritual memories of mankind, and a state which itself is nothing but the last refuge and sanctuary and consolation of a people which had already lost six million of its sons in the greatest orgy of hatred and violence, which had ever convulsed the spirit of man.

Well, from these dangers Israel emerged in six unforgettable days, from the prospect of disaster to successful and gloriest resistance. We now face the results and the consequences of these transitions, accompanied, as we must always be, by the memory of the peril that went before.

The cease fire agreements were concerted at—by the end of June. For sometime, it has been possible to maintain those agreements intact on some of these fronts. The events of the last 48 or 72 hours, prove how much attention and thought and preoccupation must be given, even to the maintenance of this provisional stability, quite apart from the broader necessity to move toward a more stable and durable peace.

The sinking of the destroyer Elath on the high seas, has carried our indignation to the highest peak, since the cease fire was ratified in early June, for this aggression committed against Israel on the high seas illustrates the urgent need for a radical change in the structure of relations between the Middle Eastern states. Could I suppose have been anticipated, that this success with its heavy toll of life, would continue to inflame the passions of our southern neighbors and impel them to try their luck again, with further firing across the canal. Thus, the first message that I received this morning was one which announced that they were firing across the canal, and that the Egyptian press is full of macabre jubilation about the range and the heavy intensity of the losses in life that Israel has sustained.

It's still my hope that the cease fire situation can be rapidly restored and that the events of the last 48 or 72 hours can be localized and prevented from spreading. But, this very situation shows how urgent it is, not only to deal with the cease fire eruptions, but also to effect a radical change in the structure of relations between the Middle Eastern states. There have been many books and articles written about the events of last June. I sometimes feel that too many books have been written about too little too soon, but certainly, the idea of a six day war requires modification. There has not been a six day war; there is a 19 year old war, that has been in existence and the question is whether it will continue to exist or whether it will be brought to an end by treaties of peace.

Our policy is that the cease fire situation can only be changed by specific public and contractual commitments signed by the parties face to face in conformity with established international tradition. The old Middle Eastern structure, which President Nasser decided to disrupt last May cannot be restored. It has been shattered too violently and too thoroughly. It cannot be rebuilt, it must be replaced, this time by a stable and durable order, to finding the new political, juridical, territorial and security relations between Israel and her neighbors. This, then is our policy. We shall maintain and respect the cease fire situation until it is replaced by a new situation, based on peace treaties, committing and engaging the states of the Middle East to peaceful coexistence, and to finding the precise term in which that coexistence shall go forward.

There is no other policy. No other enlightened line of contact has been suggested.

October 31, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

The only other alternative is that proposed by Prime Minister Kosygin at the recent Emergency Session of the United Nations, and supported by the Arab states. Their formula is that the best way to get peace is to reproduce the precise conditions which lead to the war. They seek a return to the situation which prevailed on June the fourth. This we cannot accept. We shall never, never go back to the political and juridical anarchy, or to the strategic and territorial vulnerability from which we have emerged. What must now be done is to build a new structure of relations by the hands of the sovereign countries of the Middle East itself.

We must take seriously the statement signed by Israel and her four neighbors in 1949, that the armistice lines, and I quote, "Dictated by exclusively military considerations are not to be regarded as political or territorial boundaries". We now insist on the agreed determination of the political and territorial boundaries which we have never known. After 20 years, it is time that each state of the Middle East had agreed, secure, permanent frontiers. Until the new peace map is negotiated, the present cease fire map will be fully maintained, for the June the fourth situation with its explicit conditions of irredentism, non recognition, impermanence, one sided belligerency, is gone forever; the times call for constructive innovation, not for patchwork settlements, corroded by belligerency and shattered by Nasser's deliberate violence.

It would be totally irrational to renew any of the conditions which brought Israel to the brink of disaster and which plunged the Middle East in war. Our country lost more dead in six days, proportionately to its population, than has the United States in all its military engagements since 1945. Since we will not dishonor that sacrifice, we cannot accept a settlement which falls short of a stable, contractual and durable peace. The Arab states are asking the world community to pretend that they have neither provoked or conducted nor lost the war, and that the revolutionary lessons of last June can have no consequences.

Now, this irrational idea of restoring the situation, the explosive situation of last June has been rejected by world opinion. It was this idea, which when presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations was emphatically and repeatedly dismissed. World opinion wants to see a new system and a new structure of relations in the Middle East. It does not wish to build a bonfire again, waiting for the next match to ignite it.

In peace negotiations with each Arab state, we shall make viable and reasonable proposals, conducive to the welfare and the honor of each one of the neighboring states, for our mood is not dominated by victory. It is penetrated by the desire to live together in that Middle East, reviving the best traditions of cooperation between the Arab and Israeli nations, which have contributed so much to the Mediterranean adventure and have made such a deep impact upon the thought and the spirit of mankind. This then, is our policy; To maintain and consolidate the cease fire reality, to be vigilantly and actively ready at any time to replace the cease fire situation by a new situation, which we call peace.

The new situation must differ from the previous one in two respects: In the political and juridical respect, and in the security territorial respect. By the political and juridical aspect, I mean that we must have not truces and cease fire agreements or armistices, but peace founded on contractual engagements. I do not, of course, mean yet peace in the emotional sense. It may be some time before past bitterness can be allayed, although I do hope that if peace in the juridical and political sense that we envisage can be established, it will lead to affirmative cooperation.

Beyond the mere establishment of peaceful relations, I envisage the possibility of intensive economic and social integration between the sovereign states of our region, similar to the most enlightened examples of super-national cooperation that have taken place in the world, and especially within the European community.

Anybody who looks at the map can see an objective vision of Israel and some of her closer neighbors, cooperating, each within the framework of its complete sovereignty in the concerted development of our common region.

I'm sure that this vision, which might now sound utopian is destined to be fulfilled. There is a rational element in the policy of our neighbors to which we appeal. What is to be gained by the maintenance of provisional cease-fire, or truce situations? What has been gained by 20 years of belligerency? Everything has been tried. War has been tried three times, with tragic and sterile results. Intermediate situations between war and peace have been tried—cease-fires, armistices, truces. These have sooner or later erupted into explosion.

One thing alone has not yet been tried. Peace has not yet been tried. We, therefore, submit to our neighbors and to the world the idea of an experiment in peace.

It is—finally I feel that it is not possible to make an absolute distinction between political principles and diplomatic procedures. We cannot condone the idea that the Arab states are entitled ostracize Israel, while making claims against her; to request Israel's consideration for their proposals while denying Israel's very existence.

That is why direct negotiation is not just a matter of mere procedural form. It is a matter of political and moral principle. It is the refusal to come face to face with Israel's deep roots in the Middle East. This is the origin of this conflict. The pretense that we do not exist, or that if the imagination is sufficiently exerted and stretched, we might somehow disappear—the intellectual unwillingness to understand, whether reluctantly or not, that Israel is deeply rooted in the Middle Eastern reality in its past history, in its present reality, and in its future destiny. The deep and authentic roots of this people in the soil of that land—this is a fact which our neighbors have so far refused to seize.

They have presented us as a provisional and transient phenomenon of history. Nothing could be further than the truth. Of the 122 nations in the international family today, there is one and one alone which speaks the same tongue, lives in the same land, upholds the same faith as it did 3,000 years ago. The refusal to understand the mysterious continuity of this connection, and of its renewal in modern times lies at the root of the Middle Eastern tragedy.

Therefore, to confront each other is essential. After all, they meet us face to face on the field of battle. Let them meet us face to face at the conference table.

If any—if any international representative, or friendly government believes that it can bring the Arab Governments and Israel into direct and unconditional contact, we shall, of course, applaud its efforts. But no peace has ever yet been made between those who refuse to set eyes on each other, because that's—that is why we interpret the refusal to meet as a refusal to make peace. And that is why the existing reality must be maintained until all Middle Eastern states recognize the compulsions of a future to be shared in peace.

I do not believe that the horizon is empty of hope. I believe that a candid analysis of these 19 years of experience will, in due time, bring about a convergence of Arab and Israeli minds towards the necessity of peace, and even regional cooperation.

It might take some time—I hope not too

long a time—for these realistic patterns of thought to come to expression. It is here that world opinion has a decisive role to play. It should be brought to bear upon all the states of our region, not in an attempt to dictate the specific conditions of their coexistence, but to urge upon them the imperious historic necessity of changing the old for the new, replacing belligerency by peace, replacing a state of war by neighborly coexistence, replacing the emphasis on armaments with an emphasis on development, replacing the intensive importation of arms with the intensive importation of tractors, and of the instruments and machinery for industrial and agricultural development—above all replacing the mood of rancour, hostility, and non-recognition by an attempt to probe the common elements, and the common values in the Hebrew and Arab traditions, in order that we may construct on the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean a civilization worthy of its ancient and medieval past.

Thank you.

Mr. LEROY. Thank you, sir. Ladies and gentlemen, a partial prepared text of the Ambassador's remarks will be available at this ballroom door as you go out. Much of what he said was ad lib and it will not—obviously, that text will not be a complete record of what he said. It will be somewhat of an outline. I would ask—I would make one request, however: Because of the extremely large number of people we have, I think close to 500, perhaps a little over in this ballroom, would you please refrain from taking one of those until, quote, "working press", unquote, has had the opportunity to get one, because some of those gentlemen do need them today.

I failed to introduce, inadvertently, one gentlemen who was very helpful on all the arrangements that had to be made today. He's on my right. He's immediate past President of the American Friends of Hebrew University and a long, long, time member of this club, Mr. Dave Berger.

Mr. Ambassador, I have several questions that, at the start, that are in the nature of a sort of status quo question or situations. Would you tell us first, what is the legal base—legal basis for the existence of the Israeli Nation? What importance did the Balfour Agreement have in the formation of Israel?

Mr. EBAN. Well, I interpret that question as an invitation to come here and give an hour's lecture at some future date.

The Balfour Declaration is now 50 years old, and it was the first document which inaugurated recognition of the right of our people to establish a homeland. But, the legal basis for Israel's existence today, is the legal basis for the existence of all the 120—122 nations in the international family, namely that we do exist, that our existence is ratified by our membership of the organized international community; that we are members of the United Nations and of all its specialized agencies; that the vast majority of the sovereign states of the world recognize our statehood and have established diplomatic, economic and cultural links with us. Therefore, the existence of Israel is not a matter of controversy.

I should say that we are right to exist. Our right to exist is independent of their recognition of it. A declaration by them that they recognize our right to exist would, evoke a courteous declaration from us, that we recognize their right to exist.

The recognition of a right to exist is not a negotiable concession. What we ask for, then, is not recognition of right to exist, but the consequences that flow from our statehood, namely action to translate belligerency into non-belligerency; peace into war, and boycott into cooperation.

We believe that the establishment of the new situation to replace the cease fire situation requires not only recognition, but action.

Mr. LEROY. Mr. Minister, would you kindly reiterate for us the population comparisons between the belligerent Arab nations and Israel? In round numbers.

Mr. EBAN. Well, the nations with whom we have a contiguous frontier, have a population of some 80 million, or those which actively participated in the hostilities, 80 million against two and a half million.

The community of Arab nations as expressed in their summit meeting, is much larger, it reaches some 100 million. This, of course, is both an important element in the judgment of the situation, and one of the elements in the understanding of our future. It is rather strange to portray this two and a half million people in this small piece of land, as having constituted a threat to a nation which has hundreds and thousands of square miles of territories, and 100 million people. A nation 500 times our size in territory and about 50 times our size in population. But these comparisons also indicate why I said that Israel cannot regard any temporary victory as stable until it has achieved its ultimate aim, namely the establishment of affirmative relations of mutual acceptance and cooperation between Israel and the Arab world.

Mr. LEROY. In view of Soviet assistance to Egypt, can you visualize the situation in which Port Said or Alexandria will become a second Haiphong, that is, a privileged sanctuary from bombing?

Mr. EBAN. Well, whenever I hear of analogies between international conflicts, I close myself with that valor, of which discretion is the better part. But, I don't believe that the parallelism exists, I will say only one word about Soviet policy. Certainly, the one-sided and unbalanced Soviet policy, both of rearmament and in the uncritical support of Arab policies, played a very vital and disturbing role in the situation that led to the conflict. We could have wished that we had diagnosed, in current Soviet policy, a substantive change; it is not easy to say that this has existed.

First of all, the first Soviet appearance in the Middle East after the conflict, was to give a new lease of life to the arms race. And, secondly, the Soviet Union has not supported any proposal in international tribunals or organizations which show any balanced consideration for the interest of Israel, on the one hand, and the Arab states on the other.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, do you not feel, that world economics dictate, the reopening of the Suez Canal, by force, if need be?

Mr. EBAN. I think we shouldn't underestimate the economic importance of the Suez Canal, but we should not, as the question does, exaggerate its importance.

There are alternatives to the Suez Canal. The Suez Canal is simply a technical device for linking the Red Seas to the Mediterranean. Now, the alternatives are, first of all, to use the other routes between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, name the route across the Gulf of Elath, which is open and which I hope will soon become more economically significant through our decision to build a larger pipeline which would enable oil to be exported from the Mediterranean.

Secondly, the construction of large tankers, which in any case, couldn't have navigated the Suez Canal, has made many countries in Europe less dependent upon the Suez oil route than they were, and the Suez Canal was predominantly an oil route. I think that if the Canal remains closed, it will have, perhaps, short term effect on the economies of certain countries, but they would actually be well advised in the light of what has happened in 1967 and in 1956, to make themselves less exclusively dependent upon this single ditch. I think the countries of Northern and Western Europe, to some of whose ministers I spoke, understand, that while they hope for the reopening of the canal,

they will never again, make themselves dependent on it, to the extent that they have been so far.

Mr. LEROY. Many people in this country assume that King Hussein is a force for moderation. Do you agree with that analysis?

Mr. EBAN. Well, here we have a memory, and we have a reality, and now we have a hope. The memory is of a period when we ourselves, had this definition, and therefore, I must confess that we were both surprised and disillusioned by the events of May the 30th, the treaty in Cairo, and June the 5th, the active and unprovoked participation in the war. Whatever the motives in his mind was for this tragic decision, it certainly shattered a belief, a tenet of policy, which we and many other governments had upheld.

So, the fact is, and let us face it, that the hope that this moderation would express itself has been shattered. There is now the reality. We still do not know what the Jordan Government's policy is on the problem of peace. Will they accept the idea of renegotiating their relationships with Israel, this time on the basis of permanent peace or not? That's a question, which of course, should be addressed there.

We hope that the lessons about the sterility of conflict in the war will have impressed themselves upon the Jordan Government, as with all other governments. They will seriously examine the opportunity to replace the rancors of the past by a new future, and to express their relations with Israel in the form of contractual and fire peace treaties. But, this is a hope, and whether this is their policy, is a matter that can only be elicited from them.

Mr. LEROY. Would Israel agree to talks with the UAR under the chairmanship of the United Nations' officials?

Mr. EBAN. We believe that the only way to make a transition to a new future is for direct talks between Israel and each of its neighbors. Now, if the situation is that the United Arab Republic is willing to have talks with us, but would prefer to have the presence of a third party, when that situation arises, I will address myself to this question. But, that is really not the issue, the issue is that so far, they have not accepted any device or technique or modality, which involves a direct confrontation with us.

We are willing to discuss with them, by any agreed procedure, the matters which divide us today, and the necessity to reach peace agreement. The essence of it is that our contacts should be direct. Other matters are technical.

Mr. LEROY. Mr. Minister, did you mean that you would cross that canal when you got there?

Will Israel ever peacefully relinquish control of Jerusalem? Is there any factual basis for British news stories that plans are under way for the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem?

Mr. EBAN. Apparently, I've fallen behind in my reading of the British press. I haven't seen such a proposal. There is no such proposal. The Temple in the Jewish theology is a great memory, but it's a plan for any future development.

Our attitude on Jerusalem has been outlined many times before the United Nations, and but, for the benefit of those few of you who don't have television sets, I will bring my views to your attention.

We—first of all, the change that took place on June the 5th, took place because of the decision of Jordan. Jordan had occupied the old city of Jerusalem as a result of a military conquest carried out in June, 1948, against the decisions of the international community, and Jordan's rights in Jerusalem had never been permanently or juridically recognized by any nation, not even by the Arab nations. Nevertheless, the status quo would have continued if he hadn't disrupted it.

As a result of the events in Jerusalem, which were very dramatic in their tragedy and in the volume of bereavement which ensued, the destruction of the institutions of learning and culture; a new situation has developed which differs from the previous situation in three respects: The city instead of being divided is united; instead of being crossed by a military frontier, it is at peace; and instead of being a scene of desecration and religious discrimination, as it was, not one single synagogue was left standing, and access to the oldest of the holy places was not granted; instead of this there is access to the holy places for all. And, a willingness by Israel to accept responsibility by the universal interests concerned for the administration of the holy places. I think the first time that any government in the position of control has offered to exchange the unilateral and exclusive assertion of its authority in the holy place, for agreements with the universal interests concerned.

Therefore, instead of division, there is unity. Instead of war, there is peace. Instead of sacrilege, there is sanctity. I don't see why these are not to be regarded as improvements in the Jerusalem situation. Now, we do not say that nothing remains to be negotiated about Jerusalem, and we still think that the administrative situation that I've described does not preempt the final settlement of the universal interests which is attached to Jerusalem.

And, the formula which your own government used in the Presidential statement of the 19th of June, indicates what our general policy is also, namely that the status of the holy places is a matter to be reached by agreement with those concerned.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, this question has reference to the six-day June war. We had reports of a recorded telephone conversation between Nasser and Hussein, regarding U.S. participation. Is there such a recording in existence, and if so, why is it not given more publicity and attention?

Mr. EBAN. There is such a recording in existence, I've listened to it myself. I've listened to it with some experience of listening to those two voices before, and I've no doubts about its authenticity. I'm astonished by the concepts of security which enabled it to take place. It is true that these two heads of state committed themselves very irrationally and recklessly to the idea that there had been United States and British military participation in the fighting.

My question is that this was greeted with skepticism everywhere, and I understand that they themselves have relinquished it. I believe that this was an effort to prove, perhaps to their public opinion, that Israel alone could not have been so successful in resistance. If you asked why isn't it given more attention, it is because I don't think that the thesis about American and British participation in the hostilities is really seriously accepted anywhere.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, tell us what you think of the public and private position of the U.S. State Department, vis-a-vis the Middle East, now and in the past.

Mr. EBAN. I think you now understand what I meant by opening remarks. I don't accept the assumption that there is a conflict between public and private positions, but if there are private positions, I don't feel competent to make them public. As for the public position, and this is an important fact, the public position of the United States Government is embodied in a document of—an unusual document—the President's speech of the 19th of June. And, it has been publicly stated, and privately, that this remains the guiding line of the policy of the United States in the Middle Eastern conflict. That document is formulated on a high level, both of lucidity, and of statesmanship, and its main elements are those which stress the need for innovation, just to recall, what are

October 31, 1967

in the Israeli views, is the most important points, not to go back to the June 4th situation, but to create a better situation.

The next stage should be not truce or armistice, but peace, and the fragile and violated armistice lines should not be superseded and replaced by accepted and permanent secure national frontiers. And, fourthly, the responsibility for building the new Middle Eastern peace, rests primarily on the states of the region, although they could be helped by outside forces.

Those are the three or four main elements in that address, and although no two governments would ever formulate their positions in identical terms, and we, of course, have views on other things there, we believe that these main principles should be the basis of any forward looking international treatment of the Middle Eastern Crisis.

Mr. LEROY. If peace comes to Israel, will Israel send a token task force to help us in Vietnam?

Mr. EBAN. Well, the Israeli position on Vietnam was outlined by me in the United Nations General Assembly on the second of October of this year, about this very hypothetical question of, if peace comes to Israel will Israel send a token task force to Vietnam. I hope by the time that peace has come to Israel, peace will have come to Vietnam as well.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, will you kindly tell us, in general of the foreign aid programs that Israel is now operating for the benefit of other countries?

Mr. EBAN. We don't call it a foreign aid program, but we call it an international co-operation program, not only for diplomatic reasons, but because it really is cooperation, that is to say, that we think that we gain in many ways as much as we give, and that there is therefore, a reciprocal element in this program, which is however, of unusual scope. And, Israel has assistance programs, technical cooperation programs with some 58 countries in Africa, in parts of the South-eastern Asian area, and increasingly, perhaps, surprisingly, with many of the American republics.

Some, 2,000—I'm sorry, some 12,000 young leaders of the future communities of these countries have had periods of training in Israel's institutions of learning and science, and in special courses. And some 2,500 Israeli experts, doctors, scientists, nurses, teachers, agricultural specialists, irrigation experts, have worked in more than 50 countries, sharing our accumulated experiences of the pioneering decades.

From here, I shall go to Organization of American States, with whom we have agreements, whereby Israel provides experts, usually financed by institutions of the American system, similarly with the economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and with the African organizations.

We think that in spite of the preoccupations and anxieties which crowd in upon us, we should develop this international vocation. Development is not merely a problem of small countries receiving aid from rich and powerful countries, a great deal can be done by the cooperation of small countries, each with the other; for so many of them have something in experience or in technological capacity which the others lack, and therefore, this unusual appearance of a small developing nation, in the drama of development, is something which does give a new dimension to Israel's policy. And, we are resolved, provided these other countries wish to accept this cooperation, to maintain and to expand it.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, if you'll answer this next question, we'll promise to keep it off the record, just between us. What do you plan to say to President Johnson this evening?

Mr. EBAN. Ladies and gentlemen, until you release from here I can't plan anything at all.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, would you comment on the plan of our former AEC Chairman, Mr. Lewis Strauss, which would set up a giant—gigantic atomic powered desalting plant in the Mediterranean, with the view of giving the Middle East plenty of water and thereby, prosperity, in the hopes it would bring peace?

Mr. EBAN. The concept of developing irrigation through nuclear distillation as expressed in this plan has been expressed in other plans, and Israel discussed this with the United States in 1964, and this matter was referred to in the joint statement published by President Johnson and Prime Minister Eshkol. It was decided that our governments would investigate together and carry out such agreed projects, as would illustrate the possibility of making water available through desalination, in order to increase the irrigated areas of the Middle East.

Now, that discussion between our governments is still in active consideration, and feasibility studies have been made, and that is the framework within which Israel considers her plans for desalination. But, we are naturally interested in all other proposals that are being made, and I hope to have a chance of discussing with the initiators of this project, the precise terms of intentions that they have in mind.

Mr. LEROY. Sir, before the traditional final question, I would like to present you with a Certificate of Appreciation for this date. I'm sure you have one or two of these, but you can always use a spare.

And, the official silk necktie of the National Press Club, complete with the owl which screams if you ever say, "No comment" while wearing it.

Sir, I have no idea whether we will receive from the Arab nations a request for equal time to answer your statements today, I have no idea whether I will or not. I rather think though, that this following final question rather guarantees that I will have such a request.

Here's the question, Washington delicatessens are now featuring an item called the Nasser Sandwich, half tongue and half chicken. Will this be part of any future technical assistance program you might have for Egypt?

Mr. EBAN. You may quote me as saying, no comment.

Mr. LEROY. Thank you very much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. RONAN), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. ESHLEMAN, for Wednesday, November 1, and Thursday, November 2, 1967, on account of attendance at graduation ceremonies of eldest son from Parris Island Marine Corps basic training.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL to extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole prior to the teller vote.

Mr. HARVEY during debate on H.R. 12144 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUDE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. BROCK in two instances.

Mr. REINECKE in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. QUIE in five instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. TAFT in four instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROYAL in six instances.

Mr. TUCK in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. MACHEN in six instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. ASHMORE.

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1186. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 1, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the "Great Lakes Harbors Study—Final Report," requested by res-

H14310

olutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 178), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 114. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Rept. No. 870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 871). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13669. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes, to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities, and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims (Rept. No. 872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966; with amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 3639. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6692. A bill declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 876). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2138. A bill to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit naturalization for certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations engaged in disseminating information which significantly promotes U.S. interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 877). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13653. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13768. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the free entry of certain cellophane membrane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 13769. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13770. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 13772. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 13773. A bill to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13774. A bill to authorize a study to determine the feasibility of deepening the Jacksonville Harbor, Fla., to 45 feet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 13775. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1949, for service-connected disabilities of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13776. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13777. A bill to increase employment opportunities for individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 13778. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to preserve the integrity of the original agreements and amendments in the area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 13779. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 13780. A bill to provide for sale or exchange of isolated tracts of tribal lands on the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. LENNON, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DOW, Mr. KARTH, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PELLY, Mr. KEITH, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. ROTH, Mr. POLLOCK, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 13781. A bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Develop-

ment Act of 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 13782. A bill to amend section 221(h) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 915. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.J. Res. 916. Joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS (for himself and Mr. WALKER):

H.J. Res. 917. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the year of 1968 as the National Helium Centennial Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 918. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. Con. Res. 563. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STANTON:

H. Con. Res. 564. Concurrent resolution extending congratulations to the Parliament of Finland on the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Res. 961. Resolution to urge the President to release the highway trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 13783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Caburian DeVera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13784. A bill for the relief of Francesco Castello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13785. A bill for the relief of Chester L. Stona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13786. A bill for the relief of Rafael Bove; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13787. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cavallero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 13788. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Lazaro Domingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13789. A bill for the relief of Hiroyuki Furukawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13790. A bill for the relief of Chuan Chang Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13791. A bill for the relief of Tao Shel Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

October 31, 1967

continued development of these resources is essential to our future. Their development adds to our national strength. Any attempt to restrict such improvement by establishing unrealistic criteria for the economic evaluation of waterway projects or the imposition of tolls or user charges, either by regulation or legislation, will be met head-on by those of us who believe that unrestricted use of our vast inland waterway system is essential to our national interest. Your friends in the Congress will fight all proposals of this nature.

But it is most important that your organization and the many other groups committed to the continued development of our inland waterways maintain a constant alert against such rash proposals. To date you have done a fine job, but this is no time for relaxation. Together we have strength and determination to defeat the constant efforts in certain quarters to impose unrealistic restrictions on waterway users. We must continue to mobilize our forces and stand at-the-ready to exert our united strength against these proposals which are definitely not in the national interest.

Caring for Vietnam's Orphans

SPEECH
 OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from Our Sunday Visitor:

WE'RE TOO BUSY TO MARCH: WE'VE GOT AN ORPHANAGE

(By Glenn A. McCurdy)

Hawks and doves. Peace marchers and counter marchers. Escalation and the credibility gap. Draft card burning and Martin Luther King. These are the stories which surround the most controversial war in the history of the United States.

On every level of communications the conflict in Vietnam continues in a fog of proposals and accusations, the heavy-handed drama of big headlines. News, almost by definition, is bad news. But on a much more modest level this unhappy confrontation between East and West can produce an active involvement that holds some hope for the future of mankind on this planet. When people are working to help other people there is hope, but few headlines.

Last spring the undergraduates of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia, through the efforts of an alumnus now stationed with the Air Force in Vietnam, became involved in the war in the most positive way possible, they worked to diminish pain and increase hope. In short, they quietly adopted an orphanage.

For over a month virtually every organization on the St. Joseph's campus (1,800 strong) raised money to support their new ward, the Stella Maris (Star of the Sea) orphanage in Dan Nang. After two dances, a car wash, special movies, and selling chances on a date with Miss Pennsylvania, they presented "Tony's Tots" (the established Stella Maris fund) with a check for \$1,500, with more to come.

Project Vietnam came to St. Joseph's through the letters of an alumnus, Lt. James L. Tobin, class of 1964, who was then on a tour of duty as a civic actions officer with the 620th Tactical Control Squadron near Da Nang.

"Some men spend their free time here

watching the days fall from the calendar," said Lt. Tobin, "while others read, watch endless movies or take correspondence courses to kill the time. I like to believe I spend some of my time trying to help as much as possible."

During his first months of duty he spent his off-duty hours teaching English in Vietnamese schools or supplying hospitals in Da Nang with drugs and medical supplies or arranging informal athletic programs between the people of this war-ravaged country and the GI's.

"But my deepest concern has always been for the homeless children who are innocent victims of this tragedy," said Lt. Tobin.

He outlined these feelings in a long letter to his former campus commander at St. Joseph's, Lt. Col. Daniel J. Boyle, director of Aerospace Studies. Lt. Tobin's initial request was for the support of the Air Force detachment on campus, but the story of Stella Maris quickly spread throughout the college.

Lt. Tobin describes his meeting with the nuns of Stella Maris as follows:

"We were approached by two tiny Vietnamese nuns who indicated they were looking for garbage to feed their 'pigs'. We watched them scavenging through the garbage pails behind our mess hall. Nothing escaped their hunting eyes and everything edible to man or beast was stuffed into the small bags they carried. It soon became apparent that these scraps weren't meant only for these mysterious 'pigs' for the Sisters were especially looking for dry cream products. A young airman fluent in French spoke with them and we invited them into the Commander's (Lt. Col. Fred Faupel) office. Everyone began to offer help."

The story of the orphanage, a crude building comparable only to perhaps American livestock shelters is a simple one and it is the story of a saint, Sister Angela, mother superior of Stella Maris, fled from Hanoi with three other nuns and crossed miles of mountainous jungles until they reached Da Nang and the sea. They owned only the clothes they wore, but brick by brick they constructed a small haven for the lost children of their world. They planted the seeds for what could someday be an orphanage. As word of their presence spread to nearby villages, their mission of love was fulfilled in the pitiful form of an undernourished and maimed child left in the clearing outside their shelter. Three days later this child died. The only hope they could give him was their love.

Today the nuns of Stella Maris are caring for 96 children of all faiths. Through the efforts of the 620th Squadron they are able to feed, clothe and provide medical treatment for this entire family. The goals of the present are being met, but the future is always uncertain.

"Theirs is a big project for people with big hearts," wrote Lt. Tobin. "They must be able to save for tomorrow. Drugs, medicine and vitamins are the things we need most. Last spring 36 children died because of a measles epidemic. I hope this letter will help."

It did. New York City was the center for a "March for Peace" several months ago. The students at St. Joseph's couldn't attend; they had to take care of an orphanage.

NE
Egyptian War Crimes Go Unpunished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the long and bitter civil war in Yemen has now become a struggle between the people of

that small near eastern country and a puppet regime kept in power by Egyptian troops and armaments.

Yemeni charges that Egyptians are using poison gas have been documented officially by the International Red Cross. One such case involved the population of an entire village, including the children, all killed by nerve gas coming from canisters bearing Russian markings.

So far, President Johnson has demonstrated no interest in taking the least action to have these particularly barbarous crimes against humanity punished. How long the administration will continue to ignore this pressing moral responsibility remains unclear, but our duty is clear.

Syndicated columnist Roscoe Drummond has written an open letter to our U.N. Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg, on this subject. Because of its relevance, and the valuable information it contains, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LETTER TO MR. GOLDBERG
 (By Roscoe Drummond)

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,

U.S. Ambassador to United Nations.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: In your recent statement you express "strong concern" over Egypt's use of poison gas in Yemen, but announce that the U.S. "is not taking the lead" in bringing the issue before the United Nations.

In all candor, Mr. Ambassador, why not? You say "we are deeply disturbed" but prefer to let somebody else take the initiative.

In all candor, is a let-someone-else-do-it policy good enough for the United States of America in a matter which involves violation of the Geneva Treaty, transgression of the U.N. Charter, and a heinous offense against humanity?

Isn't this the kind of international crime which the U.N. was created to deal with and which the U.N. is capable of dealing with?

But the U.N. can do nothing unless the issue is brought before it.

Is it really good enough for the United States to pursue a course of let-someone-else-do-it?

You know as do the rest of us that under present circumstances nobody else is going to do it.

The Yemeni people who are being gassed can't get their protest to the U.N. because their government does not represent them. The present Yemeni government either approves the use of poison gas against its dissident people or is so completely the tool of Cairo that it can't do otherwise.

And it seems clear that no other government is going to stand up first at the U.N.—at least not in time to accomplish anything—and say for the conscience of the world: This must stop! No Arab state is going to do it. No neutral state is going to do it.

If there were a real choice between the U.S. "not taking the lead," as you put it, and somebody else doing so, it might be understandable for the U.S. to yield the initiative to another.

But, Mr. Ambassador, there is no such choice. Nobody else is ready to take the lead. Nothing is being done and nothing is going to be done to demand an end to this hideous crime unless the United States takes the lead to demand that something be done.

At the moment a voice or two is being raised by Arab leaders urging Nassar to get out of Yemen entirely, withdraw his 25,000 troops, and end this illegal intervention. But exactly such an agreement was signed by the U.A.R. and Saudi Arabia and nothing came of it. Perhaps the losses sustained by

Egypt in the six-day war with Israel will force Nasser to retire from Yemen—for a time. But you can't count on it.

Is the U.S. going to stand by and refuse to take the initiative on the sterile theory of let-someone-else-do-it?

Mr. Ambassador, there are quite a few of us who hope not.

Michigan Girl Cites Value of 4-H Club Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it has been my pleasure to meet with young men and young women from my congressional district as they come to Washington for seminars at the national 4-H Club center. I have been very much impressed by the work of this organization.

I was pleased to receive a few days ago an article written by an 18-year-old girl from my district discussing the benefits of the club programs. It was written by Miss Brenda M. Swenson of Midland, Mich., and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

It follows:

My 4-H Story

(By Brenda M. Swinson, age 18, Midland County, Midland, Mich.)

The 4-H program has helped me to form my personality, which is based on the saying, "a little hope, faith, and charity." Without these three one cannot be successful or live in this world of ours. 4-H has helped me gain a love and respect for the "Head, Heart, Hands, and Health" God has given me.

If the 4-H program is to be successful, the members, leaders, and Extension people must have faith in it. With faith in our hearts we can try different techniques of planning meetings and recreation, and carrying out our projects. In this way we can show our beliefs and individuality, yet work harmoniously as a group.

This we did in our local service club in working at Patterson Street School with retarded children. We taught them leathercraft, sewing, dancing, games, and songs. They, in turn, taught us what they knew—songs, games, but most of all a love of life and the simplicity of beauty (flowers, the sparkle of the stars, and the warmth of their hearts). Disappointment came when membership in our service club was too low to operate any longer and we had to face the fact that we would have to discontinue the Patterson program. We had raised interest in this program that the high school took over the program. Faith that we would find some organization to continue our work kept us going as long as we did.

My older brother was a 4-H member and, being a little sister, I wanted to do what he did. It seemed years before I was old enough to participate. I joined with enthusiasm and looked forward to learning skills, gaining knowledge, and to just pure fun in the 4-H program.

Through faith and hope I found the fun, learned the skills, and gained the knowledge I wanted. More than that, I found a place where I could exercise what I had gained in the 4-H program through service clubs, junior leadership, and now leading.

This is where "a little charity" stepped in—

by sharing, giving, and urging participation. So with charity within ourselves the 4-H program, industries, colleges, and communities interested in 4-H we all gain points on the success chart.

"A little faith, hope, and charity" in the ways I have mentioned were the major tools which are still forming and molding my character, personality, and future aspirations. My family was a 4-H family, Dad leading a horse project, Mom cooking, my brother meeting the girl he was to marry through 4-H, and me still participating as a member and junior leader. I feel my community has gained by having a group in the rural area offering service, experiences, and achievement for youth.

Business arrangements with my father gave me the opportunity to own a horse, plot a garden, and have a sewing machine. Awards and some trips financed through industries and organizations have given me opportunities to travel, meet friends and resource people, and to see the broad horizon of the 4-H Clover.

Through planning workshops, camps, ceremonies and recreation and holding different offices, I have gained in leadership. I have viewed and gained better citizenship and patriotism since I attended the Washington, D.C., Citizenship Shortcourse, and 4-H Club Week at Michigan State University.

State Conservation Camp taught me that conservation is a part of our daily lives. The duty is left up to us to conserve our wildlife, water, forest, fish, and soil. I enjoyed this camp the most of my 4-H excursions because it gave me a wonderful feeling of closeness to both nature and its Creator. I felt great pride and gratitude when I was chosen to return the following year as a member of the 1965 Planning Committee.

Through this type of faith, hope and charity I have become aware of what a successful life really is, and of the results and rewards of the saying, "It is better to give than to receive." It is a challenge to live up to the motto "Make the best better," and when asked to help in a project or activity, to stand up and give the answer, "I'll be glad to."

I am attending Central Michigan University this fall preparing for a career of working with children. Further down life's path I hope to be a successful housewife and mother. And, God willing, be a 4-H leader, supporter, and parent.

L. B. J. Defeats Republicans in Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and New York Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, with just a year to go before the presidential election the Republicans are trying desperately to boost party morale by already claiming victory.

Unfortunately for them, the election will determine the winner—not their publicity releases. And while I hate to be a killjoy, I would urge the Republicans not to order their victory champagne before the final results are in.

Just last week, for example, polls conducted in Pennsylvania and New Hampshire revealed that President Johnson could defeat handily the top five Republican hopefuls.

The polls, conducted by an independent firm in Princeton, N.J., showed that

in Pennsylvania, the President ran ahead of Richard Nixon, 51 to 37; ahead of Rockefeller 45 to 41; ahead of Romney, 48 to 35; ahead of Reagan, 51 to 33; and ahead of Percy, 50 to 29.

The sampling covered 657 persons throughout Pennsylvania.

In New Hampshire, the poll showed the President and Nixon running neck and neck, but Lyndon Johnson running ahead of Rockefeller, Romney, Reagan, and Percy.

In addition, an earlier poll covering New York State—conducted by this same firm—showed President Johnson easily defeating this same group of Republican rivals.

The Republicans want to claim victory in 1968 a year early. Now if only those polls would cooperate.

I think the polls will cooperate with the Republicans to the same degree that they have cooperated with the Johnson administration in passing needed legislation.

In other words, the Republicans do not have a chance.

Detroit's End Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star contains an editorial which, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House for the added light it sheds on section 208(b) of the Air Quality Act of 1967. How can we fairly be accused of an excess of zeal when at issue is the protection of the health of the people of California?

The editorial follows:

DETROIT'S END RUN

When Detroit auto makers issued a flurry of press releases a few months ago about their development of electric autos, it looked as if the nation had turned a corner in the air pollution war. Here was evidence that the car manufacturers were really serious about helping clear the air.

But a new legislative battle in Congress has stirred misgivings about the sincerity of the industry in this matter. Representative John D. Dingell of Michigan has sponsored an amendment to an air-pollution bill that would seriously undermine the power of California to set its own, more stringent clean-air standards. The Senate previously gave California this right in an amendment by Senator George Murphy.

The Dingell proposal would give the federal government the final say on whether California could have stricter standards for auto exhausts than those for the rest of the country. According to press reports, the Michigan lawmaker's friends in Detroit want to avoid "leapfrogging," that is, a race between the state and the government to see who could tighten standards more.

It's not difficult to see what's behind this amendment. Dingell openly admits the auto industry approached him with the basic idea for the legislation. Evidently Detroit thinks California is overly zealous in battling air pollution, and fears auto makers may have