

Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. Speaker, last week's rejection of Waterbury as the only city in Connecticut to be excluded from the demonstration cities program of HUD has aroused a predictable and strong reaction among interested civic groups in my home city. These people who are bent upon the improvement of this major municipality have been unable to understand the reason for the discrimination practiced in this case.

As an example of the reaction which I have described, I append to my remarks a copy of a letter which the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce has sent to Secretary Weaver on this subject. I also add a news article from the Waterbury Republican of November 18, 1967, describing the action and reaction of this representative civic organization:

GREATER WATERBURY CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE,
Waterbury, Conn., November 20, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Secretary, Department of Housing and
Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The announcement from the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal last Thursday came as a real shock to the people of Waterbury. Inclusion of the cities of New Haven, Hartford and Bridgeport and the exclusion of Waterbury seems to point to some basic error in evaluation of our application or in our presentation of it. The records will show that this city has not shared in urban renewal funds to any degree that the cities mentioned above have.

We strongly believe that a reexamination of the facts in our case is in order, and we urge that your office make a second examination.

The people of this community have supported wholeheartedly the idea of the Model Cities program and have demonstrated this support by full community participation in the development of material and facts for the application submitted to your office. However, it is possible that we have not provided precisely the information sought or that we have not properly documented that which we have placed before HUD officials.

We would like to know from your office where we have failed and why our application was not accepted. Were we lacking in details or specific explanations? Did we fail to enclose enough supplemental material to prove the case of Waterbury's need for these funds?

Since we know intimately of the crying needs of this community for participation in the Model Cities program, we must conclude that for some reason we did not communicate this information properly to your Department.

May we hear from you at your earliest possible convenience with information as to where we failed to measure up?

Respectfully yours,

REX BROWN,
First Vice President.

[From the Waterbury Republican, Nov. 18, 1967]

CHAMBERS "DISMAYED" BY HUD

Expressing dismay at the decision of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which omitted Waterbury from those cities to receive model cities funds, the board of directors of the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce promised "an aggressive effort" to get federal funds for the model cities effort Friday.

In specific action, the board expressed "its dismay at the announcement by HUD and Secretary Robert C. Weaver to the effect

that Waterbury is not to share in model cities funds.

"The elimination of Waterbury in the first phase of model cities allocation, notwithstanding its relatively limited urban renewal grants of the past, represents a form of discrimination which is difficult indeed for us to accept—especially in the light of the inclusion of the other major population centers of Connecticut," the board said.

"We commend the City Administration, U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan, Sens. Abraham Ribicoff and Thomas J. Dodd, for their efforts in Waterbury's behalf. At the same time we resolve, beginning immediately, to carry on an aggressive effort toward restoration of this community to its rightful place of participation in model cities fund allocations."

NE file
RED FLEET MOVES INTO
MEDITERRANEAN

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. Speaker, it is undoubtedly human that in connection with recent events in Europe and the Near East we have centered our attention more upon the critical outburst of force itself than the strategic situations which result. This is especially true with this summer's Arab-Israel war. The United Nations, is now working to resolve the military and diplomatic difference of that war, and we hope that a successful result will be achieved.

However, the significant fact for our consideration is the influence which the Soviet Union has gained in that troubled area during the past few months. For the first time in history the Russians have established themselves as a maritime power in the Mediterranean. They even practice a gunboat diplomacy which had been considered outdated. Their increased influence and physical presence will be more important than the outcome of this June's 6-day war, and could well create new issues in the continuing conflict between East and West. In the opinion of many, the presence of the Red fleet in the Mediterranean represents an unparalleled deterioration of Western Europe's strategic situation. With this opinion in mind, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Red Fleet in Med Is the Event of the Year," which appeared in the November 3, 1967, issue of the German newspaper, Christ und Welt:

RED FLEET IN MED IS THE EVENT OF THE YEAR

(By Peter Meyer-Ranke)

Kremlin leaders have given the celebrations of the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution a markedly military note in view of the international situation. This has been done to encourage friends and deter enemies.

The Soviet Union's sabre-rattling preparedness is being demonstrated all over the Eastern Bloc in a monster show of parading soldiers, tanks and remote-controlled weaponry. The launching of fresh satellites underscores the technological claims of a space power.

This unpeaceful picture of ostentatious strength on the part of the Euro-Asian continental power is accompanied by revolutionary events off the southern shores of Europe.

For the first time in history the Russians have established themselves as a maritime power in the Mediterranean, and not just for

show—the new Red maritime might is most active. This factor adds completely new dimensions still frequently underestimated in the West to the dangerously smoldering Middle East conflict.

Only five years ago, in the Cuban crisis, Moscow's first attempt to act as a maritime power in distant oceans, foundered on the maritime predominance of the United States.

Today, in contrast, with Soviet watchdog fishing fleets at home in all waters a Soviet fleet squadron is despatched to the Mediterranean as a political and military shield for the Arab states.

For the second time since the war last June Soviet warships have dropped anchor in Alexandria and Port Said, an example of classic gunboat diplomacy, which had been thought outdated.

The despatch of these warships and the securing of bases are but part of Moscow's maritime policy and complemented by copious arms shipments and the demonstrative Egyptian sinking of the Israeli destroyer *Eilat* using Soviet missiles.

The permanent presence of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet in Egyptian ports is interpreted a little too self-confidently in the West as a move designed to restrain Nasser's Egypt.

There can be no denying its defensive, protective role but one day this could develop into offensive cover fire against Israel and above all against the Mediterranean-based United States Sixth Fleet.

The forebodings of Western naval commands have developed into genuine concern. Since Mediterranean power France is leaving its last remaining North African base, Mers el Kebir in Algeria next year, the Soviet Union has grasped the opportunity to set up new bases of its own on the North African coast.

The two Egyptian ports are not full-scale bases but they suffice for overhauling warships and supplying ammunition, fuel and food.

While the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the eastern Mediterranean has not even been able to dock in Beirut since the June crisis and was barred from all North African ports beforehand Moscow is demonstrating its protective power role in respect of North Africa and the Arab socialist states in the very countries from which, 25 years ago, the Allies began to close in on continental Europe—Egypt and Algeria.

The continued presence of the Red Fleet in the Mediterranean consequently represents an unparalleled deterioration of Western Europe's strategic situation, particularly as it will in the foreseeable future be joined by Soviet aircraft carriers and landing craft.

The operational conditions of the Sixth Fleet, the role of which is not only to brandish the nuclear deterrent but also to cover transport and landing operations, have thus worsened, its freedom to move and operate in the eastern Mediterranean and off North Africa is now limited, its role as a policeman and provider of protection for Western friends in the Middle East paralyzed.

The renewed worsening of the Arab-Israeli situation bears this assertion out. While Israel is increasingly coming to see the Soviet Union as the enemy, calculatedly stirring up unrest for political ends, with the failure of fresh United Nations efforts to send a neutral mediator on the Arab side the call for vengeance for the June defeat is gaining in volume.

In Cairo Nasser too is deserting ideas of a negotiated solution for extremism again. No longer is there talk of the urgent need to end the state of war with Israel. The direct peace talks demanded by Jerusalem grow increasingly unlikely. The sole exception to the trend away from talks is King Hussein but for how long will this be the case?

More emphatically than ever before the Arabs are demanding unconditional withdrawal by the Israelis. Under the cover of

Soviet naval gunships they, like the Viet Cong, reject both compromises and the conference table. A second Vietnam is in the making.

While King Hussein is travelling around in the West and in Bonn too imploringly pointing out that increasing pressure is being brought to bear on him at home by extremists and that his country's situation is desperate as he neither can nor will make peace with the Israeli nation he recognized, Nasser by sending his deputy Ali Sabri and a military delegation to Moscow and holding fresh talks with Syria and Algeria is forging fresh and firmer links with the other Arab clients of the Soviet Union.

Captured Soviet shells, fired by the Israelis from captured Soviet guns, have proved able to bring virtually to a standstill Egypt's production of artificial fertilizers and the Suez refineries, which accounted for 75 per cent of Egypt's domestic fuel oil production.

The Israelis have shown that after dealing the Egyptian army a savage blow they are still able to do the same to the Egyptian economy, a tactic to which they did not resort in June. But this threat is now offset by the fear of provoking Soviet missile counterattacks on Haifa and Tel Aviv.

The deterioration of the Middle East crisis thus coincides with the demonstrative acts of the new Soviet maritime power in the Mediterranean. What happens today off North Africa and Israel can tomorrow occur off Cyprus or Greece.

The appearance of the Red Fleet on Europe's southern doorstep in Moscow's anniversary year can justly be described as the event of the year—and not a very gratifying one for the West, either.

VIETNAM AN OBJECT LESSON

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it comes as good news that Gen. William C. Westmoreland has recently announced that the end of the war in Vietnam is in view and that, according to a war master plan, there is an intention to shift a large share of the military load in that area over to the South Vietnamese.

I have—as Members of this House know—consistently urged that the South Vietnamese and their Asian associates take on an ever-increasing share of the military burden in this area. I have also urged that we do everything possible to help in bringing about certain civil reforms in South Vietnam.

Our good position in the war, we are told by General Westmoreland, comes about because of the successes of our military forces in Vietnam operating under some highly difficult conditions. Every one of us has just cause to be proud of the fact that our American boys have once again proved to be unbeatable on the battlefield.

It is also encouraging to note that efforts are being made to bring about certain social and economic reforms, with the newly elected Government in South Vietnam having drawn up broad plans toward this end. American advisers and assistance will prove very valuable in attaining these goals, helping the social and economic achievements to coincide with the successes on the battlefield and bringing South Vietnam closer to being a stable and unmolested country.

We should, of course, guard against being overoptimistic about our successes

in Vietnam, for although we have come a long way, there apparently remains a long way to go. It is not a usual type of war that is being fought in that area, for the terrain is difficult to negotiate and the enemy is imponderable and constantly relies on unorthodox tactics on the battlefield. With respect to this war, it was General Westmoreland who said that "it is difficult to conceive of a total military victory in the classic sense."

In any event, it is encouraging to receive this advice on our situation in Vietnam from an authority who has firsthand familiarity with the matter. If we can push forward to a successful conclusion in this area, it will mean that free men will have been spared from aggression and that our American boys who have fallen on the field of battle will not have died in vain.

We should consider our involvement in Vietnam as an object lesson, using it as a guideline for our international relations of the future. We should not let ourselves become what is, in effect, a "policeman of the world," committing our men and money wherever trouble crops out on this globe. Instead, we should stand ready to aid free men wherever they are oppressed by providing assistance that will help them to help themselves, as we are now doing successfully in Vietnam.

If we will do this, then free men the world over will become self-sufficient and clear of oppression, and both the character and image of America will be strong and convincing.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 405 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN PUBLIC SHOULD BE ADVISED IF HANOI IS BEHIND PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], charged Monday night in Atlanta, Ga., that the massive anti-Vietnam demonstration staged at the Pentagon October 21 was "basically organized by international communism" and that "the marchers included every Communist and Communist sympathizer in the United States who was able to make the trip."

Mr. Speaker, this statement apparently is based on the kind of information given orally to Republican leaders of the House by the President at a White House meeting after the Pentagon demonstration. I presume the same information was made available to the Democratic leaders. I subsequently urged that the

White House make public the information it has on the true nature of the so-called peace demonstration at the Pentagon. As a result, the Attorney General of the United States visited me in my office and argued against release of the information.

I believed then and I believe now that the American people should be given full information on the degree of Communist participation in the anti-American policy demonstration so that the people may judge just how deep or widespread anti-Vietnam war sentiment is in this country.

If the evidence in the hands of the executive branch of our government indicates manipulation of the peace movement in this country by Hanoi, then the propaganda impact of such demonstrations will be lessened and perhaps destroyed. This would be a highly beneficial result, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, one of the national news magazines has quoted the Secretary of State as saying that the release of this information would trigger a new wave of McCarthyism in this country. I dislike taking issue with the distinguished Secretary of State, but I believe the American people are now mature enough to receive such information and to react without hysteria.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the distinguished majority leader of the House has made charges of a most serious nature regarding the Communist role in the demonstration at the Pentagon, I urge that the President order a full report made to the American people on the extent of Communist participation in organizing, planning, and directing the disgraceful display which took place at the Pentagon last October 21. Such a report will be most helpful and constructive to all Americans. In addition, such a disclosure would be beneficial to the well-intentioned Americans who participated in this demonstration not knowing who had organized the demonstrations at the Pentagon and elsewhere throughout the free world.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Why limit it to just this one instance? Why do we not cover the whole waterfront, so to speak? I am sure you will find the same agitators and the same Communist influences in many of these so-called demonstrations where we have seen cities destroyed and lives lost.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure that the release of this information by the President would cover more than these worldwide demonstrations that occurred on October 21.

I repeat and reiterate—I think this information which is in the hands of the President and in the hands of the executive branch of the Government should be made available promptly to all Americans.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 392 I was recorded as being absent. I was in the Chamber and answered "present" when my name was called.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

November 22, 1967

great men of our country. I have had the pleasure and the privilege of working with the Speaker in the passage of legislation in positions of leadership and also of working with him since I first came here over a quarter of a century ago. I know of no man more dedicated to this House and to this country than JOHN McCORMACK. Nor do I know of any man more effective in leadership than the Speaker of this body. When I read some of these carping critics say that he has no contact with and does not communicate with Members of this body, I think that nothing could be further from the truth. There is no Member of this body on either side of the aisle that JOHN McCORMACK cannot pick up the phone and talk to as a friend. There is no Democratic Member, regardless of the difference in political or economic philosophy, with whom he does not have the closest relationship.

I am proud indeed to have been actively associated with him. I reiterate the statement made here last week by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, who gives great leadership in this body. Incidentally, I commend Mr. ALBERT on the wonderful speech he made in Atlanta, Ga., last evening. I wish to reiterate the statement he made here last week in saying that his candidate for the Speaker of the House of Representatives as long as he has anything to say about it will be JOHN McCORMACK.

A THANKSGIVING TRIBUTE TO JOHN McCORMACK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished and beloved colleagues have somewhat preempted me by getting recognized ahead of me. I had hoped to be the first today to compliment our great Speaker upon the magnificent record he has made in the House. At this time I want to extend on my own behalf and on the behalf of all the Members of the House our best wishes to the greatest living legislator for a happy Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate and reemphasize that we on our side of the aisle join with the gentleman from Oklahoma in wishing for the Speaker a most happy and enjoyable Thanksgiving weekend. I do not think we can go quite as far as to say that the Speaker is our candidate for Speaker, but let me assure you that we join with all of you on your side of the aisle in saying that JOHN McCORMACK is one of the finest gentlemen who has ever served in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has our admiration and affection. We hope and trust that he continues this fine record

of service in the House of Representatives as long as the people from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts want him to continue to serve. Outside of the speakership, we hope that service will be indefinite.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, whether we measure the record of the distinguished Presiding Officer of this House of Representatives in terms of legislative accomplishments or on any other basis, we still know and appreciate him as one of the greatest Speakers of all time and as one of God's noblemen. No legislature body of national importance in the history of any country has produced more far-reaching legislation, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, than has been produced in this House under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, if we measured our Speaker by the yardstick of humanitarianism we would have to say that he is one of the kindest, most considerate men who ever lived. If we judged him by his conduct, both in public and in private life, we would all say that he is a practicing Christian and man of God.

Mr. Speaker, after wishing the best of the Thanksgiving season to the Speaker and Mrs. McCormack, I also desire to wish the best for all my colleagues who have worked so patiently and so hard with us through the hard and difficult months behind us.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, as Members of the House of Representatives realize and know that we are constantly in debate. Democrat against Republican, and liberal against conservative, trying by that means to determine the proper policy and the wisest course we should pursue in the development of a legislative program to improve the lot and better the lives of the American people.

However, there is one thing concerning which we never have need to debate, nor find it necessary to dispute—that is our unanimous and mutual devotion, love, and loyalty to this, the greatest republic mankind has ever known, the greatest democracy ever existing in the annals of the ages. In my judgment, William Jennings Bryan eloquently described it, when he said:

Behold a Republic increasing in wealth, in strength, in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of a universal brotherhood—a Republic whose history like the path of the just "is as a shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day."

Mr. Speaker, we have on this Thanksgiving Day every good reason to thank the Father and Creator of all for the rich privilege of being citizens of such a Republic. No man in all the world has the opportunities, the freedom, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as does the citizen of the United States of America. This Thanksgiving Day, in our prayers, we should thank God that the pioneers in the Colonies, so long ago, preserved and passed on to us a spiritual and religious heritage through which we know that there is a just God who presides over the fate of nations and the destiny of

mankind. We should thank our Father in Heaven that we are not bereft of belief in a divine Creator which is the unfortunate fate of the subjects of a Communist state. Mr. Speaker, on this Thanksgiving, we must be grateful to our Nation's forefathers who had the courage to fight and to die for individual liberty and freedom, for the establishment of a government founded and existing upon the broad base of the people's will. In my judgment, as long as the American people cling to those ideals, and preserve them in the hearts of the Nation, domestic wolves of discord nor foreign foes will ever prevail against this great Republic—the United States of America.

NE *file* MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, Ambassador Goldberg made a strong speech at a meeting of the U.N. Security Council on the Middle East situation. In this address Ambassador Goldberg reviewed our efforts to achieve peace, efforts which began even before the outbreak of hostilities last June. He set forth specific proposals which we hope, if adopted, will lead to a just and lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors. Because of the importance of the Goldberg speech, I have requested unanimous consent for it to be printed in the RECORD. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read this statement, which follows:

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 15, 1967

Inasmuch as the United States has tabled a resolution in this Council and since several delegations have commented on our resolution, it is only appropriate that I now reply to these comments.

More than six months ago, even before the fighting began last June, some governments represented in this Council, including my own, sought to avert the war and to begin to seek new ways to open at long last a road towards real, stable, enduring peace in that region which has known no peace—genuine peace—for a generation.

Mr. President, in this connection, there is one point of fact which must be set straight, as a result of comments that have been made in our present series of meetings. There have been truly Orwellian efforts by the communist members on this Council to rewrite history. And it is exceedingly ironic that those who charge the United States with delay have been from the very beginnings of this conflict the prime instruments of delay in our proceedings and of effective Security Council action.

A charge like this was made on the 13th of November by my friend, the distinguished representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Tarabanov. He said that the responsibility for delay in dealing with the matter before the conflict rests on governments, presumably including my own, because it was "they"—now I quote him—"who did not want to act in the matter."

Mr. President, how this can be said by my distinguished colleague is beyond me. It was he at the height of the crisis who said on May 24 when we in this Council pleaded the need for action—urgent action—that this would be—and I quote him—"an

exercise in futility". And then the Representative of Bulgaria went so far as to tell this Council that—and I quote him again—"we are not available for consultations on this draft resolution or on anything else that may be planned." That's the end of the quotation.

Similar efforts were made by the Soviet Representative who in a phrase well-remembered in this Council said that we were attempting to dramatize the situation.

The efforts of the United States throughout this crisis have been to prevent the conflict before it started, and after the conflict commenced, to bring it to a speedy end and to start the process of making peace in the area. I have only to refer you to the resolution offered by the United States on the 1st of June in which we proposed that—and I read:

"Noting that the Secretary General has in his report expressed the view that 'a peaceful outcome to the present crisis will depend upon a breathing spell which will allow tension to subside from its present explosive level', and that he therefore urged 'all the parties concerned to exercise special restraint, to forego belligerence and to avoid all other actions which could increase tension, to allow the Council to deal with the underlying causes of the present crisis and to seek solutions,'"

"1. Calls on all the parties concerned as a first step to comply with the Secretary General's appeal,

"2. Encourages the immediate pursuit of international diplomacy in the interests of pacifying the situation and seeking reasonable, peaceful and just solutions,

"3. Decides to keep the issue under urgent and continuous review so that the Council may determine what further steps it might take in the exercise of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security."

That resolution foundered on the opposition of those who now seek to ascribe responsibility for delay to others. And every member of this Council knows that when the conflict broke out on June 5 it was the United States along with some other members of the Council which were the principal proponents, initiators and supporters of action by this Council calling for an immediate cease-fire. Here, too, Mr. President, it was the opposition of certain members which made it impossible for the Council to act urgently and without debate in the interest of peace and stopping the fighting before it developed as it subsequently did.

Now, there were two opportunities before the Council at that time. One arose from an initiative by the Governments of Canada and Denmark, and that was to send a special representative to the area. And the other arose from the resolution that we offered.

I ask you, the members of the Council, to think of where we would be today had it, the Council, endorsed proposals made by Canada and Denmark, supported by the United States, in the interest of accelerating the peace-making process. We could have had a UN representative in the area since last June, working on the complicated task of restoring peace. Several precious months have been lost, and the question recurs—How much more time is to be wasted arguing over rhetoric when what is needed is reconciliation?

While there have been rumors spread in the corridors that the United States is now seeking delay, nothing could be farther from the truth. We have sought immediate action throughout, we seek immediate action today, and I mean action not words.

Mr. President, these are the facts. What we need is a truce in the Security Council against recrimination. And let us have an end to this ceaselessly repeated use of old and discredited charges to sow new hostility. As far as we are concerned, let there be no more delay. Let there be no more attempts to pervert this Council, this instrument of

peace, into a center of defamation and incendiary charges. For such abuse of the United Nations instrumentalities simply compounds the difficulties of the peace-making process which are already formidable enough.

I do not intend in this spirit to make any detailed reply, for example, to the statement made by the distinguished Representative of Syria. I have previously had occasion in this Council to state that the internal affairs of the United States, its leaders and its policies, are not the subject of legitimate comment by representatives in this Council. In no statement made by the United States during the many meetings of the past few months have we ever even commented on any utterances made by the leaders of Syria or attempted to characterize those utterances as has been done by the Representative of Syria with respect today to the political leaders of the United States. I do not intend to depart from this practice despite the provocation which has been offered. It is a legitimate matter of discussion in this Council to deal with the substance of the problem before us. A statement has been made by the Representative of Syria that the United States has been inconsistent in its positions with respect to the Middle East crisis. I have before me, Mr. President, a document which I shall make available to you, to the members of the Council, and to the representatives of the parties immediately concerned, containing every policy statement made by the United States since this crisis first broke out, before the conflict, during the Security Council considerations, and up to the present time. I am content to rest on the record of our statements which demonstrates that our statements have been consistent throughout. We adhere to the statements that have been made; we do not depart from them.

Illustrative of the double standard which the Representative of Syria applies in his discussion of the grave issues before us, is his reference to the arms situation. It is interesting that on commenting upon a recent decision of our Government to meet prior commitments with respect to military armaments, he does not refer to the fact that our decision was designed to meet commitments not only to the State of Israel but to several Arab countries. Nor does he talk about the outpouring of military armaments to the countries of the Middle East, including Syria, which has gone on for years and which continues to this day. If the Representative of Syria is genuinely interested in seeking limits placed on the wasteful and dangerous arms race, which has gone on in the Middle East for years, one would have expected him to express support for the idea contained in the draft resolution we have placed before the Council, which calls upon the Council to consider the necessity for limiting the wasteful and destructive arms race in the area. No such word of support was forthcoming.

Now, Mr. President, we don't need words of the character that have been uttered. The words that are now needed are words that clearly point to practical action for a just and durable peace that shall be fair and equitable to all parties. It is for such a peace that my delegation, despite all difficulties, continues to strive.

To this end, last month while the non-permanent members of the Council were actively seeking an acceptable formula for action by this Council, my delegation at the specific request of some of the parties concerned, deferred to their efforts. When their efforts did not succeed, you, Mr. President, quite appropriately in your capacity as President of the Security Council, and with the agreement of the non-permanent members, turned to the permanent members of the Council to ask that they join fully and actively in the search. My delegation responded promptly to your call, and as soon as possible formulated its concept of appropriate

and attainable Council action. And we so reported to you, Sir. On an urgent basis we likewise proceeded to discuss our concept with other members, permanent and non-permanent, and with the parties on both sides. We were guided throughout by certain axioms of negotiation—axioms which stemmed in part from the unanimous view that the Council should act under Chapter VI of the Charter.

First, only the parties themselves through mutual accommodation and compromise and peaceful means of their own choice, can make peace. An imposed peace, whether imposed by one side on the other or on both sides by any outside authority, including this Council, cannot endure.

Second, members of this Council, both individually and collectively, by virtue of their very great influence, individual or combined, and by virtue of the Council's responsibility under the Charter, can and must assist the process of accommodation between the parties.

Third, to serve this purpose, the Council must find a formula which will not prejudice the known positions of the parties of either side and which will not preclude the acceptance by either side of the assistance, encouragement, help and guidance the United Nations can properly offer.

Fourth, to arrive at such a formulation, it is essential that consultations be held with the parties on both sides, as well as with the members of the Council.

The process of consultations we had initiated had not run its course when the request for the convening of the Council made it necessary to circulate the product of our efforts on November 7. While we would have preferred to hold back our draft resolution until the final result of our consultations were in, I have no hesitation in stating that our draft resolution in our view is the only resolution now before the Council which conforms to the axioms set forth both in content and in the procedures used in drawing it up.

Moreover, even since its circulation, we have remained intensively engaged in the search for the right formula for Council action—"right" in terms of the balance it strikes between conflicting views and emotions, and in terms of the cooperation it will elicit from all involved in the peace-making process it would put in train. Even since the Council was convened, we have continued our efforts—and let me make explicitly clear that our interest is not in having an American label on the successful formula. If it would in any way facilitate the search we are all engaged in, that label can be rapidly dispensed with. Pride of authorship has no place in the serious business at hand.

Mr. President, in my statement on November 9, last Thursday, I pointed out that we of the United States have sought to stay within these requirements by basing the substance of our resolution on a set of principles: namely, the five principles enunciated by President Johnson in his address on June 19.

We did so as I pointed out not merely because our President had set them forth but because both parties had in various statements indicated that those principles were an acceptable basis for Security Council action. And I have not heard a repudiation on the part of those who have spoken that those principles still do not constitute an acceptable basis for progress in the interest of peace in the area.

I briefly recall those principles, namely:

1. the recognition of national life;
2. justice for the refugees;
3. innocent maritime passage;
4. limits on the arms race; and
5. political independence and territorial integrity for all.

We have sought to embody these five principles in our draft resolution in a way which

November 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 15781

would be fairly and prudently balanced, and would, as I have said, not prejudice the vital interests or the stated positions of either side. We have taken into account the known differences between the parties in regard both to the goals sought and to the means toward those goals. We have sought to develop and express, as well as we knew how, the maximum of common ground as a starting point for the peace-making process that should have commenced—with the blessing of this Council—months ago.

In my statement in the Council last Thursday I outlined the general considerations underlying this draft resolution. Let me now add certain specific comments on particular provisions in the hopes of clarifying their meaning and intent in light of the comments made with respect to these clauses in the course of our debate.

In paragraph 1, among the elements embraced in the concept of "a state of just and lasting peace," is "withdrawal of armed forces from occupied territories." Let me be quite clear about the meaning which we attach to this language. In the first place, it obviously refers and was always intended to refer to the armed forces of Israel; let me also state and make clear that this is completely on a par with the other essentials listed in the same statement: termination of claims or states of belligerence—which of course refers primarily to the Arab states. It also embraces a necessary ingredient for peace in the area: mutual termination by Israel and the Arab states of the state of war which unhappily still persists in the area and mutual recognition of, and respect for, the right of every state in the area to sovereign existence, territorial integrity, political independence, secure and recognized boundaries, and freedom from the threat or use of force.

Mr. President, we thought that this concept was very clear in the Resolution we offered but since doubts have been expressed on this point we have clarified them, I think explicitly, in our statements today.

Now, Mr. President, we believe that the language of paragraph 1 as stated in the Resolution and as amplified by me here today is both intrinsically sound and carefully balanced in what it requires of the respective parties. And I should like to repeat them for emphasis.

Israel must withdraw; the Arab States must renounce the state of belligerence and claim of belligerence which they have claimed for many years and the states on both sides must terminate the present state of War and must mutually recognize each other's rights, which are set forth explicitly in Article II of the Charter. And, lest there be any ambiguity, let me also make clear despite the references that have been made to this sentence that by the word "recognition" we do not mean diplomatic recognition, although we do not also mean to exclude it. This is a matter for the parties concerned to settle between themselves. We mean recognition of what the Charter provides—recognition of the sovereign existence of all nations to which all states in the area are committed by the Charter. We mean respect for the territorial integrity, political independence and freedom from the threat or use of force; and we mean that the parties should determine that in order to be free from the threat or use of force secure and recognized boundaries should be fixed.

Now I cannot emphasize too strongly that these principles are interdependent. There is nothing artificial about this interdependence; we did not manufacture it; it is in the nature of the situation and of the history of this conflict. To seek withdrawal without secure and recognized boundaries, for example, would be just as fruitless as to seek secure and recognized boundaries without withdrawal.

Historically, there have never been any secure or recognized boundaries in the area.

Neither the armistice lines of 1949 nor the cease-fire lines of 1967 have answered this description. The armistice agreements explicitly recognize the necessity to proceed to permanent peace, which necessarily entails the recognition of boundaries between the parties. Now, such boundaries have yet to be agreed upon—and agreement on this point is an absolute essential to a just and lasting peace, just as withdrawal is. Secure boundaries cannot be determined by force; they cannot be determined by unilateral action of any of the States; and they cannot be imposed from the outside. For history shows that imposed boundaries are not secure—that secure boundaries must be mutually worked out and recognized by the parties themselves, as part of the peacemaking process.

I would add one further observation as to timing. Clearly the timing of steps to be taken by the parties in fulfillment of the objectives set forth in the resolution we have tabled would need to be carefully worked out with the assistance of the Special Representative. It is not our conception that any one step or provision should be relegated to the end of the process.

In short, Mr. President, our resolution reflects the conviction that progress toward peace can only be made if there is a careful and just balance of obligations among the parties. Such a balance must take account of the just aspirations of all without harming the vital interest of any. It must recognize and seek to relieve the legitimate grievances of all without creating new grievances for any. It must be a balance which all will have a strong interest in maintaining. Only thus can it provide the foundation for a durable peace.

Let me turn briefly to paragraph 2 of the resolution since I have been speaking of paragraph 1. In our view the provisions of this paragraph are no less vital to a durable solution than those of paragraph 1. Those relating to guarantees for freedom of navigation for all nations through international waterways in the area and to the refugee problem deal with grievances of the first order of importance which clearly could not be left out of a peace settlement. The other two provisions are designed chiefly to ensure that a peace settlement shall be, as it clearly must be, insulated from violence and from excessive competition in the means of violence.

As to freedom of navigation in international waterways for all nations it is a matter of historical record that the principal factor which precipitated the conflict in early June was the UAR decision not to permit ships of all states to pass through the Straits of Tiran with equal freedom. It has been a plain fact of life that a return to peace will require guarantees concerning freedom of navigation in the Straits as well as in the Suez Canal for their closure has been inconsistent with the state of peace that has been recognized by past decisions of this Council.

I should like also to comment on the refugee problem, for it is far more than merely a political grievance. It is a profoundly humanitarian problem, and it must at long last be solved. Those who are homeless or displaced because of both the recent and the previous conflicts have a desperate need for help and for justice. The nations of the area, with the help of the world community, must act with new determination and new energy to achieve that end. And in the solution of the problem my Government is prepared to do its share and to do more than its share just as throughout the years it has been doing in relieving the distress of the refugees in the area.

But it is not merely continuance of temporary relief, to which we have largely contributed, that is needed. More than ever before this problem cries out for a permanent and a humane solution. Such a solution

must be a part of the framework of the peace settlement. The needs of the refugees and the needs of peace in the Middle East are not in conflict; they are inseparable from each other. They must be attended to together. Freedom of navigation in international waterways and the needs of peace in the Middle East are not in conflict; they are inseparable from each other. They must be attended to together.

Such, Mr. President, are my main comments concerning the provision of the United States draft resolution. Before concluding, let me only add three general observations which I hope may prove constructive.

First, an observation about the Special Representative and his role. I have no hesitation in saying that the key provision in the entire Resolution is the appointment of the Special Representative. The principles in paragraph 1 will be useful only to the extent that they may help him in working out with the parties solutions that will lead to a just and lasting peace in the area.

I have already mentioned that six months ago a resolution was introduced by Canada and Denmark in the Council asking the Secretary General to seek solutions of the dangerous tensions then prevailing. It was a good resolution. It was criticized at the time because it contained no detailed principles to guide the Secretary General.

Now, let us look back upon the history in this particular area. We may well recall the resolutions of the Security Council under which the Armistice Agreements of 1949 were negotiated by Dr. Bunche—agreements which, despite the later tragic course of events, helped at that time to stop war. But these resolutions likewise contained no detailed principles to guide the negotiations.

Our Resolution goes far beyond the resolutions of the Security Council under which Dr. Bunche so successfully operated. Our Resolution proposes a far more specific mandate. But, it seems to us that what is far more important than a list of written principles is the existence on both sides of a sufficient practical will to make peace. The peacemaking process is not quick or easy. Nor is it a kind of magic which enables each side to realize its maximum demands. The only magic in peacemaking is the awareness of each side that the benefits of peace and tranquility are valuable enough to justify very great efforts in search of it, and acceptance of compromise and accommodation by both sides on the actual terms. And, Mr. President, the terms cannot be spelled out in advance. They must be spelled out on the ground.

The crucial role which the Special Representative can play is to foster on both sides the frame of mind essential to peacemaking—the pragmatic will to peace which can face and overcome the undeniable difficulties in defining mutually acceptable terms.

Mr. President, greater and more complicated conflicts even than this grave and complicated conflict have been resolved at the peace table. Peace is indeed difficult, but it is not impossible where a genuine will exists on both sides—and where the necessary support and encouragement are afforded by third parties, including this great Organization.

This leads me to my second major observation. In our consultations on possible action by the Security Council, the question we encountered most frequently from the parties concerned on both sides, was not about any particular provision of a proposed resolution, but rather about what the United States would be prepared to do in the interest of bringing about peace in the area. Would the United States—it has been put to me very explicitly—place its influence and political support behind a just and durable peace in the area, and the steps necessary to achieve such a peace?

Let me give here in public, in this Council, the same answer we have given in private

to this question. We are committed to the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the area. From this commitment there flows a willingness to do our full share toward achieving that goal. As President Johnson said on June 19:

"I offer assurance to all that this Government of ours, the Government of the United States, will do its part for peace in every forum, at every level, at every hour."

On behalf of my Government, I now renew the pledge I made to the Council and to the parties themselves when I introduced the United States draft resolution on November 9. Under the terms of that resolution—and this includes every portion of the text—the United States could and will exert its full diplomatic and political influences in support of the efforts of the United Nations representative to achieve a fair and equitable settlement.

Finally, Mr. President, I would stress once again the spirit in which the United States will approach the question of peace in the Middle East. As the President of the United States emphasized at the very outset of the crisis last May, "The United States has consistently sought to have good relations with all the states of the Middle East." And he added this has not always been possible, and indeed it has not proved to be possible even to this day. But today, six months later, our resolve to seek such good relations remains undimmed, despite the tragic events of June and all that has taken place in the aftermath.

We are well aware that neither side in the dispute—judging by their expressions in and out of this Council—is likely to be well pleased with all aspects of our position. But this is inevitable considering that they are the parties involved. And for us it is a small price to pay if we can thereby contribute to the progress toward peace which the peoples of the Middle East and indeed, all the world so sadly need.

PRESIDENT PLEDGES AID TO AMERICAN FARMERS IN REMARKS TO NATIONAL GRANGE

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message to the National Grange Convention demonstrates the depth of his administration's desire to improve the lot of the American farmer.

As the President noted, we owe much to the hard-working farmers of America:

They have made us the best-fed people in the history of the world at a cost the average citizen could easily afford.

They have provided food and fiber for our Nation and its allies during time of international conflict and world war.

And their crop has fed hungry millions the world over.

Yet, while the farmer has given much to his Nation, we have returned too little to him. As the President made clear to the National Grange, he has committed himself to end generations of deprivation and give American farmers their just reward.

The Johnson administration has seen its farm program pay rewarding dividends. Farm income has risen over 50 percent since 1960, costly surpluses have been reduced, and the resources of the Federal Government have been marshaled to insure increased prosperity for every farmer in America.

The President has pledged "to preserve a good healthy condition for the American farmer." A grateful Nation must do no less for those who have bestowed the bounty of their labor at our doorsteps.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the President's remarks to the National Grange convention:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL GRANGE CONVENTION, BY TELEPHONE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

I am pleased and honored to be privileged to take part in your Centennial convention.

Your organization has a great leader—my close friend, Herschel Newsom. It does not matter whether the issue is our commitment in Vietnam, a tax increase to head off costly tax inflation, or import quotas that threaten our agricultural exports—Herschel Newsom and the great National Grange organization have always chosen the course of responsibility. And for this I am profoundly grateful.

This has been the history of the Grange through all its hundred years of responsible citizenship, of constructive, affirmative leadership. The Grange belongs to the class of people I call builders in America. It is easy enough to complain and be critical of what others do, especially with the benefit of hindsight. It's much more difficult to help find a true course through all the problems that beset us. The Grange has traditionally sought to attain its ends through the vigorous pursuit of affirmative goals. In fact, it has been my observation that you have always been so busy building, you have not had much time to waste on quarreling with those whose stock in trade seems to be hating and tearing down. Yours is the blessed way—and the world is far better for having people like you among us.

I like to think that you and I have many things in common—a love of the soil and the open sky, an urge to make things grow, a fascination of the challenge of wind and weather, a spiritual sustenance from the wonders of nature as they are revealed to us upon our farms. I must confess that I envy you—and at some times more than others—because you can spend more time on your farms than I can spend on mine. At least, that's the way it is just now.

Another thing we have in common is a concern about farm income, and my concern about that is perhaps even greater than yours; because as President I cannot help but be deeply concerned about the millions of people on farms who are not able to earn a decent living. I'm glad to be able to say I believe this situation should be improved and I hope is improving, but it is not improving fast enough.

We all know the pattern of the continuing revolution in American agriculture—a technological revolution—where the ability to produce continues to out run our ability to consume. It has been this way most of the time for more than forty years. The result has been all too often depressed prices and financial distress. No way has been found to cope with this problem except through programs of the Federal Government.

Some of you are old enough to remember, as I remember, the long, hard fight it took to gain acceptance of this Federal responsibility. Indeed, there are those in our country today who don't accept this as a Federal responsibility even yet—and there are far too many that wish we had no Federal farm program of any kind.

I wish it to be clear that I fully accept the Federal responsibility to help maintain farm income at reasonable and stable levels. The Federal Government cannot do the whole job. The farmer must do his part. But the programs required are of such large size that they cannot be successfully operated unless the strong Federal Government makes available the machinery through which the farmers can operate the programs.

Having accepted this responsibility, how well have we done in meeting it? Not nearly as well as I would like—because the average farmer still finds himself earning only two-thirds as much as city people earn. And many of you know from your own experience that it is still quite a struggle to make ends meet—to keep expenses from outrunning income. Yet the record shows creditable progress.

Average net income per farm in 1967 is running 56 percent above 1960. It is somewhat less than in 1966 when net income per farm reached an all-time high in our nation's history, and this setback is disappointing to all of us. I hope and believe that this setback is only temporary. I shall do my best to make it temporary and hope you will help me in that effort.

The record since 1960 does prove that progress can be made—that surpluses can be eliminated—that farm income can be increased. But this progress can be continued only if our programs are continued. These programs are under constant daily attack. In the present Congress, no less than 21 bills have been introduced that would kill, that would terminate existing farm programs. I shall be counting upon your strong support to see that these attacks do not prevail. I want you to keep the farmers in business—at least until I can join you full-time.

I am proud of what you are doing to make America strong and to feed the hungry people of the world. This country owes a lot to the farmer:

American agriculture is the envy of all nations.

You have provided food and fiber to this nation and to its allies through world war and international conflict.

You have saved the lives of millions around the world who would have starved in the absence of American food aid.

You have made Americans the healthiest, best-fed people in the history of the world and you have done it at a cost that the average person could easily afford.

You have provided the largest single contribution to world trade of any single segment of our economy.

I point these things out so that you know that we care about you and what happens to you. At the same time I salute you for these accomplishments and I thank you for all that you have done.

Most of all I ask your continued help in the tasks that lie ahead in the job that all of us have to do—a job that will give us better prices and better income, that will try to hold our costs where people can have an incentive to stay on the farm.

Our biggest problem today is that people have left the farms to go to the cities without any skills to use in the cities, and we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars trying to deal with that problem. How happier we would probably all be if we could have spent the money in preventive medicine before they left the farm.

So I am going to be here trying to correct some of the mistakes that have been made. I am going to be here trying to preserve our farm program and to preserve a good healthy condition for the American farmer. With your help and with your support I believe we can succeed.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN GOOD WILL TOUR TO WASHINGTON, D.C., AND ALEXANDRIA, VA.

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, it was my

November 22, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 17013

(MG-95), Fort Lavaca-Calhoun County Health Unit, 131 Hospital Street, Fort Lavaca, Texas.

A, B—Dr. John R. Copenhaver, M.D., Director, Cameron County Migrant Health Project (MG-97), Cameron County Health Department, 186 North Sam Houston Boulevard, San Benito, Texas 78586.

A, B—Hon. Tom H. Neely, Director, Hudspeth County-Dell City Migrant, Hudspeth County Commissioners' Court, Hudspeth County Court House, Sierra Blanca, Texas.

A, B—H. A. Rickels, Director, Spurdickens County Health Service Project (MG-110), Spur City Aldermen, City, Post Office Box 356, Spur, Texas.

A, B—B. Oliver Lewis, M.D., Director, Southwestern Texas Health Department Migrant Project (MG-44), Southwestern Texas Health Department, Headquarters, Post Office Box 517, Uvalde, Texas.

A, B—Pedro Ramirez, Jr., Director, Zapata County Migrant Health Project (MG-100), Zapata County Commissioners' Court, Post Office Box 272, Zapata, Texas.

UTAH

A, B—Robert W. Sherwood, M.D., Director, Utah Migrant Health Service (MG-98), Utah State Department of Health, 44 Medical Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah 84113.

VIRGINIA

A, B—J. B. Kenley, M.D., Director, Migrant Health Project—Virginia (MG-41), Division of Local Health Services, State Department of Health, Richmond, Virginia.

WASHINGTON

A, B—Dr. Phillip Jones, Director, Whatcom County Migrant Health Program (MG-132), Bellingham-Whatcom County District Health Department, 509 Girard Street, Bellingham, Washington 98225.

A, B—Ernest Kredel, M.D., Director, Health Services for Migrant Workers in Puyallup-Stuck Valley (MG-19), Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department, 649 County-City Building, Tacoma, Washington 98402.

WEST VIRGINIA

A, B—R. C. Hood, M.D., Director, Migrant Health Project (MG-123), Berkeley-Morgan County Health Department, 209 East King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia.

WISCONSIN

A, B—Mrs. Clayton S. Mills, Director, Migrant Medical Aid Program (MG-75), Catholic Diocese of Madison, Guadalupe House, Elm Acre, Endeavor, Wisconsin 53939.

A—Mrs. Al Lambrecht, Director, St. Joseph Migrant Family Health Clinic (MG-129), St. Joseph Hospital, 707 South University Avenue, Beaver Dam, Wisconsin 53916.

A—Mrs. Mary Ann Minorik, Director, Waushara County (Wisconsin) Migrant Health Clinic (MG-130), Waushara County Committee for Economic Opportunity, Box 310, Wautoma, Wisconsin.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at present only an estimated one-fourth of the total migrant population has access to Migrant Health Act project services. There is, therefore, an urgent need for increased Federal appropriations if we are to provide for the expansion of present project services to provide adequate coverage for the migrant worker and his family. Such expansion will add to the value of diagnostic service now offered and will make possible the funding of new projects where they are needed now. An increased number of health projects, both in home-base areas and in communities along the migrant stream, are needed so that the

migrant family will have the opportunity for uninterrupted clinical service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2688) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act for migrant health services, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2661) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added to my bill (S. 2147) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, this brings to 25 the number of our colleagues that have joined me in cosponsoring this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the names of all the Senators joining me in sponsoring S. 2147 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

The names of the Senators cosponsoring S. 2147 are as follows:

Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BENNETT, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BROOKE, BYRD of West Virginia, CLARK, COOPER, FONG, HART, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MCGEE, MONDALE, MONRONEY, MORSE, MOSS, SMITH, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

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

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

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

Poem entitled "And in Them, God," written by Earl Wayland Bowman.

NE files
TOWARD A LASTING PEACE IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the world cannot allow another outbreak of conflict in the Near East. Three times in the past generation, Israel and the Arab nations have gone to war. Each time the issue has turned on the survival of one people as a nation. Each time the weaponry has been more sophisticated and deadly, the cataclysm more horrendous. Each time we have called on the United Nations to achieve settlement. And each time, so far, we have failed to achieve a lasting peace.

The next time, and God forbid that it should come to pass, the antagonists will probably have missiles, maybe with nuclear warheads. The instruments of war have been improved—if that is the word—to kill more people with greater rapidity, as they have become more easily available and far easier to operate. The pushbutton generation of nuclear missiles is not far away. Any nation, regardless of its technical ability, will be able to train a man to pull a lever, once a helpful technician from some "advanced country" like the Soviet Union, has tuned the guidance system, armed the warhead and aimed the missile toward the enemy nearby or far away.

Next time, Mr. President, it will be too late. The time is approaching when the fate of the entire world will depend on keeping perennial trouble spots like the Near and Far East from coming to the flashpoint. We now have an opportunity to reach a settlement in the Near East. There at last appears some disposition on the part of the nations of the Eastern Mediterranean to recognize the danger and to seek peace. Moreover, the long experience of the United Nations together with the clear interest of the majority of the world powers in avoiding conflict over the holy land are clear and positive factors.

In the past month, in the course of speaking engagements in the State of California, I have attempted to outline what I believe to be the essential guidelines of settlement. Two elements are clearly necessary. First, a series of agreements providing for diplomatic recognition, defensible frontiers, commercial and cultural relations between Arabs and Israelis, as well as free use of international waterways and, hopefully, cooperation toward economic development. Second, a system of guaranteeing through timely use of neutral force, those agreements, once reached.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two speeches which I recently gave in California outlining these pro-

posals be placed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Record.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me state briefly what I propose. The settlement between the peoples of Israel and the Arab nations must take full advantage of the historic, geographic and spiritually strategic position of the holy city of Jerusalem. The city must continue to remain united as the capital of Israel, providing through international agreement on administration of the holy places, a center of world harmony for all who honor that hallowed ground. Jerusalem offers today, as it did in the time of Our Savior, a unique meeting place for the commerce and culture of Palestine and of the entire eastern Mediterranean. It could provide, by means of a customs-free access to the sea, an open door for Arab commerce, and a meeting point to exchange ideas of all kinds, technical, political and artistic. Reunited and flourishing, it would draw visitors and revenue from the entire Western World.

Any agreement on territory, whatever it may be, will require for some years to come the guarantee of a neutralizing force to prevent major border clashes to assure one side against attack from the other. Decades of hostility will not pass overnight. There is need for a friendly policeman. I suggest it is high time for the creation of an international peacekeeping force under the United Nations to meet this need. Using the increasingly powerful observation capabilities of an artificial satellite this force could gain ample warning of large-scale troop movements. With airborne troops provided by acceptable donors, such a force, under U.N. command, could be based at a nearby, neutral point, like the island of Cyprus where their very presence would be an added boon to stability.

These suggestions might seem fanciful to those who continue to do their thinking in yesterday's world. But tomorrow is too soon and too frightening for our great Nation not to dare to contrive the necessary devices of peace among men. The holy land is the place to start.

EXHIBIT 1

THE VISION OF HOPE: A NEW JERUSALEM

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Professors & Finance Group of the City of Hope, Beverly Hilton Hotel, Beverly Hills, Calif., October 22, 1967)

I deem it a great honor to be here this evening. I share your deep concern for the human condition, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak briefly with you about the hopes and fears of our world in this era of exploding change and of almost constantly expanding horizons. The persistent advance of the City of Hope, reaching out to increasing numbers of men and women in Southern California, and throughout the world, is testimony of the indomitable good will of its membership and of your determination to put scientific achievement at the service of mankind. Your insistence on the sanctity of the individual, his right to life and freedom, to dignity and to equal treatment, bespeaks the very heart of the American philosophy. The City of Hope has opened its doors to all, regardless of creed,

status, origin or pocket book. Your determination to deal equally with rich and poor, the humble and the high, fully expresses the best teachings of our common culture.

The selfless human effort, exemplifies a kind of wisdom that is all too rare in our society today. You dare to hope, when many others, out of fear and cynicism, have despaired.

I have read with deep interest of the achievements of the City of Hope in developing chemical agents which will help in the treatment of epilepsy and other convulsant diseases. These discoveries resulted, in part, from unrelated research connected with protection of workers in our aerospace industry. It is an exciting example of human ingenuity profiting from the increasing interplay among the growing scientific community here in California. It demonstrates in real terms, what we all feel to be true, that, here in our State, the phenomenal growth of human knowledge has put us at the frontier of the modern world. Men and women in California are meeting challenges and finding opportunities which other societies will not experience for years to come. What we do here will have a critical impact on the future of all mankind.

Through its contributions in mass communications, in motion pictures, radio and television, California has changed thought patterns throughout the world. So, too, will its advances in electronics, aero-space, high-energy physics, and medical science. I am proud that the human dimension, as shown in institutions like that which we honor tonight, has been given due emphasis. Never before have men held so much power over nature. This is an awesome force, and we must bring it out of the shadow of fear into the light of human progress. You are not going to stop progress—or change—for that matter. Science is going to continue unlocking doors and making great new discoveries, and the rest of us had better get along with the growing need to improve ourselves and strengthen whatever virtues the human race has been able tenuously to acquire. For all the newly found powers over nature—for good or for evil—are going to be in human hands to utilize.

The work on epilepsy underscores an essential point—advance in the modern world is a product of many minds, many views, and many elements of knowledge all working together in common service to mankind. This joining together of thought in free association is the bedrock of our American system, of our democracy.

Our own traditions of behavior drawn from the teachings of many great religions have helped to build a peculiarly American sense of common values, of individual dignity, human rights, free give and take and fair play. These are a product of our Judeo-Christian culture. They are enshrined in our proudest national documents—in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, in the Biblical cadence of Lincoln at Gettysburg. These origins are distant. They reach to the source of what we call Western civilization. They trace back to the stone passages, the Temple walls, the aged olive trees of the still-living, sacred city of Jerusalem.

Last fall, together with my wife and other members of the American delegation to the 1966 session of the Interparliamentary Union in Teheran, I wandered through the teeming, timeless streets of the Old City. I paused, in awe, and for a long time, in the Dome of the Rock, where we are told Abraham brought his son Isaac for sacrifice to the Lord. No American with any sense of history can escape the overwhelming vision of human struggle and aspiration and the inspiring faith in a Supreme Being which remains palpably etched in the ancient stones and holy sites which remain. Our common culture, though drawn from many parts, has a central origin in the teachings of this great mystical, ancient city.

Jerusalem was divided when I visited there. It is not divided today. It must now, I think, remain united—united not merely as the capital of a thriving state of Israel, but as a living joyous center for the celebration of harmony in our Western world. Jerusalem remains the city of hope for Christian, Muslim and Jew. Its division has been, for the past 19 years, a symbol of despair for the establishment of peace on this earth. Its unity now ought to give rise to new possibilities for brotherhood. We all have a stake in that cause.

As a member of the United States Senate and an American, I strongly believe that the continued unification of Jerusalem, both as the capital of Israel and as a world religious center, must be a cardinal objective of the foreign policy of the United States. On June 5, 1967, I was the first member of the Senate in those first anxious hours of this summer's conflict to address the Chamber and call for a settlement recognizing Israel's right to live in peace and freedom. And I pointed out shortly thereafter that any such settlement must recognize the Israeli claim to a unified Jerusalem as its capital.

Reunited, Jerusalem is now, as it was in the time of David, the key to stability in the Holy Land. It lies athwart the rugged Judean hills between the fertile Plain of Sharon and the Valley of the Jordan. Since earliest times, it has stood astride major trade routes to the Arabian hinterland. It has been a meeting ground for the peoples of Palestine. But for the past two decades, it has, alas, represented cleavage and hostility. It is therefore today a proper place to begin to repair the peace of the Near East—to remove that area from conflict between East and West.

For reasons not readily apparent, there has been little definition in America's policy in the Near East. America has, to a large extent, carried water on both shoulders in what Administration leaders have called an "even-handed policy".

The job of a great world power is not to play cat and mouse with the destiny of peoples. The recent conflict has shown that the people of the United States believe overwhelmingly that they have a direct commitment to the safety, integrity and prosperity of the people of Israel. In my opinion, the United States has erred in trying to conceal that point from the Arab nations, friendly or otherwise. We have permitted the so-called Palestine problem to move us, rather than striking the firm position, which the people of the United States insist we take. This has been no service to our diplomacy, to Israel, or even to our few remaining Arab friends. We have, by our unwillingness or our hesitation to proclaim our stand, given unwitting cause to continued Arab emotionalism and hostility.

The time has surely come to make our position unmistakably clear. This is not to imply that America has no role to play among the Arab peoples, nor that they should be abandoned to the socialist camp. In the long run, nothing would be more harmful to the interests of Israel, the United States, and of world peace. Despite the shrill propaganda of some of their leaders, there are some realists in the Arab world. It is to our benefit to encourage them and to bring them to the negotiating table, and most important, to seek assiduously to bring their peoples together with the people of Israel in mutual understanding.

In this cause, the city of Jerusalem will again play a major role. It occupies once again a strategic crossroad. In this Holy City we all have a continuing concern, as communicants and seekers of truth. The Israeli government has announced its interest in working with the Vatican on administration of the Holy Places. It has already signified that it will adhere to its longstanding policy of placing them under international control.

An avowed and accepted international in-

terest in Jerusalem would make it a drawing point for peoples all over the world. The benefits to be derived from this would redound to the whole region. Even before the conflict of last June, the anemic economy of Jordan had learned to profit from the tourist trade, and had done so despite the ridiculous rigamarole associated with the Mandelbaum Gate—now, thankfully, passed into history. With the free movement of people which a real peace would bring to the Near East, that traffic would increase many times. Certainly, there is no question that under the present arrangement more people will be able to visit the Holy Shrines than ever before. An intelligent policy on the part of Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon, if that is not too ephemeral to contemplate, would extend those benefits to the entire Eastern Mediterranean.

But it is not simply a tourist economy that would flourish after a true peace in the Holy Land. Large sections of the Arab world, particularly Jordan and Southern Syria, have been closed off from access to the sea. This folly of Arab intransigence has diverted large quantities of trade through the Port of Beirut which ordinarily would have passed through Haifa, Gaza, and Jaffa. It would be to the advantage of all residents of the Holy Land to establish a free market to Jerusalem for Arab produce, both agricultural products and handicrafts. This would provide immediate advantages of a greater market to both sides. Combined with free access to the sea and a customs zone at one of Israel's teeming ports, the Arab hinterland would find a strong pull of self-interest toward continued peace and understanding with the people of Israel.

I have long believed that the self-interest of the peoples of the Near East was the principal force that would bring them together in the peaceful existence which we all devoutly desire. Arab produce has an ample market in the growing industrial economy of Israel. Israeli technology has much to offer the Arabs. Such an exchange, incidentally, would redound to the great advantage of the United States. It would not only reduce the need for aid grants but would provide Arab development on a long run, self-sustaining basis. Some years ago it was the claim of Tel Aviv that it had more doctors per capita than any other city on earth. No similar statistics come readily to hand from Amman or Jedda, but is evident that the situation is far from the same. Indeed, the Arab need for modern knowledge can be nowhere better filled than by a people whose homage to human wisdom is second to none.

As a Californian, and ranking Republican member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am particularly intrigued by the possibilities of the Eisenhower plan for joint development through nuclear energy of the water resources of the area. Religious, racial, and national conflicts in the Middle East are, themselves, a symptom of the staggering difficulties of life in a harsh, desolate and arid portion of the world.

More than ten years ago, President Eisenhower determined to help alleviate these frightful shortages of food and water. He sent his personal emissary, Eric Johnston, to the area to try to bring the Arabs and the Israelis into agreement on a comprehensive plan for the development and allocation of the waters of the Jordan River. Regrettably, that effort failed, but the idea of cooperative water resource development in the Middle East did not die.

This summer, former President Eisenhower and his Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, proposed a daring new approach to bring water to the Middle East. The Eisenhower-Strauss proposal would locate three massive dual-purpose nuclear powered desalting and electric

power generating plants in the Middle East. Two plants would be located on the Mediterranean coast of Israel, the other at the northern end of the Gulf of Aqaba in Jordan or Israel.

Earlier this year, both Houses of the Congress approved, and the President signed into law, my bill to allow the Department of the Interior to participate financially in the construction of a 150 million gallon per day desalting plant off the coast of Orange County in Southern California. The Orange County plant is about fifty times larger than any desalting plant operating in the world today.

The first stage of the bold Eisenhower-Strauss proposal will be a 450 million gallon per day plant; three times larger than the one authorized for Orange County. This first plant would produce electric power far in excess of the present needs, but industry and prosperity would quickly follow the availability of abundant water and power.

Technical problems undoubtedly exist, but they should not bar a serious attempt to implement the Eisenhower-Strauss proposal. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee now has pending before it a resolution, of which I am a co-author, to put this plan into action. The Eisenhower-Strauss plan would provide jobs for refugees, would increase the productivity of desert wastelands, and would give Israel and the Arab governments a common basis for cooperation.

Indeed, the possibilities for future development of what once a wandering people called the Land of Milk and Honey are almost boundless. As we who live in the equable, but semi-arid, climes of Southern California know, the soil can produce unbelievably, once water is available. All of this requires cooperation and understanding, trust and comprehension. It cannot be done without establishing a deep conviction that the long run interests of Arabs and Jews in the Near East are joined and not antagonistic.

In the effort to achieve understanding the arrangements for Jerusalem are absolutely crucial. To each religion Holy Places of the other are sacred. In Hebron the tombs of Abraham and Isaac are sealed, in the custom of the Muslim tradition. They are patriarchs to Islam as well as to Jews and Christians. At least four Christian churches claim dominion over the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. The rock where Abraham offered to sacrifice Isaac is part of the Mosque of Omar. There are now differences of opinion over the administration of the Wailing Wall. Any one of these problems would be a political hot potato of the first magnitude in our country. The Government of Israel will need help in meeting each problem, and, probably would seek broad support for the administration of these areas. Certainly, it has given every indication that this will be the case.

The peace and security of Israel must remain a major concern of America and her people. In Jerusalem, and its great treasures of history, lies the Holy Grail of this noble cause. If men of all faiths are able to pray together in Jerusalem again, the city will inevitably become the center of understanding in the Near East. With wisdom, foresight and courage, that understanding may bring the peace men have long been seeking, not merely for Israel, but for all the world.

THE PROGRESS OF HUMAN BROTHERHOOD IN THE LAST HALF CENTURY

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Israel Bonds Organization, northern California area, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., November 5, 1967)

I am deeply honored to accept this high award bearing the name of a great American humanitarian and statesman. The late Herbert Lehman was my friend and colleague. His wit, intelligence and warmth live on and they occupy a special place in my memory. He will long be honored in the history of our

country as a crusading Governor of the Empire State, a guiding spirit in the worldwide effort to rebuild devastated Europe at the close of the Second World War, and an undaunted and outspoken member of the United States Senate.

Herbert Lehman was well ahead of his time. He saw the needs of the human heart and the human spirit as the aftermath of global conflict ushered us into a startling new era. Together we served in the United States Senate and fought side by side in many battles where the rights of people were involved, battles to achieve equality of opportunity for all, battles against disease, battles to bring our national resources to bear on the problems of the aging and the aged. He will long be remembered for his deep interest in eradicating the scourge of infantile paralysis from our society. A dozen years ago, he authored the Senate Resolution providing the means by which the Salk vaccine was made available to the people of our nation. And close to his heart, as an American, he was earnestly devoted to the cause of a free and flourishing state of Israel. His was a concern for people, for justice, and for the right.

My fellow Americans, in the past 50 years the earth on which we live has witnessed vast and unbelievable change. There has been a quantum jump in the problems of the human race, including the very problem of survival. Unfortunately, the countervailing increase in added wisdom or new devices to deal with them has not kept pace. Alas, human virtue does not grow as fast as scientific discovery. But we have learned much from men like Herbert Lehman. Our experience has shown us clearly that free nations need each other, that we progress when we act in concert. Conversely, we fall when we seek to withdraw in isolation. For the days of isolation, of living alone on this globe, are gone.

In my early days in the Senate, Herbert Lehman and I served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was added evidence of his interest in conservation, for he was, indeed, an ardent conservationist. He was keenly devoted to the preservation of the resources of this country and of our great natural and aesthetic treasures. My theme tonight concerns the progress of the past half century. There are many important milestones. Next year California will be celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Save-the-Redwoods League, which brought forth the concept of preserving our majestic groves through private philanthropy. Herbert Lehman staunchly believed in these labors. Were he alive today, he would count as one of the achievements of this year, 1967, the progress made in the Senate, when, last week it overwhelmingly adopted an excellent piece of legislation, from his Interior Committee, establishing a Redwood National Park in Northern California.

This is one of the hopeful signs. The redwoods share with the ancient olive trees of Jerusalem the unique and moving distinction of continuing their existence through all of the past two thousand years, since the time when leaders of the Roman Empire caused the most cruel dispersion of the peoples of Palestine. Through all of the tempestuous, intervening centuries, the trees in Gethsemane and here in California have stood as living sentinels of hope for better times, and for a deeper appreciation of the miracle of Creation and of eternity, and for the resurrection of the good name and good deeds of the children of the Lord.

I recall one more half-century celebration. Fifty years ago, on November 2, 1917, the leaders of another far-flung empire proclaimed in a now historic document that it "viewed with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." The Balfour Declaration bore witness to a growing conviction in the Western

world that the return of the peoples of Israel to their home in the Holy Land was an article of deep and abiding faith, and an essential element in human progress.

The American people have wholeheartedly supported this movement. In 1891, President Benjamin Harrison received a memorial calling for the creation of the new Israel. In 1922, the Congress of the United States adopted a resolution introduced by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., of Massachusetts favoring "the establishment in Palestine of the national home for the Jewish people." In 1944, my own Republican party and the Democratic party incorporated this goal in their national platforms. This has been a bipartisan cause of all of the people, and shall so remain.

The State of Israel was formed in the aftermath of one of the bitterest conflicts in human history. The world has not yet been able to comprehend the full horror of the sufferings of the Jewish people of Europe. The creation of Israel was an act of atonement by those who would build a new world, hopefully created on the principles of equality, brotherhood and the noble freedoms which are at least designed to set man apart from beast, and to give him the chance to vindicate his creation in the image of the Lord. Our relationship to the people of Israel has a deep meaning in the American spirit. The Psalm states:

"Except the Lord build the house,
They labor in vain that build it.
Except the Lord keep the city,
The watchman waketh but in vain."

So, too, my fellow citizens, it is with the world. The resolutions of the problems of the human race are far more of the spirit than of the flesh. The peace of this earth is ultimately dependent on the divine hope of brotherhood and on its extension as a working principle in the behavior of nation states.

The last 50 years have not all been marked by progress in this quest. The vast surface of Eurasia has been the host of a new doctrine and materialistic view of life discounting the force of human initiative, mocking the spirit of equality, and destroying brotherhood among peoples who have long sought freedom. This is the 50th year of the creation of the Soviet Union. There is no freedom for the Jews of that nation today—nor has there even been—for those who in past years have given so much for their motherland. Their religious observances are stifled by administrative decree, and their hope to return to the land of their forefathers has been systematically frustrated and betrayed.

I am not here this evening to exercise the spectre of atheistic Communism. But, I must state frankly, that those who live on this side of the world need to look to friends and to allies not only for mutual protection, but for the necessary energies and inspiration to achieve at least a rudimentary system of world security. This would must be made not only of firmness and conviction, but of compassion and understanding. At the end of the Second World War, when the human race had been horrified by the ravages of global conflict, there arose like a phoenix from the ashes, a bright new confidence that peoples could join together in reason and, using the processes of debate and deliberation, amicably settle their differences. Here in the City of San Francisco, this hope gave rise to the Charter of the United Nations. But that great "Town Meeting of the World" was not enough. I am a devoted supporter of the United Nations, but the miracles we hoped it might achieve did not come to pass. The need for collective security among free nations soon called forth the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a military defensive system against potential Soviet aggression. A new chapter in American foreign policy

began to unfold. For the first time in our history, we began to agree, in advance, to come to the aid of a friend. Other agreements were later made across the globe. These arrangements were not only military; they sought to find a basis for arms control agreements, and to advance the cause of peace through economic development, in a lasting solution of the age-old ills of pestilence, famine, and forlorn poverty.

This, too, was a bipartisan effort. I recall with great pride one of my illustrious predecessors, Senator Arthur Vandenberg from Michigan, who spoke out two decades ago to bring to our country a clear understanding that there must be an interdependence among free peoples, that the United States could not—cannot—"go it alone." But the great hopes for world-wide security, so bright in the aftermath of the Second World War under men like Winston Churchill, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy, have paled into disillusionment. France's De Gaulle, Egypt's Nasser, and other narrow nationalists, refuse to accept the principle that one people's freedom is in pawn to another's safety.

In this nuclear age no one nation can stand alone against all comers. Ours is an interdependent world.

Once we lived in the secure protection of the dividing oceans, two vast moats separating us from any potential foe. Today, any city on earth can be largely obliterated within moments by the flick of a finger. And logic or reason are not necessarily a part of the process. The order for the flick may come from either a reasoning or unreasoning mind.

Militarily, the United States is more powerful today than at any time in her history, but she has less security than ever before. That is the supreme paradox of the nuclear age. The discoveries of science, and the streaking speeds of transportation and communication with 12,000 mile per hour intercontinental ballistic missiles have effectively and permanently eliminated the idea of living alone. Isolation is all gone and nothing can bring it back. Whether we like it or not, we are all, American and Russian, Chinese and French, Israeli and Arab, ultimately in hock to the reasoning process of a relatively small number of people who control the levels of power in the bastions of the expanding memberships in the nuclear club.

All nations who value their independence have a common interest in and a responsibility for the defense of the free world. But, today the concept of collective security, so hopefully unveiled as a sound deterrent to war, is in a sad state of disrepair.

Not only has that interdependent system been weakened, but the United Nations has far to go to fulfill the promise which attended its birth. There is no area of the world in which the United Nations has more experience than in the Near East. It was the midwife at the birth of the nation of Israel. The United Nations has for nearly two decades maintained supervisory activities along the border of Israel and her neighbors. With substantial American assistance, a United Nations relief and works agency has continued to feed thousands of homeless refugees, whom the Arab nations would not absorb. These issues remain unsolved and seemingly insoluble.

The difficulties which beset the United Nations are a reflection of the disunity among world leaders. In my view, the realistic hope for peace in the Near East depends on a firm commitment of the so-called "Great Powers," the United States, the Soviet Union, and the nations of Western Europe as well. Without this commitment to a stable peace in the Near East by all protagonists in the present precarious balance of world power, that region will continue to be a cat's paw for nationalist adventurism. The Near East remains the crossroads of civiliza-

tion between Europe and Asia. The Suez Canal is as important to the economy of the Soviet Union as it is to Great Britain—and as it ought by international law to be to Israel. No settlement which permits discrimination in the uses of that waterway or fails to open free communication among all the peoples of that area is likely to endure.

As the ten-year history of conflict between Israeli Defense Forces and those of the Arab states surrounding them has shown, there will be no victory for Arab nations bent on the destruction of Israel. Little groups of willful leaders, putting their hopes on shiny new weapons, readily supplied by Communist Eastern Europe, threaten the world with the horror of global war, without so much as a "by your leave" to the rest of us. But the complete rout of the Arab Army in the deserts of Sinai, for the third straight time, ought to provide a severe and instructive lesson. The Arab leaders must learn that peace will not come to the Near East by recourse to war nor by recurrent demands for the destruction of Israel. Israel is a political, economic and geographical fact of life on earth.

The Arab nations must know too that their aims cannot be achieved simply by acquiring modern arms. The Soviet Union has attempted to turn the Near East into a battleground of the Cold War. But the arithmetic must be equally clear to them. It has cost nearly \$2 billion in Soviet arms to the Near East and, with recent shipments, that cost is rapidly going up. Both the Arabs and the Soviet Union surely recognize the failure of their last adventure. Certainly, the Arabs and the Soviets must begin to realize that neither they nor the rest of the world can afford a crisis in the Near East every decade.

The world is growing restive under the continued pressure of the division between the Communist and the Free. But that does not alter the hard fact that no agreement on the Near East can be enforced by the United Nations, or by anyone else, unless all interested nations, and surely the super powers, are committed to such an agreement and take responsibility for its enforcement.

That is not going to be easy to achieve. Old alignments are falling away. Our once gallant ally, France, now views the situation with a combination of glacial indifference and commercial opportunism. The Communists too have their problems. Rumania shows an unaccountable independence. She has rightly refused to join in parroting Moscow's condemnation of Israel. Similar grumblings have been heard in other parts of Eastern Europe.

It is now doubly important that we in the West keep together those of our allies who remain steadfast. The United States has a long-standing tie to the State of Israel. Americans acknowledge a direct commitment to the safety, integrity and prosperity of that country. In this, our people have been ahead of our government. In my opinion, the Administration has erred in trying to conceal that fact from the Arab nations, friendly or otherwise. We have allowed the so-called Palestine problem to manipulate us, rather than sticking to our position which the people of the United States insist we hold. This has been no service to our diplomacy, to Israel, or even to our few remaining Arab friends. We have by our unwillingness, or our hesitation to proclaim our stand, given unwitting cause to the Arab emotionalism and hostility.

The long-term solution to the Near East question requires, in my view, deep candor together with reason and frankness on all sides. It is comparatively easy to draw a balance sheet showing the interests of each protagonist and, by a simple mathematical process, to chart the prospective courses of negotiation. Geography does not change. Twenty years hence the peoples of Israel and of the Arab nations will be living, as now,

side by side. It will always be in their common interest to live in peace.

The real Near East question, then, is why doesn't this happen? The United Nations has the experience and most of the necessary means of diplomatic communication and intelligence. The so-called "Great Powers" have every reason to avoid conflict. Finally, there are a few simple steps which could be taken to insure the maintenance of a settlement, once it is reached.

The textbooks today are full of commentaries on "neutralization" as a means of stabilizing crisis areas by taking those regions out of the contest between the so-called "Great Powers" and achieving a fair balance of forces between opposing sides. This solution can only be applied, however, when a mutual interest in settlement can be clearly perceived by all—and, most important, when each side recognizes that the other has more to gain by settlement than by chaos and conflict.

There are many who propose neutralization for Southeast Asia. This could, some years from now, be the final answer. But this possibility is far from reality. Neither the necessary scope of understanding, nor even the intent to communicate, now exist between Hanoi and the rest of the world. And some of the powers of the Orient, notably Red China, have yet to show that they have any interest in arranging a settlement. On the contrary, their determination to persevere on the battlefield is increasingly apparent.

There is also a communication problem in the Near East, but it is not so stubborn. Israel seeks peace and security. She needs defensible frontiers and the recognition of her right to use international waterways. Finally, she will not, and cannot, be expected to part with the now unified City of Jerusalem. The Arab nations also need peace. They must at last overcome their irrational fears and they must acknowledge a crying need to turn swords into ploughshares in a determined effort to overcome centuries of poverty and ignorance among their own people. The more enlightened Arab leaders know this, but they seem to be afraid of their own propagandists and provocateurs, who for years have made their daily bread out of a steady diet of hopeless, vindictive polemics.

It may be too much to hope that peace might proceed without incident. Visible guarantees will be required. The one element long lacking in the arsenal of the United Nations is a permanent international peacekeeping force. Today, there is a need and an opportunity to create such a force in the Near East. The experience of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization, whatever its triumphs or its failings, is common to all concerned. Modern technology and the peculiar terrain of the Levant offer unique opportunities to provide instant intelligence affording a U.N. force the earliest possible warning of military movements.

Earlier this year, I proposed an artificial satellite to watch over the Holy Land to provide intelligence on large scale military movements in the area and to give a genuine advantage in guarding against surprise attack. Such a satellite could be built with the equipment used in our civilian lunar orbiter program. It would give a U.N. peace force and other elements on the side of peace an opportunity to take quick and effective action—in any case, it would be better than the hand wringing around the world which accompanied the outbreak of hostilities last June.

I would add to that proposal the possibility that an international force be created from airborne units assembled from forces of acceptable donor nations and given a permanent base in the Near East. Mobility is essential. A peace force must be able to put

itself between opposing forces without delay. Airborne troops would be required. The satellite warning system would be on guard. The peace force would have every opportunity to act rapidly.

I propose that serious consideration be given to using such neutral ground as the Island of Cyprus for this purpose. The Island has long been a base for military activity in the Eastern Mediterranean. A U.N. force is already stationed on Cyprus to help reduce ethnic disturbances. A permanent U.N. presence would be a strong weight toward stability. It would act as a further guarantee of the independence of that strategic Island both in terms of tempests of the Near East and of the larger conflicts of the Cold War. It would bring an added measure of stability to the Eastern Mediterranean, and an opportunity for Cyprus to live in a true neutrality.

It is high time that the United Nations proceeds to the issues it was created to solve. A peacekeeping force in the Near East is essential. In my view, the rational nations on earth must recognize its necessity. The United States must play a leading role. It is vital to the Near East, to the United Nations, and to the entire world that we move now, effectively and with imagination, to build the devices that will guard stability and prevent conflict. The Holy Land ought properly to be the first beneficiary of what ingenuity we can offer to the cause of peace among men. If, in the past fifty years, we have failed to keep up with the proliferation of man's problems, it is because we have failed to apply our creative spirit with full vigor. We have delayed too long. Too many costly battles have been fought and refought without hope of achieving an end to bloodshed. The time to act is now, while the opportunity for settlement is at hand.

The American people believe deeply in peace—no matter what our critics abroad may say to the contrary. We, all of us, Americans and Europeans, the Communists and the Free, must find common ground in forging the implements of international settlement, and making them stronger than weapons of war. Israel and the United States are nations which clearly perceive the importance of that cause; they must now act in concert toward this goal.

There is in the City of Jerusalem, which was divided when I visited it a year ago with my family, a new spirit. That city must now remain united—not merely as a capital of the thriving State of Israel, but as a living and joyous center for the celebration of the harmony of our world. It is a city of hope for Christian, Muslim and Jew. Its division for the past 19 years has been a symbol of despair for peace on this earth. And its unity now as the capital of Israel, and a world center of international religious activity should open a wide door to understanding among all peoples who acknowledge a common legacy from that hallowed place.

We seek harmony among nations as we seek brotherhood among men. The experience of the past 50 years has brought a fuller realization of the frightening problems of our time. But I firmly believe that the maturing relationship between the United States and the people of Israel can stand as a hallmark of international commitment which all peoples must give to one another, if man is to endure and thrive.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS— WELFARE PROGRAMS NEED HUMAN TOUCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise at this time to complete the legislative history of two amendments to H.R. 12080,

which were sponsored by me and other Members of the Senate, and which were adopted in the Committee on Finance. The amendments to which I refer are amendments Nos. 400 and 401.

Mr. President, I wish to incorporate at this point, by reference, excerpts from the RECORD of previous sessions which show other statements I have made concerning these amendments. Originally, when the amendments were submitted, I made a statement which is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16, 1967, beginning at page S14818. Other statements by me concerning and explaining these amendments are contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the proceedings of October 20, 1967, October 23, 1967, at page S15102, October 26, 1967, at page S15405, and October 31, 1967, at page S15578.

Mr. President, I believe these two amendments will bring about great improvements in the present welfare systems of our country.

Amendment No. 400, which has the endorsement of the National Association of Social Workers, Inc., and also the National Association of Counties, makes provision for the State plan of each State to provide for the recruitment, training, and effective use of community service aides and social service volunteers in their welfare programs.

It is intended that particular effort would be made to use men, and not just women alone, as community service aides. It is intended also that these community service aides would be recruited primarily from the poor and those who would otherwise, except for their salaries under such programs, be recipients of welfare, to work in the communities in which they live. These people will be far better able to communicate with the welfare recipients, better able to explain public assistance and other community programs to them, and better able to help those who administer State public welfare programs make such programs most effective and most helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the amendment also provides for the use of social service volunteers on a nonpaid or partially paid basis. It is intended that these volunteers, in addition to coming from the more affluent segments of American society, would come also from among the poor themselves.

This amendment would be effective January 1, 1969, a date which was changed in committee. I wish to point out that the date was changed only because some legislatures will have to meet in 1968 in order to change their basic law under the State welfare system plan.

It is certainly my intent and the intent of the other sponsors of the amendment that we would not have to wait until that date to implement the program, but that the States and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would move rapidly ahead to do so as soon as possible.

JOHN BARRETT DAY PROCLAIMED
BY GOVERNOR OF VERMONT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, one of the more important international organizations of which the United States is a member is the Organization of American States. The predecessor of that Western Hemisphere organization was the Pan American Union. The prime mover in the Pan American Union was Dr. John Barrett, who was born and raised in the town of Grafton, Vt., which incidentally happens to be the town in which both of my parents were born and raised.

Mr. President, November 28 will be designated tomorrow by Gov. Philip H. Hoff, of Vermont, as John Barrett Day, and there will be an observance in the town of Grafton, Vt.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a paper prepared by Dr. Vernon Reyman, of Grafton, Vt., who is the chairman of John Barrett Day, which sets forth the life of Dr. John Barrett and the story of the organization of the Pan American Union.

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

A PAPER PREPARED BY DR. VERNON REYMAN,
GRAFTON, VT., CHAIRMAN OF JOHN BARRETT
DAY

JOHN BARRETT (1866-1938)

November 28 has been designated by Hon. Governor Philip H. Hoff of Vermont as John Barrett Day.

To set aside this day is not only fitting and proper in view of the trip made by President Johnson to Punta Del Este, Uruguay last April, hopefully, to breathe new life into the Alliance For Progress and to promote Latin American economic cooperation, but this day seems even more significant because of the man who had so much to do with the successful beginnings and development of Pan-Americanism.

There stands in Grafton, Vermont opposite the Old Tavern, where the road leads to Townshend and Newfane, a large impressive white house in front of which stands a granite rock on which a plaque silently says:

John Barrett, Diplomat and Builder of the Pan American Union, born here November 28, 1866.

Hon. John Barrett was not only born in Grafton, Vermont but his deep love and affection which "bound him to family and to place" has always been an integral part of his life. He attended the village school, then Vermont Academy, graduated Worcester Academy in 1884 and received his AB from Dartmouth College in 1889 which college among others later bestowed upon him an honorary LL.D degree for his "long and distinguished career".

After college he taught in California only to take up newspaper work and for four years on the Pacific Coast he was convinced that the development of trade with the Orient "was a sure means of prosperity."

Before the age of 30 President Cleveland appointed him Minister to Siam from 1894-98 settling American claims worth millions of dollars by arbitration and "to the satisfaction of all involved."

During the Spanish American War he worked for a chain of American newspapers in the Far East as their foreign correspondent and at the close of the war he accepted an appointment as delegate to the Second International Conference of American States in Mexico City in 1901.

This was followed in 1902-3 by a trip around the world to secure most countries representation and participation in the St. Louis Exposition. After this mission was completed his Latin American interests

were aroused. He entered the diplomatic service in 1903-4 serving as Minister to Argentina and then first Minister to Panama (1904-5). Theodore Roosevelt transferred him to Colombia to settle our controversy with that country over the Panama Canal. President Roosevelt at first suggested several others to President Rafael Reyes but the latter wanted Dr. Barrett with whom he had "good relations".

Secretary of State Elihu Root met Dr. Barrett in Rio de Janeiro in 1906 at the Third International Conference of American States, recognizing in him an enthusiastic and extremely able personality. This led to the appointment of Director-general of the Bureau of American Republics. John Barrett tackled this job in 1907 with vision and confidence. This set in motion 14 years of assiduous work among the South American republics culminating not only in the name-change at his initiative to the Pan American Union but it was also through his influence that Andrew Carnegie was persuaded to contribute generously to the building of the beautiful marble structure in Washington, D.C., now occupied by the Union and dedicated on April 26, 1910.

It was at that dedication that Andrew Carnegie praised the Director-General Barrett as "a man whose abilities to meet all emergencies has been truly surprising; nothing could shake his devotion to his mission and heart and brain was one in the cause."

It was Dr. Barrett who had entire charge and responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the building—a center for growing cooperation in the Americas advocating increased understanding for the Pan American cause and dedicated to "peace-friendship and commerce."

John Barrett held many distinguished high posts and in 1899 was commercial commissioner in China, Japan, Korea, Formosa, Siam, Cambodia, Java, India, Borneo and the Philippines.

He later presided over the First and Second Pan American Commercial Conference held in Washington, D.C., in 1911 and in 1919.

As a newspaper man in Manila he met and advised Admiral George Dewey of whom he wrote a glowing biography published in 1899.

Other books Dr. Barrett published include: Latin America, Land Of Opportunity (1909); the Pan American Union (1911); and Panama Canal, What is it, What it means (1913).

Hon. John Barrett resigned his post September 1, 1920 because of "material necessities" and devoting himself to speaking and writing on international topics.

In 1934 he married Mrs. Mary E. Cady of Burlington, Vt., who died in 1937. Dr. Barrett himself died October 17, 1938 at Bellows Falls, Vermont but is buried in the family plot in Grafton, Vermont.

United States Supreme Court Justice Field said of him "his (Barrett's) interpretation of the law and facts of the case reflected greatest credit."

Said Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union "the passing of Dr. Barrett means an irreparable loss to the cause of Pan Americanism; for 30 years he labored to promote close relations between the nations of America; during 14 years as Secretary General he enlarged the functions of the organization and strengthened its usefulness to all republics in the Western Hemisphere; his example will be a constant inspiration to renewed effort in fulfillment of the great purpose to which he devoted his long and useful public career."

On November 2, 1938 the Governing Board of the Pan American Union passed a resolution to the above and transmitting a copy thereof to the United States Government and to the family of Dr. Barrett.

As Vermonters we have every reason to be proud of this man and as Graftonites we pay humble tribute to our native son and visionary.

PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the struggle going on in Vietnam, which we have been inclined to overlook in the course of debate as intense as the one we had yesterday on a very different matter, and to the remarkable and most informative speech which we heard yesterday from General Westmoreland, commander of the forces of the United States in Vietnam.

There are two things that he said which are of unique significance to the country. He is the man on the job and what he says is what the United States can do and is doing, and not what others over whom we have no control say we can do. When General Westmoreland speaks to what we are doing and what we can do, it is critically important that we listen.

In his address to the National Press Club, General Westmoreland said that we will "use United States and free world forces to destroy North Vietnamese forays while we assist the Vietnamese to reorganize for territorial security."

The other point he made was that we will "turn a major share of frontline DMZ defense over to the Vietnamese Army."

Mr. President, the one thing irritating the American people most about Vietnam is directly involved in these two aspects of U.S. activities there; namely, what are the Vietnamese doing for themselves? What are the Vietnamese people doing? What is the Vietnamese Government doing? What is the Vietnamese Army doing?

We have been bedeviled for much too long with rumors and some statements of fact by authoritative newspapermen that the Vietnamese Army fights a five-and-a-half-day war, that it takes only safe positions, and that there is an enormous amount of incompetence in their army.

I know that some of them are very brave men, because I saw many of their units myself, a year and a half ago. They stand on a level with anyone's army—including our own. But a general feeling pervades this country that there is real weakness there, that they are not carrying their load, that, unlike the Republic of Korea troops, they are not growing and developing with the situation.

Mr. President, more and more the attention of the United States must be focused on that particular aspect of the subject. The people of this country—whether hawks or doves makes no difference—must insist that the U.S. Government, through its President and Commander in Chief, do all that it humanly can to fix the responsibility where it belongs; namely, upon the Vietnamese people, the Vietnamese Government, and the Vietnamese Army.

One of the most compelling reasons for phasing out in Vietnam, will be if that country does not show any inclination to carry its load.

Upon that question, there can be no dispute. We are not there fighting a colonial war. We are supposed to be helping them. We cannot help anyone who will not try to help himself.

Thus, when General Westmoreland says these two things, he is speaking very