

Protectionist sentiment in Congress is building up to a new crisis, said William M. Roth, the Administration's foreign trade negotiator, in a recent Detroit address. He said the drive for legislation to make it harder for imports to enter the United States threatens to turn the clock back to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. This was the most restrictive law ever adopted by Congress.

Mr. Roth said industries that seek new trade barriers may not be the ones to suffer when other countries retaliate against American exports. Bills are now pending in Congress to restrict imports of textiles, watches, petroleum, meat, dairy products, lead and zinc. One bill already adopted by the House would permit the President to restrict imports on any foreign product produced abroad under labor standards below those of the United States. Few foreign products would be allowed in under such conditions. Another bill in the Senate would establish mandatory quotas if imports contribute to the economic problems of domestic producers.

In general, lower trade barriers promote the interests of all countries by enabling them to exchange goods they produce most efficiently. They help keep prices down at home by forcing domestic firms to meet competition. Trade also sends money abroad for the purchase of American products. The United States has an opportunity to sell more as the world becomes prosperous and industrialized.

Restrictions that benefit a small number of industries that cannot compete hurt the country as a whole. Higher prices and inflationary pressures are only a part of the price of protectionism carried as far as some would like to see it go.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal,
Oct. 12, 1967]

BILLS TO CURB IMPORTS THREATEN TRADE AGREEMENTS

Waves of shortsighted selfishness are breaking against Capitol Hill, threatening to drown three decades of sustained United States effort to lower senseless barriers to world trade and prosperity.

The largest wave makers are the steel, chemical and textile industries and some elements of agriculture, but lead, zinc, electronics, glass and oil lobbyists are at work, too.

The target is the so-called Kennedy round of tariff cutting negotiations, a four year long struggle that culminated in May with the United States and other trading nations agreeing to reduce tariffs by an average of 35%—the biggest trade liberalization in history. Congress in recent weeks has been swamped with bills to frustrate tariff cuts by placing import quotas on a wide range of goods.

Sen. Dirksen (R-Ill.) and Sen. Hartke (D-Ind.), both strong backers of the domestic steel industry, are supporting a particularly insidious measure that will attach quotas for steel and other products to the Johnson administration's urgent social security bill pending in the senate. The perverse hope is that Johnson, not daring to veto the whole package, will swallow the quotas. This is reckless legislating. It would force the White House, and the nation, to accept all or nothing on two vital but unrelated matters.

The Dirksen-Hartke ploy is made all the worse by the fact that quotas are far more pernicious than tariffs, because goods can at least be imported over tariff walls and the cost of protectionism slapped on the public can be eased by tariff revenue. Under quotas the protectionist is king and the public be damned.

To be sure, in the short run, it may be tempting to coddle a domestic industry. But world trade is implacably a two way street. History is littered with cases in which the

protectionism of one nation is swiftly matched by the protectionism of others in a sorrowful enactment of mutual strangulation.

Trade liberalization over the last 20 years has produced a threefold increase in world commerce and greatly improved global understanding. Certainly the United States has prospered accordingly. In 1966 we bought \$26 billion in goods overseas and sold \$30 billion. It would be one of the great tragedies of our era if this edifice of mutual benefit were brought to ruin.

U.N. DELIBERATIONS ON ARAB- ISRAEL CONFLICT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are grounds for genuine satisfaction in the progress of the U.N. deliberations on the Arab-Israel conflict. With rare unanimity, the Security Council has adopted a resolution calling for the dispatch of an envoy to the Near East.

The administration should be commended for the way in which it has resisted Arab-Soviet pressures calling on Israel to withdraw its forces from occupied territory in advance of a peace settlement.

But optimism on these matters is qualified by the extraordinary reaction in Cairo following the adoption of the U.N. resolution. Once again, President Nasser has exhibited an uncompromising belligerence. His speech last Thursday was a repudiation of peace with Israel. When he speaks of political solutions, he is speaking of Israel's surrender. Much more ominous is his disclosure that Egypt has restored its military strength and is determined upon military action against Israel if it fails to force Israel's retreat by diplomatic pressures.

This speech by President Nasser has been sharply criticized in the press. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, one of which appeared in the New York Times on November 25, 1967, and the other in the Washington Post on the same date, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a need for a swift and effective answer to Nasser's speech. We must now make it clear to the Egyptian dictator that we are not prepared to let him mobilize his forces in preparation for a new assault against Israel. There is one answer—and that is to make certain that Israel has the deterrent capacity to resist attack.

I would like to raise the issue here, Mr. President: Is the administration prepared to provide Israel with the weapons it must have to give it deterrent military capacity to prevent another war?

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted in November by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, meeting in Cleveland. The resolution reflects growing alarm over developments in the Middle East and the view of many Americans that it is crucial that Israel be enabled to maintain her capacity to uphold the peace and to deter further aggression.

There being no objection, the resolu-

tion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Resolution on peace in the Middle East, adopted in Cleveland, by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds)

Twenty years ago this month, the delegates of the United States and Canada to the United Nations strongly supported the historic United Nations General Assembly resolution which led to the establishment and recognition of the State of Israel. This year, at tragic costs in lives, Israel has again repelled Arab armies poised for its annihilation.

We commend our governments' position that the Middle East cannot return to the intolerable conditions which provoked conflicts in the past, and that makeshift measures, which President Lyndon B. Johnson has characterized as "prescriptions for renewed hostilities", must be replaced by a permanent peace.

Only the parties to the conflict can, through direct negotiations, determine the nature of a peace settlement and commit themselves to its fulfillment. Thus we urge our governments to continue to work for policies which would bring Arabs and Israelis face-to-face at the peace table.

Until peace is achieved, and to meet the new threat brought about by the re-arming of the Arab states, it is crucial that Israel be enabled to maintain its capacity to uphold the peace and to deter further aggression. We, therefore, urge the United States government to continue and to take such steps as will help make possible this essential deterrent.

It is only through peace that the welfare of all the peoples in the region can be advanced. Peace in the Middle East will be a significant step forward toward the realization of peace throughout the world.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Nov 25, 1967]

NASSER VERSUS THE U.N.

Evoking a spirit of bravado that Egypt's situation does not justify, President Nasser has now retreated to a position of belligerent intransigence that seriously compromises the recently brightened prospects for peace in the Middle East.

Nasser's speech to the opening session of the Egyptian Parliament was a rude affront to the fifteen members of the Security Council who had just voted unanimously a resolution pointing toward a just settlement of the long-standing Arab-Israeli dispute. His vow not to recognize Israel nor to allow her ships to use the Suez Canal defies the spirit and the letter of that resolution.

This was the Egyptian President's first public appearance in four months. It would serve the cause of peace if it were his last for at least four more. In fact, it would help if all the area's national leaders who are prone to intemperate language refrained from public pronouncements for a while to give the United Nation's special envoy, Gunnar Jarring, a fighting chance for success on his mission of reconciliation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1967]

SIEGE IN CAIRO

President Nasser, giving his first public speech in four months, set back the cause of peace so recently advanced by the Security Council's resolution on the Middle East. He retreated from the moderation he has evidenced privately into a tough, irresponsible play for the Cairo crowds. One can understand, without excusing, why an insecure politician might lapse from the cool of diplomacy to the heat of the mob. The danger is that having recommitted himself publicly to an extreme position, Mr. Nasser will have extra trouble easing back toward the compromises necessary in the real world.

A case in point was his unqualified vow never to let Israeli ships pass through the Suez Canal. Previously he had said the ships could pass after a Palestine settlement. It was reckless of Mr. Nasser to make such a vow. It can only harden Israel's hold on the Canal. He can scarcely expect Western countries to help him open an international water way which he has warned in advance will be open only to users of his choice.

President Nasser's speech was pitched to using international diplomacy as a lever to pry Israeli troops out of every inch of occupied soil. This is quite different from the Western intention to use diplomacy as a channel to a general settlement. Mr. Nasser does not thereby doom United Nations peace moves. It may be that this speech amounted to his maximum bargaining demand, not to the fallback position which Egypt will have to move to in any settlement. Nonetheless, it is disturbing to find him so unreasonable. It raises questions about his political stability. If he stays in that stance Israel will surely reciprocate his unreasonableness. Meanwhile, he will forfeit available Western sympathy and the pressure on Israel which is that sympathy's political form.

Mr. Nasser showed greater realism in addressing himself to Egypt's domestic situation. He revealed that the toll of Egyptian war dead was 11,500—almost as heavy a loss in six days, as the United States has suffered over as many years in Vietnam. In claiming that Egypt's army is now stronger than in June, he made clear that the gains flow from postwar military personnel changes, not from arms. The thrust of his speech was that the Egyptian people are in for a long seige. He should realize that, the more flexible his diplomacy, the shorter the siege.

SENATOR RANDOLPH SUPPORTS BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, much has been said and written in recent months about the need to reverse the population flow from the rural to urban areas. Recently, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 64, which would establish a bipartisan commission to promote balanced economic development.

One of the cosponsors of that resolution was Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. In fact, I believe Senator RANDOLPH was the first of my colleagues to call me and ask to be listed as a cosponsor. He also offered to provide any assistance necessary in steering it through the Senate, an offer which I was glad to accept.

The senior Senator from West Virginia has long demonstrated his concern over this problem. A recent article by Vera Glaser for the North American Newspaper Alliance pointed out Senator RANDOLPH's leadership in this regard. As the article claims, JENNINGS RANDOLPH is indeed "a prime activist" in this crusade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Back-to-Land Plan Urged by Senator RANDOLPH To Reverse Rural Exodus" appear in the Record at this point.

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

BACK-TO-LAND PLAN URGED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH TO REVERSE RURAL EXODUS
(By Vera Glaser, North American Newspaper Alliance writer)

The cure for riots, crime and filth in America's cities may lie in making rural areas liveable and attractive enough to re-

verse the current population surge to congested urban centers.

A prime activist in what appears to be a growing "Back-to-the Land" cadre in Congress is Senator Jennings Randolph, Chairman of the Public Works Committee, whose folksy ways belie the power he wields over billions in Federal expenditures.

"I have a feeling the people of America need to walk on earth rather than cement," Randolph said in an interview.

It was shortly after he had taken the Floor of the Senate to deplore the dollars-and-cents cost of crime in the U.S. to victims, offenders and society as a whole, which he estimated at \$21 billion a year.

As a Senator from West Virginia, classified as a rural State whose largest city is Charleston (Pop. 86,000), Randolph has a stake in reversing the exodus which has been under way for a decade.

TAX INCENTIVES

But he is not alone. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has been talking up the idea for a long time. Recently 25 Senators of both parties, led by Republican James B. Pearson of Kansas and Democrat Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma, introduced a bill to provide tax incentives to encourage development of new jobs in rural areas, citing it as a means of reducing population pressures in the cities.

Interestingly, the sponsors included such urban-oriented lawmakers as Connecticut's Abraham Ribicoff, Pennsylvania's Hugh Scott and Illinois' Charles Percy.

At least nine similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Randolph, however, is going a step farther. So convinced is he of the Nation's need to utilize its open spaces, that he will soon take his plea to President Johnson. Since LBJ has requested his staff to produce his fresh ideas for next year's legislative program, it is possible he will decide to push Randolph's "Back-to-the-Land" effort.

Population dispersal, Randolph admits, is a long-haul effort. Currently 70 percent of the people and 80 per cent of the Nation's commerce and industry are packed into one per cent of the land area, a situation which Randolph predicts could bring disaster.

GOOD LIFE

Given the necessities of the good life, he believes rural residents will not only remain where they are but will encourage hundreds of thousands of others to migrate to the country. As a starter, he believes four vital components—water, education, roads, and jobs—must be made available in deprived areas.

Randolph drew a standing ovation in Denver recently when he suggested using new techniques to identify regions which, with water resources development, could support large population increases.

But he was more moved by the reaction of one individual, an old lady in the hamlet of Hepzibah, W. Va., when water was piped into the area:

"She had tears in her eyes when she told me she had until then never been able to take a shower or bathe in a tub," Randolph recalled.

In West Virginia, he estimated, loan-and-grant programs of the Farmers Home Administration (FHA) have had an impact on the lives of some 75,000 people by providing water, housing and jobs.

CITY'S PRESSURES

Word of the improvements is getting around. He said a man telephoned from Detroit to say he had lived there five years, was earning good wages in an automobile plant, but could no longer take the city's pressures. He told Randolph he was selling his home and bringing his family to resettle in West Virginia.

To motivate any large number of people in that fashion, however, will require the funneling, at heavy expense, of a long list of

amenities into deprived areas. Among the most important will be roads.

Randolph sees the current U.S. Highway Program, under which more than half of an approved 41,000-mile network has been constructed, as a mere beginning.

"Some time between now and 1975, when the current road program is completed, I expect we will authorize another 40,000 to 50,000 miles," he predicted. That could bring the Nation's expenditures for highways to about \$100 billion over a period of four decades.

Randolph does not seem to worry about the availability of education in rural areas, pointing out that his State has 25 colleges located within a few hours' bus ride of even the most remote areas.

JOB LURE

He admits one of the most difficult parts of the effort will be luring jobs to the country, but insists it is not impossible, particularly with the tax incentives proposed in his bill. Two major shoe companies are building plants in rural areas of West Virginia where Randolph believes the labor supply is the drawing card.

Randolph also believes some are so fed up with big-city pressures that they may even be willing to change their means of livelihood for a crack at a life in the open spaces.

"We can't expect miracles and we can't expect upheavals, but I believe if we set ourselves to this task, we can rebuild a better America. It is going to take real thinking," he said.

Randolph is used to uphill fights. He pioneered in the rural electrification and airport programs. He has a fund of patience and good humor and, perhaps most important, the conviction that America's uncongested areas, where life is pleasant and free of tension, are a reservoir of strength.

THE STEWARDSHIP OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last Sunday's Washington Post contains an article by Prof. Adolfe Berle which served, or should have served, to remind all of us that an objective view of the stewardship of President Lyndon B. Johnson up to this point in history has to conclude with the realization that the President grasped the problems of America at home and abroad and "simply did his damndest to see her through on all fronts."

If our President has detractors, we should not be surprised. In this century, the most reviled Chief Executives have been Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. To that list of strong Presidents we can now add the name of Lyndon B. Johnson. In each case, of course, the criticism which was heaped on these men—which is still being heaped upon the head of Lyndon Johnson by some—stems from the fact that they were strong Presidents, determined to deal with the problems of their time. And deal with them they did.

When John F. Kennedy was assassinated in 1963, Lyndon B. Johnson was catapulted into the White House, into world power, and into the vortex of swirling change both here in the United States and in foreign affairs. In a very real sense, the task which faced Lyndon B. Johnson was not one that many men could have faced up to. Damocles had but one sword hanging over his head, but the President of these United States in these days has many. As Professor