

**MISSING
PAGE'S**

*THROUGHOUT
FOLDER*

June 20, 1967

for Cuba Committee, exposed security malfeasance in the case of defecting employes in the National Security Agency, spotlighted diversion of government funds to identified Communists, pinpointed the true nature of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, revealed Communist manipulation behind last month's "Vietnam Week" demonstrations.

As to the charge that HUAC has "served no legislative purpose," the facts again are otherwise. It has made an estimated 160 legislative recommendations, some 45 of which have been enacted into law or adopted as administrative regulations. And it has diligently pursued its "legislative oversight" function by monitoring the way in which the security laws are enforced.

Nevertheless, the opposition to the committee goes on. A full-fledged campaign against it is being waged by an organization called the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. My opponent last night, Richard L. Criley, is the Midwestern director of this group. According to material put into the Congressional Record by former Indianapolis Congressman Donald Bruce, May 3, 1961, seven of the 13 original leaders of this group have been identified as members of the Communist Party.

According to Bruce's statement and a release this week by Rep. Richard L. Roubush, Midwestern director Criley has been identified by four different witnesses as a member of the party. Questioned about this identification, Criley took the Fifth Amendment—in effect pleading that a truthful answer would be incriminating.

Not all opposition to HUAC stems from such sources, of course, but the sustained agitation does. And that's one key reason that the committee is so "controversial."

(Mr. BLACKBURN (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BLACKBURN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BROTZMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CURTIS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GARDNER (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GARDNER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL

(Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE, Mr. Speaker, the importance of legislation that will affect the lives of all our young men cannot be minimized. The selective service bill that we are considering today will probably affect more young men in the next 4 years than any other piece of legislation in this 90th Congress.

I shall vote for this bill reluctantly. I do so feeling that during this period of crisis and due to our military commitments around the world, we cannot afford an interruption in our Selective Service program.

My reluctant support is based primarily on the fact that this fails to provide for uniform national standards, and allows for a haphazard system in which each local draft board sets its own standards which inevitably must result in unjustifiable inequities. I am very disappointed that the other body has watered down provisions that would have insured uniform national criteria for classification of men for the draft.

This bill authorizes that the Federal Government recommend such standards. I am hopeful that this will be a beginning in working toward uniform classification standards and that it will minimize the inequities that exist.

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHALEN, Mr. Speaker, armed conflict in the Middle East has ceased. The long debate dealing with the unresolved problems in this area now has begun.

Future world peace may well hinge upon the outcome of these discussions. Thus, the United States has an important stake in current Middle East negotiations.

While representatives of the executive branch serve as our country's spokesmen during the dialog on the Middle East, it is imperative that their views reflect national attitudes.

The most effective means of discerning and expressing national views is through congressional action.

To this end, I am introducing today the following House resolution "expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East."

Some 54 of my colleagues, as of now, have agreed to support this resolution, and I am taking the liberty of listing their names below.

I invite the other Members of the House of Representatives who have not done so already to join me in this expression of national policy.

The text of the resolution and the names of Members who have introduced identical or similar resolutions follows:

H. RES. 645

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East

Whereas, an internal Middle East conflict inherently endangers the peace and well-being of the world community of nations; and

Whereas, an open door in the Middle East is vital to the flow of world commerce; and

Whereas, by United Nations Declaration Israel legally deserves the status and rights of a sovereign nation and the territorial integrity which such status entails; and

Whereas, many thousands lost their lives in the recent Middle East conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that permanent peace in the Middle East can be achieved only if:

1. The existence and sovereignty of Israel is acknowledged by the Arab nations;
2. Freedom of passage in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba is guaranteed not only to Israel but to all nations;
3. Final settlement of the boundaries of the State of Israel is made and such boundaries are acknowledged by the Arab nations;
4. Effective restrictions are imposed upon the flow of arms into the Middle East from other members of the world community;
5. All nations address themselves to a final and equitable solution of the refugee problem in the Middle East; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, in order that lasting peace may be established in the Middle East, urges the President of the United States:

1. To use all diplomatic resources at his command, including our membership in the United Nations, to work for the accomplishment of the five aforementioned objectives, and
2. To avoid repeating the mistake of 1956 which led to resumption of hostilities eleven years later, by opposing, as a precondition to the discussion and negotiation of the aforementioned five objectives, the relinquishment by Israel of territories possessed at the time the cease fire was effectuated.

CONGRESSMEN FILING THE MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Garner E. Shriver, Theodore R. Kupferman, Daniel E. Button, Fred Schwengel, John E. Hunt, Jerome R. Waldie, W. E. Brock, Seymour Halpern, Ed Reinecke, Lionel Van Deerlin, Lawrence G. Williams, E. S. Johnny Walker.

Thomas G. Morris, Tom Railsback, Howard W. Robison, Richard L. Ottinger, James H. Scheuer, James A. Byrne, Barratt O'Hara, Robert L. F. Sikes, Louis C. Wyman, Catherine May, William L. Hungate, John Brademas, Bill Nichols, Margaret Heckler.

Thomas M. Rees, Garry Brown, Joel T. Broyhill, William L. St. Onge, J. Herbert Burke, G. Elliott Hagan, William F. Ryan, Harold R. Collier, Richard S. Schweiker, Torbert H. Macdonald, Henry P. Smith III, Robert L. Leggett, Donald E. Lukens.

Dan Kuykendall, Walter S. Baring, James C. Corman, J. Irving Whalley, James C. Gardner, Peter Kyros, John Slack, Morris Udall, Robert Denney, Guy Vander Jagt, Gilbert Gude, Florence Dwyer, Edward G. Blester, Jr., William V. Roth Jr., George Bush.

QUESTIONNAIRES HELP OUR CONGRESSMEN

(Mr. BURTON of Utah (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress hope we qualify as experts on the needs and desires of our constituents. Nonetheless, it seems necessary to "touch base" with the people frequently in order to keep our feet on the ground, for the world changes and the moods of our constituents change—and not always in harmony.

I am sure that most of us are aware of the great value of mailed questionnaires, and I am sure that if the citizens of our districts could sit in our places they, too, would feel that the efforts expended in registering their opinions are unusually worthwhile.

Our distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] recently conducted such an opinion poll—as did I. In the course of comparing notes, he showed me an editorial from a newspaper in his district, the Longmont Daily Times-Call, which seemed to present the rationale of the opinion poll unusually well.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members:

QUESTIONNAIRES HELP OUR CONGRESSMEN

We have always admired those people who are easy with a pen and can sit down and turn out a short, sensible letter to their Congressman. We have known a few people who not only can, but do send their views to Washington in this way. Unfortunately they are a rare type with the result that our representatives in Washington are often forced to grope for the opinions of most of their constituents.

Finding the sense of their districts has become an increasingly difficult problem for our congressmen and senators. First they can spend very little time at home because Congress stays in session much longer than it used to. Being a Washington representative is not the part-time job it once was.

Secondly the number of people each Congressman and senator represents has increased many times making it just about impossible to talk to a very large proportion of the people in a district or a state.

In many ways we are inclined to deplore the use of questionnaires by Congressmen to find out what people are thinking, but for the moment, we cannot think of a better way for them to do the job.

The recent questionnaire which Congressman Don Brozman sent out did a fine job of presenting eight questions of major importance to the country. Of the 190,000 questionnaires sent out over 29,000 were returned which represented the opinions of 49,000 people (two votes being allowed per card).

Answers to some of the questions seemed less than consistent. People want to raise the Social Security benefits, but at the same time they oppose a tax increase. And without a tax increase they want to continue the war in Vietnam until North Vietnam gives in. They showed no desire for us to stop bombing the North without definite concessions.

It is going to be hard to keep the war going at the present pace and increase home spending without a tax increase.

People seem reluctant to get China into the UN; although the margin against this is far smaller than it probably would have been a few years ago.

Youth should be interested in the poll to the extent that most people thought the draft was fair and that 18-year-olds should not vote. It is interesting to note that Congress is working to change the draft law since the poll was taken, though not materially.

People were not clear at all as to how they feel about the federal government becoming

a giant tax collecting agency that would pull in the funds for the states and then parcel them back out on the basis of how much the states had paid in.

The clearest point of all which we hope all congressmen, in Colorado and across the nation, take to heart is that 94.4 per cent of the poll answers think Congress should have a code of ethics.

(Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BERRY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

(Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ROTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to sponsor this bill.

The independent segment of the oil industry in the State of Oklahoma is struggling for its survival. Since the 8-year-old mandatory oil import program was undertaken in 1959 to protect the national security as relates to petroleum fuels, there have been accumulated pressures on the oil import program which can be summarized as follows:

Certain proposals by five different companies to construct new or expanded refinery-petrochemical facilities in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with authorization to move about 95,000 barrels daily of light products and an indeterminate volume of residual fuel to the U.S. mainland.

Pending "trade zones" at Taft, La., and in Bay County, Mich., both approved by the Foreign Trade Zones Board, the Department now has the responsibility for acting on applications to permit 30,000 barrels daily of foreign petrochemical feed stocks sought for processing in these zones.

The Canadian exports into U.S. markets, which were estimated and then deducted from other—offshore—imports in each allocation period, exceed agreed-upon volumes in each period, and because of new Canadian capacity are resulting in increasing pressures which many doubt can be contained under the informal arrangements that have applied to Canadian imports in the past.

For reasons that still are not clear, Interior proposed, and the President signed, an amendment to the oil import proclamation to give Secretary Udall "discretionary" authority to import asphalt outside the 12.2 import ratio. The proposal was said to be tied to develop-

ing "asphalt shortages" and "higher prices"; however, I must say I have been unable to find evidence of either "asphalt shortages" or "higher prices."

In addition to the very real potential of these threatening and widening "loop-holes," confidence in the import program is further undetermined by Government's declared intent to manipulate the program as a coercive means of holding down oil prices. Secretary Udall has notably mentioned that keeping down prices is the basic reason for the proposal to permit greater asphalt imports.

Not one of these propositions to hike imports has any relationship to security considerations. All are simply private measures to give specific companies special or preferred treatment in their access to foreign oil or its products. Each could have only one effect—to improve its sponsor's economic position in relation to competitors.

The five active applications which have been made to coastal projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would create gaps in the import program; and as well, additional inflow of foreign petroleum products, assuming all the products were approved, would aggravate the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by another \$100 million. Further, it would simply destroy the Department of Defense cuts in foreign product purchases and imports in order to ease the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

In relation to the applications which were made to the Foreign Trade Zones Board some 2 years ago to establish trade zones in Taft, La., and Bay County, Mich., which were approved by the Secretary of Commerce, it should be noted that import allocations of 74,000 barrels daily to Puerto Rico firms already exceed the equivalent feed stocks of about 50,000 barrels a day which go into the export limit. Further, if petrochemical processors are granted preferential access to foreign feedstocks, others for comparable reasons would be compelled to seek similar treatment. Indeed, can the Government, in fairness, dole out preferential treatment to just one or two without giving similar treatment to others? Such a "trade zone stampede," as Mr. Udall has stated, "could wreck the whole import program."

In relation to the supposed shortage of asphalt and to rising prices of the product in the U.S. highway program, all evidence indicates that there is subsequent excess of the current demand. A recent study pointed out that in 1958 the asphalt capability from our domestic crude was 700,000 barrels a day. Since 1958, production of crude has increased 24 percent. In 1966, asphalt demands were only 368,000 barrels daily. In actuality, the asphalt stock situation actually improved in 1966, rising from 16.1 million barrels at the beginning of the year to 17.3 million barrels at the end of 1966. Therefore, it would seem evident that there is no available information which would justify granting importers of asphalt or asphaltic oils preferential treatment under the import program.

In addition to this accumulation of threats to the stabilization of the import program, the completely unauthorized

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

interference into oil pricing, first in the Oklahoma-Kansas crude oil prices last fall, then in gasoline pricing, now in asphalt prices, serve to shatter confidence in the entire program. These actions serve only to raise the question as to whether imports are to be firmly limited to serve oil security objectives or maneuvered to keep depressed oil prices further depressed.

While the import ratio has held fairly stable, domestic production and exploration have continued to decline along with operating rigs, drilling completions, footing drilled, and seismic crews have reached new lows in 1966. The additions to our reserve have been inadequate. In Oklahoma, 1959 and 1966 activity compares as follows:

Total well completions fell from 6,230 to 4,069, a 35-percent decline.

Footage drilled declined from 21,278,000 feet to 18,142,000 feet, a reduction of 15 percent.

Operating rigs were reduced from 226 to 141. In 1967, rig activity has further declined.

While drilling of exploratory wells increased in 1966, the 505 wildcat wells drilled were less than one-half the number drilled in 1959.

Crude oil production increased 11 percent compared to an increase of 18 percent in crude oil imports into districts I through IV.

The only basis for mandatory oil import program is national security, and that basis must be completely reaffirmed.

With that overall objective in mind we should:

Commit ourselves to the preservation of the general principles of the current quota system with a reasonable reduction in the overall level of imports.

Include all nonresidual imports into districts I through IV within the prescribed import ratio.

Subject all products moving from offshore chemical plants to the same restrictions that such products would have if moving from foreign sources.

Allow free imports into trade zones only to the extent products are exported and require raw material quota in proportion to the U.S. product imports.

Delay the use of the "discretionary" asphalt import authority at least until the Office of Emergency Planning has completed its study of national security aspects of the importing of both finished asphalt and asphalt content crude.

Continue to recognize the defense contribution of overland crude by exempting these imports from controls but restrict overland import growth to the same rate as the U.S. crude demand growth.

Establish more specific guidelines for the operation of the Oil Import Appeals Board.

Because so many States, including Oklahoma, are supported by the oil industry, and because the whole stability of our economy could be at stake, I would urge my colleagues to move as quickly as possible on this measure.

This measure will provide long-range stability and insure an ample oil supply to this country in the interest of our national security. The American oil industry has too long suffered from the fourth

agency of Government who rules by agency decree. It behooves us to protect our national economy and resources by supporting this measure.

A BREAK FOR THE HOMEOWNER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we gave a break to the homeowner—the backbone of our Nation. For far too long, the homeowner has been the forgotten man on the American scene, and the one hardest hit by the tax collector.

The American homeowner—the pillar of our communities—has no organized pressure group for massed demands upon the Congress. His basic rights and needs have a way of being lost in the turmoil of behests and pleas which always swirls about this Hill.

I urge all of my colleagues in this House to remember that we are the spokesmen for the American homeowner, and he depends upon us to be aware of his burdens and needs, and to act for the fulfillment of those needs.

One of these needs, and one of the most important, is a meaningful measure of tax relief. I have pressed for such relief in previous sessions of this House, and I shall strive for this goal again in this Congress.

For that reason, I am introducing today two bills aimed at assisting homeowners, and helping to fortify American communities against the spreading blight which results from lack of repairs and improvements to homes.

The first bill would provide depreciation allowances to make up for wear and tear on a home. We have ample precedent for this in the depreciation allowances enjoyed by the owners of business and commercial property.

Homes are the stock in trade of American communities, providing the taxes which form a major part of local tax income. If they are kept in good repair, the locality's tax resources remain strong.

The general economic health of cities, towns, and villages reflects the condition of their homes. The money spent for upkeep and repairs goes into the tills of local businessmen. Furthermore, the businessmen of a well-kept home area are always more prosperous—and let us not forget that their income taxes swell the Federal Treasury.

Even more basic than that, we must never lose sight of the fact that the construction industry is the bellwether of the overall economy in urban area. When the construction industry thrives and its mechanics are earning steady incomes, local industry and commerce also thrive.

My proposals can provide the incentive to homeowners to maintain the condition of their homes and to improve them, providing a tremendous shot-in-the-arm to the construction industry, and helping it to help the economy.

The second bill I am introducing today would provide for a deduction of up to \$750 in the owner's income tax return

for expenses incurred by the taxpayer on improvements and repairs to his residence. This is the heart of my program. It is a forceful incentive to home beautification and continuing upkeep.

I am certain that many of us have observed increasing signs of general depreciation in many communities. This is especially evident in lower income communities, and that is understandable in the light of the soaring costs of materials and skilled labor.

Home depreciation is a progressive blight. A repair that goes undone one year may cost twice as much to correct in the second year, and four times as much in the third year.

Eventually, if the regular, periodic maintenance work has not been carried out, there comes a point where the cost of repairs becomes so prohibitive as to be impossible. From that point on, creeping blight becomes rampaging blight.

The Bureau of the Census in 1960 reported that only 74 percent of all the housing in America could be deemed to be in sound condition. Since then, there has been a steady increase in the costs of home maintenance. We can hardly hope that the rate of deterioration had decreased. In fact, we can safely assume that delapidation has spread.

We must do everything in our power to encourage the physical preservation of the American home, for it is the foundation of the American community.

Enactment of the two laws I have introduced today will go a long way toward making that preservation more possible.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE FORCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I stood before the Members of this House on June 5, as the parties in the Middle East plunged into their first day of open struggle, to express once again my grave disappointment and concern for the action of the U.N. Secretary General U Thant in withdrawing the troops of the United Nations Emergency Force from Egypt on May 18. That action was taken directly upon the request of President Nasser, and without the consultation or advice of any formal body within the United Nations.

It was the stated opinion of the Secretary General at that time that Egypt, in exercising her rights as a sovereign nation, had full right to demand and expect the immediate withdrawal of the U.N. peacekeeping force. Mr. Thant argued that while the General Assembly had created the emergency force in 1956, the actual admission of the troops to Egyptian soil had been the result of direct negotiations between the Secretary General and the Egyptian Government, thus precluding the need for General Assembly consent to a withdrawal.

To many of us these legalisms seemed hollow. We felt, as Israel's Foreign Minister Abba Eban noted before the U.N. Security Council, that—

It is not a question of sovereignty that is here involved. The United Nations has a right to ask that when it assumes a function, the termination of that function shall not take place in conditions that would lead to anti-Charter situations.

We asked along with Mr. Eban, as we may well ask now:

What is the use of a United Nations presence if it is, in effect, an umbrella which is taken away as soon as it begins to rain?

Today we have evidence to support our doubts—evidence which bares the illogical framework of Mr. Thant's argument. I refer the attention of my colleagues to the aide-memoire of August 5, 1957, by the then Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, which was released in yesterday's New York Times. Here we find the record of secret negotiations between Mr. Hammarskjold, who foresaw our current problems in the withdrawal of the U.N. force, and the Egyptian Government. We learn that those negotiations resulted in the tacit agreement that the UNEF would not be removed until the General Assembly could meet to determine whether the mission of the troops had been completed.

I can only find it deplorable that our present Secretary General was unable to exercise the vigor and foresight of his predecessor in guarding the stability of the Middle East.

Of still more shocking consequence however is the disclosure that Mr. Thant acted not only in poor judgment but in defiance and denial of a negotiated precedent. He contended that the decision to remove the UNEF was his alone, and that—

It is not for the General Assembly to act; it is not within the competence of the General Assembly to act.

In so doing Mr. Thant not only rejected, but in effect denied the existence of the procedure established by his predecessor to deal with just the kind of emergency situation which arose in the Middle East. This procedure contrary to Mr. Thant's statement specifically provided the General Assembly with competency to act on this very question which arose. At a time when the need for deliberation and contemplation regarding the Middle East was of the highest order, the Secretary General chose to ignore the means for accomplishing this, so wisely established by Mr. Hammarskjold.

Mr. Thant has stated that the memorandum was known to him. It is truly unfortunate that he did not see fit to follow or reveal the wisdom which it provided for him, for the United Nations and for the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the full text of the Hammarskjold document as reprinted in yesterday's New York Times, for inclusion in the body of the RECORD:

TEXT OF HAMMARSKJOLD MEMORANDUM ON
MIDEAST PEACE FORCE

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Following is the text of an aide-memoire prepared Aug. 5, 1957, by Dag Hammarskjold, then Secretary General, for his files on negotiations covering the presence of United Nations troops in the United Arab Republic. Before his death, Mr. Hammarskjold gave a copy of the memorandum to a friend, Ernest A. Gross, former United States representative at the United

Nations, who has agreed to its publication this week by the American Society of International Law.

As the decision on the U.N.E.F. [United Nations Emergency Force] was taken under Chapter VI [of the Charter] it was obvious from the beginning that the resolution did in no way limit the sovereignty of the host state. This was clear both from the resolution of the General Assembly and from the second and final report on the emergency force. Thus, neither the General Assembly nor the Secretary General, acting for the General Assembly, created any right for Egypt, or gave any right to Egypt, in accepting consent as a condition for the presence and functioning of the U.N.E.F. on Egyptian territory. Egypt had the right, and the only problem was whether that right in this context should and could in some way be limited.

CABLE FROM BURNS

My starting point in the consideration of this last-mentioned problem—the limitation of Egypt's sovereign right in the interest of political balance and stability in the U.N.E.F. operation—was the fact that Egypt had spontaneously endorsed the General Assembly resolution of 5 November [creating the force] and by endorsing that resolution had consented to the presence of the U.N.E.F. for certain tasks. They could thus not ask the U.N.E.F. to withdraw before the completion of the tasks without running up against their own acceptance of the resolution on the force and its tasks.

The question arose in relation to Egypt first in a cable received 9 November from Burns [E. L. M. Burns, Canadian lieutenant general who was chief of staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine and who became in November 1956, commander of the United Nations Emergency Force and is now adviser on disarmament to the Canadian Government] covering an interview the same day with Fawzi [Mahmoud Fawzi, Egyptian Foreign Minister in 1956 and now Deputy Premier for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic]. In that interview Egypt had requested clarification of the question how long it was contemplated that the force would stay in the demarcation line area. To this I replied the same day: "A definite reply is at present impossible, but the emergency character of the force links it to the immediate crisis envisaged in the resolution of 2 November [calling for truce] and its liquidation. In case of different views as to when the crisis does not any longer warrant the presence of the troops the matter will have to be negotiated with the parties." In a further cable to Burns the same day I said, however, also that "as the United Nations force would come with Egypt's consent, they cannot stay nor operate unless Egypt continues to consent."

On 10 November Ambassador Loutfi [Omar Loutfi, chief Egyptian delegate at the United Nations in 1956, later an Under Secretary of the United Nations, who died in 1963], under instruction, asked me, "whether it was recognized that an agreement is necessary for their (U.N.E.F.'s) remaining in the canal area" once their task in the area had been completed. I replied that it was my view that such an agreement would then be necessary.

On 11 November Ambassador Loutfi saw me again. He then said that it must be agreed that when the Egyptian consent is no more valid, the U.N. force should withdraw. To this I replied that I did not find that a withdrawal of consent could be made before the tasks which had justified the entry, had been completed; if, as might happen, different views on the degree of completion of the tasks prescribed proved to exist, the matter should be negotiated.

The view expressed by Loutfi was later embodied in an aide-memoire, dated the same day, where it was said: "The Egyptian Government takes note of the following: A.

It being agreed that consent of Egypt is indispensable for entry and presence of the U.N. forces in any part of its territory, if such consent no longer persists, these forces shall withdraw."

I replied to this in a memo dated 12 November in which I said: "I have received your aide-memoire setting out the understanding on the basis of which the Egyptian Government accepts my announcing today that agreement on the arrival in Egypt of the United Nations force has been reached. I wish to put on record my interpretation of two of these points." Regarding the point quoted above in the Egyptian aide-memoire, I then continued: "I want to put on record that the conditions which motivate the consent to entry and presence, are the very conditions to which the tasks established for the force in the General Assembly resolution [requesting preparations for establishment of the force], 4 November, are directed. Therefore, I assume it to be recognized that as long as the task, thus prescribed, is not completed, the reasons for the consent of the government remain valid, and that a withdrawal of this consent before completion of the task would run counter to the acceptance by Egypt of the decision of the General Assembly. I read the statement quoted in the light of these considerations. If a difference should develop, whether or not the reasons for the arrangements are still valid, the matter should be brought up for negotiation with the United Nations."

MESSAGE FROM FAWZI

This explanation of mine was sent to the Egyptian mission after my telephone conversation in the morning of the 12th with Dr. Fawzi where we agreed on publication of our agreement on the entry of the U.N.E.F. into Egypt. In view of the previous exchanges, I had no reason to believe that my statement would introduce any new difficulty. I also counted on the fact that Egypt probably by then was so committed as to be rather anxious not to reopen the discussion. However, I recognized to myself that there was an element of gambling involved which I felt I simply had to take in view of the danger that further delays might cause Egypt to change its mind, accept volunteers and throw our approaches overboard.

However, the next morning, 13 November, I received a message from Dr. Fawzi to the effect that the Government of Egypt could not subscribe to my interpretation of the question of consent and withdrawal, as set out on 12 November, and therefore, in the light of my communication of that date, "felt impelled to consider that the announced agreements should remain inoperative until all misunderstandings were cleared up." The Government reiterated in this context its view that if its consent no longer persisted, the U.N.E.F. should withdraw.

I replied to this communication—which cause a further delay of the transportation of troops to Egypt by at least 24 hours—in a cable sent immediately on receipt of the communication. In drafting my reply I had a feeling that it now was a must to get the troops in and that I would be in a position to find a formula, saving the face of Egypt while protecting the U.N. stand, once I would discuss the matter personally with President Nasser.

In the official reply 13 November I said that my previous statements had put forward my personal opinion that "the reasons" for consent remained valid as long as the task was not completed. I also said that for that reason a withdrawal of consent leading to the withdrawal of the force before the task was completed (as previously stated) in my view, "although within the rights of the Egyptian Government would go against its acceptance of the basic resolution of the General Assembly." I continued by saying that my reference to negotiation was intended to indicate only that the question of withdrawal

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7567

should be a matter of discussion to the extent that different views were held as to whether the task of the General Assembly was fulfilled or not. I referred in this respect to my stand as explained already in my message of 9 November, as quoted above.

FREEDOM OF ACTION

I commented upon the official reply in a special personal message to Fawzi, sent at the same time, where I said that we "both had to reserve our freedom of action, but that, all the same, we could go ahead, hoping that a controversial situation would not arise." "If arrangements would break down on this issue" (withdrawal only on completion of the tasks), "I could not avoid going to the General Assembly" (with the conflict which had developed between us on this question of principle) "putting it to their judgment to decide what could or could not be accepted as an understanding. This situation would be a most embarrassing one for all but I would fear the political repercussions, as obviously very few would find it reasonable that recognition of your freedom of action should mean that you, after having permitted the force to come, might ask it to withdraw at a time when the very reasons which had previously prompted you to accept were still obviously valid." I ended by saying that I trusted that Fawzi on the basis of this personal message could help me by "putting the stand I had to take on my own rights, in the right perspective." The letter to Fawzi thus made it clear that if the Government did not accept my stand on withdrawal as a precondition for further steps, the matter would be raised in the Assembly.

On the basis of these two final communications from me, Egypt gave green lights for the arrival of the troops, thus, in fact, accepting my stand and letting it supersede their own communication 13 November.

In my effort to follow up the situation, which prevailed after the exchange in which different stands had been maintained by Egypt and by me, I was guided by the consideration that Egypt constitutionally had an undisputed right to request the withdrawal of the troops, even if initial consent had been given, but that, on the other hand, it should be possible on the basis of my own stand as finally tacitly accepted, to force them into an agreement in which they limited their freedom of action as to withdrawal by making a request for withdrawal dependent upon the completion of the task—a question which, in the U.N., obviously would have to be submitted to interpretation by the General Assembly.

OBSTACLES TO SOLUTION

The most desirable thing, of course, would have been to the Egypt by an agreement in which they declared, that withdrawal should take place only if so decided by the General Assembly. But in this naked form, however, the problem could never have been settled. I felt that the same was true of an agreement to the effect that withdrawal should take place upon "agreement on withdrawal" between the U.N. and the Egyptian Government. However, I found it worthwhile to try a line, very close to the second one, according to which Egypt would declare to the United Nations that it would exert all its sovereign rights with regard to the troops on the basis of a good faith interpretation of the tasks of the force. The United Nations should make a reciprocal commitment to maintain the force as long as the task was not completed. If such a dual statement was introduced in an agreement between the parties, it would be obvious that the procedure in case of a request from Egypt for the withdrawal of U.N.E.F. would be as follows. The matter would at once be brought before the General Assembly. If the General Assembly found that the task was completed, everything would be all right. If they found that the task was not completed and Egypt,

all the same, maintained its stand and enforced the withdrawal, Egypt would break the agreement with the United Nations. Of course Egypt's freedom of action could under no circumstances be limited but by some kind of agreement. The device I used meant only that instead of limiting their rights by a basic understanding requesting an agreement *directly concerning withdrawal*, we created an obligation to reach agreement on the fact that the tasks were completed, and, thus, *the conditions for a withdrawal established*.

I elaborated a draft text for an agreement along the lines I had in mind during the night between 15 and 16 November in Capodichino [Italy] I showed the text to Fawzi at our first talk on 16 November and I discussed practically only this issue with Nasser for seven hours in the evening and night of 17 November, Nasser, in this final discussion, where the text I had proposed was approved with some amendments, showed that he very fully understood that, by limiting their freedom of action in the way I proposed, they would take a very serious step, as it would mean that the question of the extent of the task would become decisive for the relations between Egypt and the United Nations and would determine Egypt's political freedom of action. He felt, not without justification, that the definition given of the task in the U.N. texts was very loose and that, tying the freedom of action of Egypt to the concept of the task—which had to be interpreted also by the General Assembly—and doing so in a written agreement, meant that he accepted a far-reaching and unpredictable restriction. To shoot the text through in spite of Nasser's strong wish to avoid this, and his strong suspicion of the legal construction—especially of the possible consequences of differences of views regarding the task—I felt obliged, in the course of the discussion, to threaten three times, that unless an agreement of this type was made, I would have to propose the immediate withdrawal of the troops. If any proof would be necessary for how the text of the agreement was judged by President Nasser, this last mentioned fact tells the story.

It is obvious that, with a text of the content mentioned approved by Egypt, the whole previous exchange of views was superseded by a formal and explicit recognition by Egypt of the stand I had taken all through, in particular on 9 and 12 November. The previous exchange of cables cannot, any longer have any interpretative value as only the text of the agreement was put before the General Assembly and approved by it with the concurrence of Egypt and as its text was self-contained and conclusive. All further discussion, therefore, has to start from the text of the agreement, which is to be found in document A/3375. The interpretation of the text must be the one set out above.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. CONTE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WHERE IS THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ARMY?

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, recent news reports from South Vietnam have quoted Premier Nguyen Cao Ky as saying that 600,000 American troops

would now be required to win the war that is raging there. This would necessitate the sending of an additional 137,000 men to South Vietnam.

Despite the 1964 campaign promise made by President Johnson that American soldiers would not be sent 9,000 or 10,000 miles away to do what the Asians ought to be doing for themselves, we have sent approximately 463,000 troops to Vietnam and now, the United States finds itself being told by this petty Vietnamese military dictator what our future military manpower commitments ought to be. Although one might ask the whereabouts of the South Vietnamese military forces these days, and question its overall lamentable performance, the sad and tragic fact is that the Rusk-McNamara team will acquiesce in Ky's demand for additional American troops "to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which appeared in the June 16, 1967, New York Times that comments on the conduct of the war:

PREMIER KY'S WAR?

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam has pronounced judgment: 600,000 American troops are needed to win the war in Vietnam. He calmly, and with apparent confidence, made his desires known a few hours after the Pentagon announced that Secretary of Defense McNamara, Under Secretary of State Katzenbach and others are flying to Saigon Sunday.

The United States seems on the verge of one more major escalation of the Vietnamese conflict. General Westmoreland's recent trip to the United States, coupled with seemingly inspired reports from Washington and Saigon, reinforces the belief that an American force of 462,000 men plus other forces at sea and in Thailand is considered insufficient.

All this even though President Johnson said again and again in his 1964 electoral campaign that he had no intention of sending "American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

Unfortunately, Premier Ky's soldiers have not even shown the determination needed to defend their own people in the pacification program. As a result the defensive work as well as most of the offense has had to be taken over by American soldiers. This is aside from the fact that the pacification campaign has, to date, been a failure; its promised revitalization has not occurred.

It would stretch credibility to detach Premier Ky's figure of 600,000 American soldiers from the fact that he is a candidate for the Presidency of South Vietnam and has been conducting an open drive for the post even before the official opening of the campaign. He is apparently running on a program of outpromising any other candidate, with American troops and supplies as his promissory notes.

Escalation on the ground and in the air has merely extended the scope of the war and the casualties without bringing any discernible progress toward an end of hostilities. The sole effect of each increase in forces is to provide the impetus for yet another increase and multiply the risk of world holocaust.

The quest for a military victory in Vietnam has perhaps been spurred by the speed of the Israeli victory in the Mideast. If so, it would be well to consider the enormous and baffling problems that now face Israel, the Arab states and the great powers as a result of a military success that the United States could not at this late stage duplicate in Vietnam.

The longer the Vietnam war goes on and the greater the costs on both sides, the more

H 7568

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

intractable the obstacles to a negotiated settlement will become. In any case Marshal Ky should be told that the war is not being fought to advance his political career.

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

[Mr. KASTENMEIER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

file
STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR
GIDEON RAFAEL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON MAY 29, 1967

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1967, Israel Ambassador Gideon Rafael spoke before the Security Council of the United Nations. In his address, Mr. Rafael reviewed the repeated acts of aggression of the Arabs which led to the recent crisis in the Middle East.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Ambassador Rafael's address as follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR GIDEON RAFAEL, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED NATIONS BEFORE THE SECURITY COUNCIL ON MAY 29, 1967

Mr. President, on Saturday, May 13th—just two weeks ago—the streets of Cairo reverberated with the sound of tanks and the cries of agitated crowds whipped up by cheer leaders chanting: "We want war with Israel."

We in Israel looked on this spectacle with detachment, thinking that this was just one more outburst of chauvinist frenzy which is such a common feature of the Arab military dictatorship regimes.

But the tanks and the marching columns did not return to their barracks. They moved forward into Sinai as the spearhead of a massive military concentration along the southern borders of Israel.

While the military machine was moving with ever increasing momentum, the Egyptian propaganda machine poured out a torrent of threats against Israel and charged that we had massed large forces on our northern border in preparation for an attack against Syria.

Although the trumped-up nature of these propaganda allegations was obvious, my Government nevertheless instructed me to inform the Secretary-General of their complete unfoundedness. As the Secretary-General confirms in his first report to the Security Council (S/7896), I conveyed to him on 15 May the assurances of my Government that Israel had not concentrated any troops anywhere, and harbored no aggressive intentions against any of her Arab neighbors. I requested the Secretary-General to convey these assurances to the Arab Governments concerned. He acted without delay on our request and added that the independent inquiries which he had conducted through his own United Nations representatives in the area confirmed the facts conveyed to him by Israel. At the meeting of the Security Council on 24 May, I drew the Council's attention to the relevant paragraph of the Secretary-General's report. This notwithstanding, the Representative of the United Arab Republic in his letter of 27 May to the President of the Security Council not only brazenly repeats this fabrication, but in do-

ing so he distorts the Secretary-General's report. I understand his predicament, but I cannot admire his audacity.

The unfounded charge of alleged Israel troop concentrations is the keynote of the Egyptian case for moving its forces against Israel. If it is pulled away, the whole flimsy edifice of Egyptian propaganda will collapse like a house of cards. By the alchemy of constant repetition, the Egyptian propaganda machine tries to transmute the big lie into golden truth. This technique has been tried before, and not so long ago—with initial success and final disaster for its practitioners.

Mr. President, to return to the narration of the events. On 16 May, one day after my government had conveyed these assurances to the Secretary-General, President Nasser moved against UNEF, and deployed heavy Egyptian forces right along the Israel border. In his report to the General Assembly the Secretary-General, with his accustomed restraint and courtesy, has painted a vivid picture of the attitudes and actions of the Egyptian authorities. An ultimatum was issued, and while it was being delivered Egyptian military forces took over positions held by UNEF, and shells were even fired to speed up the evacuation. With UNEF safely out of the way, more Egyptian forces were poured into Sinai. At this point the situation became critical.

Israel defense forces were still on their normal peace footing. But in the light of these sudden and threatening moves, my Government was compelled to take limited precautionary measures.

On 22 May the Secretary-General, alarmed at the rapidity with which the situation was deteriorating, left on his journey to Cairo. While he was en route, President Nasser, in a fiery speech proclaimed the blockade of the international waterway of the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

When the Secretary-General arrived in Cairo, not only did he find himself confronted with the fait accompli of the blockade, but also with the same whipped-up crowds greeting him with cries: "We want war with Israel." Next came announcements that operational blockade measures were being put into effect, and that mines were being laid in the international waterway.

The Secretary-General returned to New York earlier than expected and his report is now before the Security Council. In paragraph 10 of that report (S/7906) he stated:

"The decision of the Government of the United Arab Republic to restrict shipping in the strait of Tiran of which I learned while en route to Cairo, has created a new situation. Free passage through the Strait is one of the questions which the Government of Israel considers most vital to her interests. . . . While in Cairo, I called to the attention of the Government of the United Arab Republic the dangerous consequences which could ensue from restricting innocent passage of ships in the Strait of Tiran. I expressed my deep concern in this regard and my hope that no precipitate action would be taken."

Mr. President, this is President Nasser's reply to the representations made to him by the Secretary-General. On 26 May he said: "Sharm el Sheikh means real confrontation with Israel. Taking such a step means that we should be ready to enter full-scale war with Israel. It is not an isolated operation."

This speaks for itself.

As the Secretary-General himself has stated, the important immediate fact is that the situation in the Straits of Tiran represents a very serious potential threat to peace.

The position of my Government was stated in unambiguous terms by the then Foreign Minister of Israel at the 666th Plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 1 March 1957, and I repeated that statement when I spoke

at the meeting of the Security Council on 24 May last. I wish to confirm today again in the most solemn terms that this is the position of the Government of Israel. Every interference with the freedom of navigation in these waters is offensive action and an act of aggression against Israel, the infringement of the sovereign rights of all nations to the unimpeded use of this international waterway and a gross violation of international law.

There is today no controversy whatsoever over the international character of the waterway in question. For ten years now it has been used uninterruptedly, hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping with all their different cargoes and under many different flags including Israel's have freely passed to and fro.

I wish to recall, Mr. President that statements recognizing the international character of the Straits of Tiran and acknowledging that freedom of navigation for all countries is the rule there were made at the 666th, 667 and 668th Plenary meetings of the General Assembly in March 1957 by many countries, particularly those with important maritime interests, notably the U.S.A., Argentina, France, United Kingdom, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, Belgium, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, Iceland and Denmark, and others.

In response to the recent unilateral and arbitrary action of the Egyptian Government many more unambiguous and emphatic statements by these and other Governments, have been issued, not only in support of Israel's vital rights and interests in the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, but also to uphold their own rights and interests and to safeguard the integrity of the law of the sea.

In face of the proclaimed lawlessness of the Egyptian Government, the assertion of these rights and the protection of the established law is a matter of supreme and urgent concern to each member of the international community.

In the light of this situation, the eviction of UNEF from its position at the entrance to the Straits, at Sharm el Sheikh, was not only an act of defiance of the will of the United Nations and a violation of Egypt's pledged word, but was the signal for the revival of belligerence after ten years of tranquility in the Gulf of Aqaba.

What, Mr. President, was the real role of UNEF? Its main tasks were in Sharm el Sheikh and in Gaza—to see to it that Egypt did not interfere with freedom of navigation, and to deter terrorists and marauders from crossing the borders of Israel. UNEF acquitted itself of these two tasks with distinction. Israel, along with all peace-loving nations pays tribute to the officers and men of the Force who have so faithfully carried out their strenuous mission for peace.

From what I have said it becomes obvious that a United Nations force has no tasks to fulfill in Israel. The entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba is not in Israel, and the marauders and infiltrators do not operate from Israel territory.

Mr. President, the proclaimed and practiced policy of belligerence so brazenly pursued by the Government of the United Arab Republic is the crux of the matter. This is the underlying cause for the present and other crisis situations in the Middle East.

This belligerence made an empty shell of the Armistice Agreement. The two central violations of the Egyptian Israel Armistice Agreement are the denial of free passage in the Suez Canal and the denial of free passage in Aqaba. In September 1951, the Security Council ruled that such belligerent practices and blockades cannot co-exist with the armistice regime.

While the United Nations ruled that belligerence is incompatible with the armistice

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 7569

regime, Egypt wants to use the armistice agreement and United Nations machinery as a cover for the continuation of that very belligerency which the Armistice Agreement was intended to end. This is the meaning of the innocent-looking sentence where the Secretary-General reports President Nasser's assurances that all that he wanted was "a return to the conditions prevailing prior to 1956". What were these conditions, Mr. President? Illegal blockade of the Suez Canal; armed incursions by organized gangs of Fedayeen; and illicit interference with the freedom of navigation through the Straits of Tiran. The Government of Israel will not permit a return to these conditions.

This is the real issue, and not the mixture of stale allegations and fictitious charges put forward by the representatives of the United Arab Republic. . . . The Representative of the U.A.R. has presented to the Council at length and in detail his version of the historical developments of the last twenty years. It was a fascinating exercise in fiction and diversion. Unfortunately, he forgot to mention one basic fact which determined the course of events to follow: On May 15, 1948, the Egyptian Army and those of other Arab states invaded the State of Israel with the avowed aim communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to occupy the territory of Israel and to destroy its independence. This aggression, which was committed in flagrant violation of the charter and of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, was resisted and defeated by the people of Israel.

It is this unsuccessful attempt to wipe out Israel which is the basic cause for the future developments. This Arab invasion of Israel was called at the time by the principal members of the Council by its true term: aggression. And all that followed is directly traced back to that aggression—and to that alone. If there is still any doubt, Colonel Nasser himself has dissipated the last vestiges of it and thrown off all pretence. In his speech before the Central Council of Arab Trade Unions on 28 May 1967 he revealed his true intentions—not new to Israel or to those who knew the realities of the Middle East, and shocking to those who believed that they were dealing with a responsible leader. This was his message:

"The Arab people want to fight.

We have been waiting for the suitable day when we shall be completely ready since if we enter a battle with Israel we should be confident of victory and should take strong measures. We do not speak idly.

We have lately felt that our strength is sufficient and that if we enter the battle with Israel we shall with G-d's help, be victorious. Therefore, we have now decided that I take real steps.

UNEF stays as long as we wish and until we are ready. I have said at one time that within half an hour we can say to the UNEF: go. And this is what has really happened.

The battle will be a full-scale one and our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

Mr. Presidents, these threats do not need any interpretation. This is not the first time in our generation that we have seen to what lengths of folly dictators can go unless checked in time, and what disasters they can inflict on mankind, including their own people. Is it too late to hope that this organization, born out of the shambles of a dictator's madness, will rally in defense of its own principles and restrain President Nasser from the course on which he is set? The people of Israel, steeled in hardship and oppression, stand firm, resolute and united and will not shrink from defending their liberty and independence.

It is not too late for reason to prevail. The Government of Israel believes that four immediate steps should be taken in the present crisis:

(1) All inflammatory statements and threats against the territorial integrity and

political independence of any state should cease.

(2) The Charter obligation of non-belligerence must be strictly complied with.

(3) The armed forces should be withdrawn to their positions as at the beginning of the month.

(4) All forms of armed incursions, acts of sabotage and terrorism should cease, and the Government's concerned should take all steps to prevent their territory from being used for these hostile acts.

(5) In the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba there should be no interference with any shipping.

If these steps are taken promptly, the deep anxieties of the hour will be lifted and the present dangerous tensions will subside.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN FAVOR OF REORGANIZATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, it was my privilege to testify before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations in favor of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 for the District of Columbia.

I know that all of our colleagues are in favor of making our Capital City a model for the country and the world. I therefore call their attention to my statement, which follows:

A MORE RESPONSIVE AND EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Statement of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York, before Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, House Committee on Government Operations, June 14, 1967)

Mr. Chairman: I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this morning in support of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 submitted to us by the President on June 1st.

As you know, Reorganization Plan No. 3 is designed to provide the people of the District of Columbia with, in the words of President Johnson in his February 27th message on the Nation's Capital, "The most responsive and efficient government we are capable of providing."

In 1965 the House rejected—temporarily, I am sure—a bill to give home rule to the District of Columbia. In its place it substituted a "Referendum" bill which never got to conference with the Senate. It was my privilege to be the sponsor of the Administration's Home Rule bill and to play a role in the attempt to enact it into law. I have supported home rule legislation since I came to the House in 1947.

We are not, however, here considering Home Rule, much as we may want it. That is within the jurisdiction of the District Committee. This committee does have jurisdiction over this Reorganization Plan and I will address myself to that.

The District of Columbia government needs an overhauling. It has needed it for too long.

The commission form of government is outmoded and today's urban problems demand a more efficient form of government. President Johnson is giving the people of Washington that opportunity in Reorganization Plan No. 3.

I have taken an active interest in city government all of my adult life. I have served

as counsel to the Democratic Leader of the New York State Assembly devoting a large part of my service to New York City legislative problems. Prior to my election to Congress in 1947 I served as special counsel to the Mayor of New York City handling City Home Rule legislation that was requested from the State Legislature. For about twelve years I have been a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. During those years I have become acutely aware of the many deficiencies of the commission form of government we have here in Washington. It is no reflection upon those who have taken upon themselves the task of serving as Commissioners that this is true, since the system itself is at fault and only rarely those who administer it.

All of my experience leads me to the conclusion that I express to you—the District government badly needs reorganization and the plan before this Committee offers the best answer to that need.

This plan will put the responsibilities for executive leadership in the hands of one man who will be expected to exercise that leadership in the best interests of the people of Washington. He will be aided by a City Council made up of residents—those most familiar with the city's problems and most capable of dealing with those problems.

The plan in no way usurps the legislative responsibilities of either the House or Senate Committees on the District of Columbia.

This is not a substitute for home rule and I hope that no Member of the Congress will consider it as such. The people of the District of Columbia are still taxed without representation—a phrase which may have a familiar sound to the Members of the Committee—and they still have no voice in any way in the House or in the other body. This plan does not give that to them and no reorganization plan can do so. That can be initiated and accomplished only by the full legislative process.

The same is true as to any attempt to give the City of Washington an elected executive and/or an elected council or local legislature.

However, we must not let the situation in the District continue as it has since the 1870's when representative government was abolished. The Congress must allow this plan to take effect if there is to be any improvement in the situation.

There are those who suggest that the plan is in need of improvement or that it should be rejected in its entirety. This plan has been known to the Members of the Congress and the Members of the House District Committee since the President carefully outlined it in his message of February 27, 1967. At no time since, have I heard any reason which would merit rejection of the plan.

If the objective of some of my colleagues be to improve still further the government of the District of Columbia, that may be done by legislation which is and will remain the full province and opportunity of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

But the prospects for such legislative improvements are not encouraging. All the time I have served on the District Committee I have urged the strengthening of the District's government structure. The Committee has been many times to the well, but the District has never had a drink of water.

The lesson of our legislative history is that the detailed job of government reorganization must be done by means of a reorganization plan. This is what the Hoover Commission recommended and this is what the Congress directed in the Reorganization Act of 1949. I hope that Congress will allow this plan to go into effect.

I need not, I am sure, describe the plan to the Members of the Subcommittee. You have heard able supporting testimony from Members of your own Committee as well as your colleagues on the District Committee on

H 7570

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

both sides of the aisle. Better government is not, I am pleased to say, a partisan issue.

I do, however, wish to state briefly what I see as the strength of the proposed new structure for the District government.

It will—

Bring strong executive leadership and new esprit to the District government;

Replace the outmoded commission form of government with its divided leadership and closed and clouded lines of authority and responsibility;

Establish through the Council, official representation for citizens of the District in the making of rules, regulations and budgets of their local governments;

Increase the capacity of the District government to draw top personnel;

Give the District a strong representative for negotiations with other area governments and federal agencies;

Allow the President to search nationwide to head up the District government;

Give unified direction to government responses to urban problems, reduce overlapping and improve coordination of programs.

The plan is not a substitute for home rule. It will not bring elected government. This can only be done by legislation and I hope the District Committee will turn its heightened attention to that longstanding need.

In the interim, however, the District must have better government, better management and broader citizen participation. The plan provides all three.

Let me turn now to the opposition to this plan as posed by some of our colleagues.

Discussion of motives rarely accomplishes anything except to fray tempers.

Nevertheless, I dare say only because I believe it needs saying: The only reason for opposition to this plan is legislative pride of authorship and I deem it false pride. What else can account for the introduction of this plan as a bill which has been referred to the House District Committee.

Everyone, including all of the opponents who serve on that District Committee, agree that the District government needs reorganization.

Why, therefore, has not one of them, ever before June 5, 1967, introduced a bill to accomplish that?

How many more years of service on that committee will they need to study the problem?

How many more years do they need to study this plan?

We have heard from the sponsor of the bill embracing this plan word for word, that the plan needs improvement. He says he cannot make any specific suggestion as to how or in what respects until he studies it some more. I would think that introduction of a bill in a Member's name is a certification by that Member that he knows its contents and that he sponsors its provisions.

He says that if the plan becomes effective under its terms, turmoil will result. He gives us no intimation of how such turmoil can be avoided if his bill or any other reorganization plan becomes effective.

He tells us that a recommendation has been made as to reorganization which can be accomplished by the District Commissioners, without Presidential or Congressional action.

He overlooks the obvious. Good or bad, the District Commissioners have no intention of following that route. They are supporting this plan. Furthermore, the three District Commissioners cannot replace themselves with one Commissioner, nor can they provide for a council as called for by this plan.

Opponents of the plan say they do not like an appointed council and that an elected council is better. They refuse, however, to commit themselves to introduce or support a bill for an elected council.

They quibble about the council being bipartisan or non-partisan, but refuse to indicate how the matter should be handled.

They argue about residence requirements of the Commissioner, but will not say what they should be.

No one says it, but I ask how many of the opponents of this plan are concerned about the racial complexion of the Commissioner and of the Members of the Council.

Are they afraid that the non-white residents of this community will prove their loyalty, competence and integrity in government?

The argument that the law does not permit reorganization by this method falls of its own weight when we read the statute which specifically and in so many words permits it.

This plan scrupulously adheres to and stays within the four corners of the statute.

It does not add to or take away any authority or power heretofore vested in the District government by legislative enactment.

Moreover, there is no impairment nor impediment of the privilege, power and right of the Congress to change any thereof.

Permit me to briefly outline the history of this plan so that the Congress may properly evaluate the opposition to this plan.

On February 27, 1967, the President, in a message to Congress, outlined this plan. Almost immediately thereafter the House District Committee was convened in executive session with a view to adopting a resolution opposing the plan on the ground that it would invade that Committee's jurisdiction.

I urged that the Committee immediately proceed to acquire jurisdiction by introducing legislation and conducting hearings to accomplish the reorganization.

No such action was taken.

The President did his utmost to get the best advice available on what should be in and what should be omitted from this plan.

Every Member of the District Committees of both bodies of Congress was given every possible opportunity to make suggestions to improve this plan. There was full and frank discussion of every facet and fair consideration given to all thereof.

Every Member of the House District Committee received a draft of the plan with several alternate provisions covering those matters as to which a difference of opinion had been expressed. We were requested to indicate our preferences as to those items as well as any other ideas we wished to express.

It was only after the expiration of a reasonable time thereafter that the President sent us this plan.

We then spent two more days in informal executive session of the House District Committee to review the plan in detail.

It is my very considered opinion that not a single valid objection was developed to any part of this plan.

It was made clear that the legislative jurisdiction of the District Committees and of the Congress were neither being trespassed upon, invaded, nor prejudiced in any manner whatsoever.

The Committees were and are free to recommend any bills they see fit to add to, take away from or change any part of this reorganization in advance of it becoming effective, simultaneously therewith or at any time thereafter.

I urge that the plan be approved and that this Committee recommend against passage of any disapproving resolution.

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to present my views to you.

THE KENNEDY ROUND

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while the details of the Kennedy round results are not yet available, enough is known to greet it as a time bomb loosed against the American economy. It is the product of a doctrine that fits the modern competitive realities of American industry and agriculture in world markets about as well as a tintype fits the modern camera.

After the shouting and the huzzahs die down these realities will rise from the fog and economic facts of a stubborn kind will stare us in the face. The need for protective devices will not be reduced but will grow.

As the tariff disappears as a safeguard other devices will take its place. Nontariff trade barriers will assume greater importance. International negotiations as twisted and tortured as was the Kennedy round do not change the facts of economic relations. The United States is competitively weak even under the existing tariff levels. It is weak in the face of imports. It is weak in foreign markets.

Some other countries are also competitively weak vis a vis yet other countries in varying degrees. They will not hesitate to do what they regard as necessary to safeguard their industries and agriculture. It would be living in dreamland to believe the contrary.

This country lost heavily in the Kennedy round. Its dependence for protection aside from a few agricultural products rested almost wholly on the tariff. This is not true of other countries. The tariff was the lesser of their protective devices. We are in the position of disarming ourselves of the predominant weapon in our arsenal. The other countries merely give up one of many pieces in their arsenal.

The inevitable demand in this country in the future will be for the greater use of nontariff barriers.

The overwhelming factor in our international trade resides in our high level of wages on which our economy depends for moving the vast volume of goods turned out by our industry and agriculture. The technological lead over other countries that in the past made it possible to maintain our insular economic position in a world of much lower wages is disappearing, contrary to the complaint of other countries about the brain drain to the United States. Competitively these high wages are an export liability and a handicap in the face of imports, much as our economy at home depends on them.

Scores of industries important to our economy already face a deteriorating competitive outlook in foreign trade. With present tariff levels coming down 10 percent each year for 5 years, the outlook will be bleaker yet. The flight of capital overseas will be accelerated.

Imports of manufactured goods, already a menace to many industries, will find our market an increasingly easy mark. Labor will feel the impact sharply.

This is the situation. The early praises of the Kennedy round will fade away in years ahead as the disenchantment sets in.

H 7552

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

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

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to introduce many bills during my relatively short tenure in the House of Representatives, but none which surpasses in satisfaction the bill which I propose today.

Its principal proposer is not me, but a distinguished citizen of the 14th Illinois District, which I represent. I announced a contest in early spring. The title was "There Ought To Be a Law," I asked my constituents to suggest ideas for laws which they believed to be in the public interest.

Inevitably, there were humorists. One of them suggested:

There ought to be a law against "There Ought to Be a Law" contests.

More than 2,500 of the entries, however, were serious and they expressed people's concern for good government. My staff culled out the best entries, reducing the contenders to about 25.

These were type onto a mimeograph stencil and copies were made without identifying the contestants. The copies were distributed to the contest judges—all distinguished residents of the 14th District. Among them were three State Senators, two Federal judges, and nine college presidents. They graded the entries, each privately; and it then was only a matter of scoring to find a winner.

He is Carl Baldwin, an engineer who works for Electro-Motive Division of General Motors Corp.

His proposal was not new; there being three other similar suggestions already introduced in this Congress. I have chosen, however, to seek a different procedure from the others.

In essence, Mr. Baldwin proposed that, in overturning an act of Congress or of a State legislature, a two-thirds majority of the Supreme Court would be needed—in other words, six Justices, rather than only five, would be required to declare a law unconstitutional.

Others have introduced constitutional amendments to effect this change. After consulting with eminent legislative authority, however, I decided that the intention could be carried out by an act of Congress. The Constitution, as I am sure you know, is silent as to the size of the Court and its procedures—indeed, is silent on its power to find a law unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, for being the winner of this contest, Mr. Baldwin was awarded a prize. He and Mrs. Baldwin have come to Washington as my guests. They are in the gallery at this moment to be present for the introduction of his bill.

file
STAYS TO PEACE—THREATS TO PEACE

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the Nation and to the world, President Johnson yesterday outlined a series of basic principles which, if accepted, could lead the way to lasting accords in the many areas of conflict in the world.

In this address, delivered prior to the opening of the United Nations special General Assembly session, Mr. Johnson discussed the problems of Latin America, of Europe, of Southeast Asia and last, but not least, of the Middle East. He offered a realistic approach for the future.

In his speech President Johnson placed particular emphasis on conditions which would establish the basis for lasting peace in the Middle East. The points he enumerated were primarily directed to the combatants in the Middle East, to Israel and the Arabs. These suggestions emphasized that which we, Members of Congress serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, have been endeavoring to achieve for the State of Israel since its creation.

I outline these conditions and emphasize the first: the condition that Israel has the right to live in peace, with proper respect for its rights as a sovereign nation. Once this condition is established, the other problems, no less important, can be adjusted. These are: The refugee problem, the arms problem, the water problem; the boundary problem; the free-passage-international waterway problem, and the troop-withdrawal problem.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the speech of President Johnson in the RECORD. It is my hope that the suggestions as outlined will be implemented.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE FOR EDUCATORS

Secretary Rusk, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the chance to share with you this morning a few reflections of American foreign policy, as I have shared my thoughts in recent weeks with representatives of labor and business, and with other leaders of our society.

During the past weekend at Camp David—where I met and talked with America's good friend, Prime Minister Holt of Australia, I thought of the General Assembly debate on the Middle East that opens today in New York.

But I thought also of the events of the past year in other continents in the world. I thought of the future—both in the Middle East, and in other areas of American interest in the world and in places that concern all of us.

So this morning I want to give you my estimate of the prospects for peace, and the hopes for progress, in these various regions of the world.

I shall speak first of our own hemisphere, then of Europe, the Soviet Union, Africa and Asia, and lastly of the two areas that concern us most at this hour—Vietnam and the Middle East.

Let me begin with the Americas.

Last April I met with my fellow American Presidents in Punta del Este. It was an encouraging experience for me, as I believe it was for the other leaders of Latin America. For they made, there at Punta del Este, the historic decision to move toward the economic integration of Latin America.

In my judgment, their decision is as important as any that they have taken since

they became independent more than a century and a half ago.

The men I met with know that the needs of their 220 million people require them to modernize their economies and expand their trade. I promised that I would ask our people to cooperate in those efforts, and in giving new force to our great common enterprise, which we take great pride in, the Alliance for Progress.

On meeting of chiefs of state, of course, cannot transform a continent. But where leaders are willing to face their problems candidly, and where they are ready to join in meeting them responsibly, there can be only hope for the future.

The nations of the developed world—and I am speaking now principally of the Atlantic Alliance and Japan—have in this past year, I think, made good progress in meeting their common problems and their common responsibilities.

I have met with a number of statesmen—Prime Minister Lester Pearson in Canada just a few days ago, and the leaders of Europe shortly before that. We discussed many of the issues that we face together.

We are consulting to good effect on how to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

We have completed the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations, in a healthy spirit of partnership, and we are examining together the vital question of monetary reform.

We have reorganized the integrated NATO defense, with its new headquarters in Belgium.

We have reached agreement on the crucial question of maintaining allied military strength in Germany.

Finally, we have worked together—although not yet with sufficient resources—to help the less developed countries deal with their problems of hunger and over population.

We have not, by any means, settled all the issues that face us, either among ourselves or with other nations. But there is less cause to lament what has not been done, than to take heart from what has been done.

You know of my personal interest in improving relations with the Western world and the nations of Eastern Europe.

I believe the patient course we are pursuing toward those nations is vital to the security of our nation.

Through cultural exchanges and civil agreements.

Through consular and outer space treaties. Through what we hope will soon become a treaty for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and also, if they will join us, an agreement on anti-ballistic missiles.

We have tried to enlarge, and have made great progress in enlarging, the arena of common action with the Soviet Union.

Our purpose is to narrow our differences where they can be narrowed, and thus to help secure peace in the world for the future generations. It will be a long slow task, we realize. There will be setbacks and discouragement. But it is, we think, the only rational policy for them and for us.

In Africa, as in Asia, we have encouraged the nations of the region in their efforts to join in cooperative attacks on the problems that each of them faces: economic stagnation, poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance. Under Secretary Nicholas Katzenbach just reported to me last week on his recent extended trip throughout Africa. He described to me the many problems and the many opportunities that exist in that continent.

Africa is moving rapidly from the colonial past toward freedom and dignity. She is in the long and difficult travail of building nations. Her proud people are determined to make a new Africa, according to their own lights.

They are now creating institutions for political and economic cooperation. They have set great tasks for themselves—whose

June 20, 1967

attachment to the labor force is seasonal or supplemental to some other activity, often students, housewives, or farm women. Thus a high proportion of such workers are women.

More conclusively, of the many millions of dollar visitors and tourists spend, the resulting incomes to the people serving the visitors are on the average very low, usually inadequate as income for a family and often even for a single person.

The analysis based on the number of jobs provided by the recreation industry, even those that are year-round, exaggerates the economic impact, because so few of the jobs pay a living wage. There is a limited demand for occupational skills which pay an annual wage of about \$6,000 per year. Examples of better paid jobs are mechanics at amusement places and ski lifts, construction workers, professionals in the theater, public park employees, and a few at administrative and managerial positions at larger recreation establishments. In the small and medium sized enterprises the proprietors will normally perform those jobs which require skill and training. Examination of the composition of the labor force in the study areas on the basis of skills and wages, reveals that some areas provide hardly any jobs that pay an adequate family income.

In the final analysis, therefore, after having sifted out the short-term and casual employment, and, in turn having narrowed the year-round employment to that employment which provides a primary family income, we find just a few areas where perhaps 50 to 100 employees make a living out of recreation—aside, of course, from the proprietors and managers. All the other hundreds and thousands of man-years represent in varying degrees supplementary incomes. It is not surprising that the overwhelming number of these jobs are filled by women, and many in the peak periods by students.

Taking the three major groups of enterprises: (1) food, (2) lodgings, and (3) amusement and recreation services, we find that the most labor-intensive establishments are hotels, motels, tourist courts, and camps, (131 proprietors and employees per \$1,000,000 of receipts) and the lowest intensity is in the amusement and recreation service establishments (91). Eating and drinking places provide on the average 113 jobs per \$1,000,000 of receipts. Within the major groupings of businesses there are, of course, variations in labor intensity. For example, hotels, because of the extra service they provide, show a higher intensity than motels, and trailer parks and recreation camps show a lower intensity than motels. Among the eating and drinking establishments, restaurants and cafeterias are more labor-intensive than refreshment places and bars. The widest range is found among the recreation or service establishments, but as a general rule, urban recreation establishments are more labor-intensive than outdoor recreation facilities.

The measurement of impact does not end with the number of jobs created. It is the wage level (as well as duration of employment which is discussed under seasonality) which determines total disposable income for local spending by recreation employees. Compared to manufacturing employment, the wages in the service and trade industries are low, and the recreation sector includes some of the lowest wages. Most of the occupations require simple skills and little training; consequently the pay is poor.

The range is considerable. For example, such typical vacation attractions as amusement parks and horse racetracks pay annual wages of over \$6,000; even the lower paid jobs in golf clubs and at natural tourist attractions are above the wage level of motels and restaurants.

Hourly wages are not uniform for each type of recreation employment throughout the country because of regional differences in

the labor market. Jobs in recreation, as in most service establishments, are not covered by a "minimum wage," and generally labor is not unionized. These factors mainly account for regional variations. For example, in Gatlinburg and Cherokee hourly wages range between 60¢ and \$1.25, and in Park City where labor is unionized, the range is between \$1.00 and \$7.40. In the other areas the range is between 75¢ and \$1.50. It should be noted that even farm laborers could not be attracted at these hourly rates.

Aside from the predominantly low wage level, employment is adversely affected by the uneven seasonal labor demand. There are two employment aspects to the seasonality of the recreation industry. The first relates to the actual length of the season and the second to the peak activity within the season. The season has become longer but the peaks remain.

A further employment effect of seasonality is the scarcity of workers to fill jobs demanding greater skills. In all study areas it was found that many of the skilled jobs, such as cooks, mechanics, and managerial positions, are performed by the proprietors and their families. They have difficulties in recruiting or holding adequately skilled persons largely because of the competition with permanent or otherwise more advantageous positions which are available in nearby towns. There is a consistent pattern of daily commuting of the skilled and semi-skilled workers who live in or near recreation areas to the surrounding towns.

I think Mr. Nathan points out the problems involved. This issue of the Redwood National Park comes while the people of my district are struggling to rebuild their homes, their communities and lives in the wake of consecutive disasters. First it was an earthquake, next a flood, then tidal waves, fires and, seemingly, every other destructive act of nature. Even so, none of these could do to the will and spirit of the people in the First District what the Federal Government now might possibly do—put them out of work or demean their existence by destroying the industry that supports them.

As Members of Congress we accept the high calling of governing instead of being governed. We are charged with imposing our collective will upon the people of America. If we impose it wisely they will be the better for it. If not—by depriving men and women of their jobs, their chosen calling all out of proportion to need—then we are not legislators but, instead, economic hatchet men, unmindful of man's destiny and his right to build and prosper for himself, his family, his community and his God.

Now, with one fell swoop, a multimillion dollar industry, a way of life, a community of people might be plucked out of their place in the sun, shorn of their birthright, their property and their economic security. And nothing under that sun could ever replace the skill, production and pride that now exists among them as laborers in one of the most basic industries in the land.

Slice it anyway you like, saw it, strip it, grind it into economic or aesthetic double-talk and it still comes out one way—job wrecking.

I do not envy those among us who in the haste of their decisions lay their hands of approval on any such scheme. Particularly, when with judicious foresight they can have a better Redwood

National Park and Seashore and the people of northern California can keep the place of usefulness and dignity their labor has earned for them.

I hope all of you will keep an open mind on this matter, it is readily recognized as the most complex conservation proposal ever to be considered by the Congress.

No one should make up their mind until such time as the House has completed its hearings and the committee members have visited the area. This is the only way you can have access to all the facts.

Let me assure you, as the Congressman from the area, it is my desire to create the finest National Redwood Park and Seashore attainable consistent with sound economic factors and with full consideration being given to both schools of conservation thought—preservation conservation and wise multiple-use conservation as they relate to this unique redwood region on the north coast of California.

AREA HELICOPTER SERVICE

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, interest in establishing regularly scheduled helicopter service for the Washington area has been rekindled with the announcement of 11 airlines that they would seek Government approval to link Dulles, Friendship, and National Airports with one another, and downtown Washington.

An application to provide nonsubsidized helicopter service has been pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board for several months. It is not my purpose to endorse the proposal of any company who has had previous experience in this field or that of the airlines.

It is my intent, however, to urge the CAB to take immediate and swift action to certificate a carrier to operate in the Washington metropolitan area. I also wish to commend the airlines for their general endorsement.

Ground congestion to the three area airports is a hydrant-headed monster that grows bigger and bigger. This inconvenience to the traveling public must be eliminated.

Many of you in this Chamber were present last summer when members of the Commerce Committee's Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee staged a 1-day feasibility demonstration to show how helicopters could effectively and speedily transport travelers from Capitol Hill to area airports.

Helicopter service would sharply reduce in-transit time between the downtown and area airports. This is a fact that hardly need reiteration. For instance, it takes only 11 minutes to go to Dulles or Friendship via helicopter.

I call upon my colleagues to voice their approval of certification of a carrier and to urge the CAB to conclude its hearings so that the operation of regularly scheduled helicopter service can commence as soon as possible.

June 20, 1967

accomplishments will require years of struggle and sacrifice.

We very much want that struggle to succeed, and we want to be responsive to the efforts that they are making on their own behalf.

I can give personal testimony to the new spirit that is abroad in Africa, from Under Secretary Katzenbach's report, and from Asia, from my own travels and experience there. In Asia my experience demonstrated to me a new spirit of confidence in that area of the world. Everywhere I traveled last autumn, from the conference in Manila to other countries of the region, I found the conviction that Asians can work with Asians to create better conditions of life in every country. Fear has now given way to hope in millions of hearts.

Asia's immense human problems remain, of course. Not all countries have moved ahead as rapidly as Thailand, Korea, and the Republic of China. But most of them are now on a promising track, and Japan is taking a welcome role in helping her fellow Asians toward much more rapid development.

A free Indonesia—the world's fifth largest nation, a land of more than 100 million people—is now struggling to rebuild, to reconstruct and reform its national life. This will require the understanding and the support of the entire international community.

We maintain our dialogue with the authorities in Peking, in preparation for the day when they will be ready to live at peace with the rest of the world.

I regret that this morning I cannot report any major progress toward peace in Vietnam.

I can promise you that we have tried every possible way to bring about either discussions between the opposing sides, or a practical de-escalation of the violence itself.

Thus far there has been no serious response from the other side.

We are ready—and we have long been ready—to engage in a mutual de-escalation of the fighting. But we cannot stop only half the war, nor can we abandon our commitment to the people of South Vietnam as long as the enemy attacks and fights on. And so long as North Vietnam attempts to seize South Vietnam by force, we must, and we will, block its efforts—so that the people of South Vietnam can determine their own future in peace.

We would very much like to see the day come—and come soon—when we can cooperate with all the nations of the region, including North Vietnam, in healing the wounds of a war that has continued, we think, for far too long. When the aggression ends, then that day will follow.

Now, finally, let me turn to the Middle East—and to the tumultuous events of the past months.

Those events have proved the wisdom of five great principles of peace in the region.

The first and greatest principle is that every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live, and to have this right respected by its neighbors.

For the people of the Middle East, the path to hope does not lie in threats to end the life of any nation. Such threats have become a burden to the peace, not only of that region but a burden to the peace of the entire world.

In the same way, no nation would be true to the United Nations Charter, or to its own true interests, if it should permit military success to blind it to the fact that its neighbors have rights and its neighbors have interests of their own. Each nation, therefore, must accept the right of others to live.

This last month, I think, shows us another basic requirement for settlement. It is a human requirement: Justice for the refugees.

A new conflict has brought new homelessness. The nations of the Middle East must at last address themselves to the plight of those who have been displaced by wars. In

the past, both sides have resisted the best efforts of outside mediators to restore the victims of conflict to their homes, or to find them other proper places to live and work. There will be no peace for any party in the Middle East unless this problem is attacked with new energy by all, and, certainly, primarily by those who are immediately concerned.

A third lesson from this last month is that maritime rights must be respected. Our Nation has long been committed to free maritime passage through international waterways, and we, along with other nations, were taking the necessary steps to implement this principle when hostilities exploded. If a single act of folly was more responsible for this explosion than any other, I think it was the arbitrary and dangerous announced decision that the Strait of Tiran would be closed. The right of innocent maritime passage must be preserved for all nations.

Fourth, this last conflict has demonstrated the danger of the Middle Eastern arms race of the last 12 years. Here the responsibility must rest not only on those in the area—but upon the larger states outside the area. We believe that scarce resources could be used much better for technical and economic development. We have always opposed this arms race, and our own military shipments to the area have consequently been severely limited.

Now the waste and futility of the arms race must be apparent to all the people of the world. And now there is another moment of choice. The United States of America, for its part, will use every resource of diplomacy, and every counsel of reason and prudence, to try to find a better course.

As a beginning, I should like to propose that the United Nations immediately call upon all of its members to report all shipments of all military arms into this area, and to keep those shipments on file for all the peoples of the world to observe.

Fifth, the crisis underlines the importance of respect for political independence and territorial integrity of all the states of the area. We reaffirmed that principle at the height of this crisis. We reaffirm it again today on behalf of all. This principle can be effective in the Middle East only on the basis of peace between the parties. The nations of the region have had only fragile and violated truce lines for 20 years. What they now need are recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will give them security against terror, destruction and war. Further, there just must be adequate recognition of the special interest of three great religions in the holy places of Jerusalem.

These five principles are not new, but we do think they are fundamental. Taken together, they point the way from uncertain armistice to durable peace. We believe there must be progress toward all of them if there is to be progress toward any.

There are some who have urged, as a single, simple solution, an immediate return to the situation as it was on June 4. As our distinguished and able Ambassador, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, has already said, this is not a prescription for peace, but for renewed hostilities.

Certainly troops must be withdrawn, but there must also be recognized rights of national life—progress in solving the refugee problem—freedom of innocent maritime passage—limitation of the arms race—and respect for political independence and territorial integrity.

But who will make this peace where all others have failed for 20 years or more?

Clearly the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. Sooner or later it is they who must make a settlement in the area. It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together.

But we must still ask, who can help them? Some say it should be the United Nations, some call for the use of other parties. We

have been first in our support of effective peace-keeping in the United Nations, and we also recognize the great values to come from mediation.

We are ready this morning to see any method tried, and we believe that none should be excluded altogether. Perhaps all of them will be useful and all will be needed.

I issue an appeal to all to adopt no rigid view on these matters. 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.

Yet there is no escape from this fact: the main responsibility for the peace of the region depends upon its own peoples and its own leaders of that region. What will be truly decisive in the Middle East will be what is said and what is done by those who live in the Middle East.

The can seek another arms race, if they have not profited from the experience of this one, if they want to. But they will seek it at a terrible cost to their own people—and to their very long-neglected human needs. They can live on a diet of hate—though only at the cost of hatred in return. Or they can move toward peace with one another.

The world this morning is watching, watching for the peace of the world, because that is really what is at stake. It will look for patience and justice—it will look for humility—and moral courage. It will look for signs of movement from prejudice and the emotional chaos of conflict—to the gradual, slow shaping steps that lead to learning to live together and learning to help mold and shape peace in the area and in the world.

The Middle East is rich in history, rich in its people and in its resources. It has no need to live in permanent civil war. It has the power to build its own life, as one of the prosperous regions of the world in which we live.

If the nations of the Middle East will turn toward the works of peace, they can count with confidence upon the friendship, and the help, of all the people of the United States of America.

In a climate of peace, we here will do our full share to help with a solution for the refugees. We here will do our full share in support of regional cooperation. We here will do our share, and do more, to see that the peaceful promise of nuclear energy is applied to the critical problem of desalting water and helping to make the deserts bloom.

Our country is committed—and we here reiterate that commitment today—to a peace that is based on five principles.

First, the recognized right of national life;
Second, justice for the refugees;
Third, innocent maritime passage;
Fourth, limits on the wasteful and destructive arms race; and
Fifth, political independence and territorial integrity for all.

This is not a time for malice, but for magnanimity; not for propaganda, but for patience; not for vituperation, but for vision.

On the basis of peace, we offer our help to the people of the Middle East. That land, known to everyone of us since childhood as the birthplace of great religions and learning, can flourish once again in our time. We here in the United States shall do all in our power to help make it so.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in contrast to President Johnson's temperate and reasoned arguments, the speech of Premier Kosygin, delivered 1 hour later, was deeply disappointing, but only to those who do not understand communism, its ways and objectives. His address should awaken all people to the distortion of truth by all Communist leaders. Mr. Speaker, I request that at the close of these re-

marks the address of Premier Kosygin before the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York be inserted in the RECORD. I will not analyze his remarks. They are self-explanatory and cannot be misinterpreted. I believe he seeks a way out of the Soviet defeat in the Middle East. He wants the Soviet Union to be viewed in the eyes of the peoples of the world as a peace-keeping and peace-achieving nation.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1967]

TEXT OF ADDRESS TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY
MR. KOSYGIN

Mr. President, distinguished delegates, representatives from almost all states of the world have gathered for the emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly to consider the grave and dangerous situation which has developed in recent days in the Middle East and which arouses deep concern everywhere.

True enough, no hostilities are being waged here at this moment. The fact that there has been a cease-fire is a certain success of the peace-loving forces. It also does considerable credit to the Security Council, though it failed to discharge fully its obligation under the United Nations Charter. The aggression is continuing. The armed forces of Israel occupy territories in the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan.

As long as the Israeli troops continue to occupy the seized territories, and urgent measures are not taken, to eliminate the consequences of the aggression, a military conflict can flare up any minute with a new intensity.

That is exactly why the Soviet Union took the initiative in convening an emergency session of the General Assembly. We are gratified to note that many states supported our proposal. Thus they displayed their awareness of the dangers with which the situation is fraught and manifested their concern for the consolidation of peace.

OBLIGATION IS SHARED

The General Assembly is confronted with a responsible task of adopting decisions that would clear the way toward the restoration of peace in the Middle East. This task concerns all states irrespective of differences in social or political systems, philosophical concepts, irrespective of geography and alignment with this or that grouping. It can be solved only if the multiple and complex nature of today's world does not push into the background the common objectives that join states and peoples together, and above all, the need to prevent a military disaster.

What question is now uppermost in the minds of all peoples? We believe that all the participants in the General Assembly will agree that all nations are concerned above all about the problem of how to avoid this disaster.

No nation wants war. Nowadays nobody doubts that if a new world war starts it would inevitably be a nuclear one. Its consequences would be fatal for many countries and peoples of the world. The more far-sighted statesmen from various countries, outstanding thinkers and scientists warned of this from the first day nuclear weapons came into existence.

The nuclear age has created a new reality in questions of war and peace. It has vested in the states a far greater responsibility in all that pertains to these problems. This cannot be called in question by any politician, any military man, unless he has lost the capacity for sensible thinking—all the more so in that military men can imagine the aftermath of a nuclear war better than anyone else.

"NO STONE UNTURNED"

However, the practice of international relations abounds in facts which show that

certain states take quite a different approach. Continuous attempts are undertaken to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them from outside political concepts and alien views on social order.

No stone is left unturned to breathe a new life into military blocs. The network of military bases, those strong-points of aggression flung far and wide all over the world, is being refurbished and perfected. Naval fleets are plying the sea thousands of miles from their own shores and threaten the security of states in entire areas.

Even in those cases when the aggravation of tension or the emergence of hotbeds of war-danger is connected with conflicts involving relatively small states, not infrequently it is the big powers that are behind them. This applies not only to the Middle East, where aggression has been committed by Israel backed by bigger imperialist powers but also to other areas of the world.

For nearly three years now the United States, having cast aside all camouflage, has been carrying out direct aggression against the Vietnamese people.

This war is waged so as to impose on the Vietnamese people an order to suit foreign imperialist circles. It will be no exaggeration to say that the world has branded with ignominy the perpetrators of this aggression.

There is a way to solve the Vietnamese problem, and it is a simple one: The United States must leave Vietnam, it must withdraw its forces. First and foremost it must immediately and unconditionally stop the bombing of the Democratic Republic of [North] Vietnam. No statements about readiness to find a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese question can sound convincing unless this is done.

Such statements by United States statesmen should not depart from what the United States actually does. It should be taken into account that the continuing war in Vietnam intensifies the risk of this military conflict overflowing the boundaries of this area, and is fraught with a terrible danger of escalating into a major military clash between the powers. This is precisely what the present course of the United States foreign policy is fraught with.

A hostile stance in regard to Socialist Cuba, the armed intervention in the Congo and the Dominican Republic, the attempts of armed suppression of peoples in the colonial territories striving for their independence—these are all links of the same chain, a manifestation of a far-from-peaceful policy of those who by their actions create and fan international tensions and precipitate international crises.

EUROPEAN ISSUES CITED

Let us turn to Europe—the continent where the fires of both the First and Second World Wars started. There the principal concern of the Soviet Union and of our friends and allies and many other states has been, throughout the postwar period—and still is—to prevent a new world war, to curb the forces that would like to take revenge for the defeat in World War II.

The forces that would like to follow in the footsteps of Hitlerites have long since clearly emerged in the process of the struggle for peace in Europe. These forces are rooted in West Germany. It is there that a refusal to put up with the results of the war is openly voiced throughout the postwar years a demand to revise the European borders established after the war is put forward, and access to weapons of mass destruction is eagerly sought after. These forces have aligned themselves, to the danger of the peoples, with non-European aggressive forces.

The militarists and revenge-seekers in the Federal Republic of Germany should know that any attempt to translate their hare-brained plans into reality would entail grave

disasters for the peoples, and above all it carries a deadly menace for West Germany itself.

The Soviet Union is firmly in favor of peace in Europe, and bases its European policy upon respect for the boundaries established after the war, including those between the two sovereign German states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

This is a far-from-exhaustive list of events that enliven international life and sometimes lead to great tension and the appearance of hotbeds of war.

PAST CLASHES RECALLED

If the events in the Middle East are analyzed, the conclusion will unfailingly be made that the war between Israel and the Arab states, too, did not result from some kind of misunderstanding or inadequate understanding of one another by the sides.

Nor is this just a local conflict. The events that took place recently in the Middle East in connection with the armed conflict between Israel and the Arab states should be considered precisely in the context of the general international situation.

I would not like to go into details, but basic facts have to be mentioned in order to give a correct assessment of what has happened.

What were the main features in relations between Israel and the Arab countries during the past year? These were the continuously increasing tension and the mounting scale of attacks by Israeli troops against one or another of its neighbors.

On Nov. 25, 1966, the Security Council censured the Government of Israel for a carefully planned "large-scale military action" against Jordan in violation of the United Nations Charter, and warned that if such actions were repeated the Security Council would have to consider "further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter." Israel, however, did not wish to draw a lesson.

Last April 7, Israeli troops staged an attack against the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic. This was a largescale military operation involving planes, tanks and artillery. Following this, Israel provoked new military incidents on its border with Jordan.

TROOP BUILD-UP CHARGED

Once again Israel was warned by a number of states about responsibility for the consequences of the policy it pursued. But even after that the Israeli Government did not reconsider its course. Its political leaders openly threatened wider military actions against Arab countries. The Premier of Israel made it clear that the armed attack on Syria in April was not the last step, and that Israel was itself going to choose the method and time for new actions of this kind.

On May 9, 1967, the Israeli Parliament authorized the Government of Israel to carry out military operations against Syria. Israeli troops began concentrating at the Syrian borders, and mobilization was carried out in the country.

In those days, the Soviet Government, and I believe others too, began receiving information to the effect that the Israeli Government had timed for the end of May a swift strike at Syria in order to crush it and then carry the fighting over into the territory of the United Arab Republic.

When the preparations for war entered the final stage the Government of Israel suddenly began to spread both confidentially and publicly profuse assurances of its peaceful intentions. It declared that it was not going to start hostilities and was not seeking a conflict with its neighbors.

UNPRECEDENTED PERFDY

Literally a few hours before the attack on the Arab states the Defense Minister of Israel swore his Government was seeking peaceful solutions. "Let diplomacy work," the Minister was saying at the very moment when the

Israeli pilots had already received orders to bomb the cities in the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

An unprecedented perfidy, indeed!

On June 5, Israel started war against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. The Government of Israel flouted the Charter of the United Nations, the standards of international law, and thus showed that all its peaceful declarations were false through and through.

What followed is well known.

Here, within the United Nations, I will only recall the arrogance with which the unbridled aggressor ignored the demands of the Security Council for an immediate cease-fire.

COUNCIL EVENTS TRACED

On June 6 the Security Council proposed an end to all hostilities as a first step toward the restoration of peace. Israel widened the operations on the fronts.

On June 7 the Security Council fixed a time limit for the stopping of all hostilities. Israeli troops continued their offensive, and Israeli aircraft bombed peaceful Arab towns and villages.

On June 9 the Security Council issued a new, categorical demand prescribing a cease-fire. It was also ignored by Israel. The Israeli Army mounted an attack against the defensive lines of Syria with the purpose of breaking through to the capital of that state, Damascus.

The Security Council had to adopt yet another, and its fourth, decision, a number of states had to sever diplomatic relations with Israel and to give a firm warning about the use of sanctions before Israeli troops stopped military actions. In fact, the greater part of the territory of Arab countries now actually occupied by Israel was seized after the Security Council took a decision on an immediate cessation of hostilities.

The facts irrefutably prove that Israel bears responsibility for unleashing the war, and for its victims and for its consequences.

But if anybody needs additional proof that it was Israel who unleashed the war in the Middle East, that it is actually an aggressor, that proof was furnished by Israel itself. It is impossible to interpret in any other way the refusal of the Israeli Government to support the proposal of the Soviet Union to convene an emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly. If the Government of Israel did not feel its guilt before the peoples of the world, it would not have been so afraid of our discussion and those decisions which this General Assembly must take.

Israel has no arguments that would justify its aggression. Its attempts to justify itself, just as the attempts of its advocates to whitewash the policy and actions of Israel which are based on the assertions that the attack on the Arab states was a forced action on the part of Israel, that the other side left no alternative, are a deception.

If Israel had any claims against its neighbors, it should have come here to the United Nations and here searched for a settlement, by peaceful means, as is prescribed by the U.N. Charter. After all, Israel claims to be entitled to the rights and privileges offered by the membership in the United Nations. But rights cannot exist in isolation from duties.

More and more reports are coming of atrocities and violence committed by the Israeli invaders on the territories they have seized. What is going on in the Sinai Peninsula and in the Gaza Strip, in the western part of Jordan and on the Syrian soil occupied by the Israeli troops, brings to the mind the heinous crimes perpetrated by the Fascists during World War II. The indigenous Arab population is being evicted from Gaza, Jerusalem and other areas. In the same way as Hitler's Germany used to appoint Gauleiters in the occupied regions, the Israeli Gov-

ernment is establishing an occupation administration on the seized territories and appointing its military governors there.

NO PLACE FOR ZIGZAGS

Israeli troops are burning villages and destroying hospitals and schools. The civilian population is deprived of food and water and of all means of subsistence. There have been facts of prisoners of war and even women and children being shot and of ambulances carrying the wounded being burned.

The United Nations cannot overlook these crimes. The Security Council has already addressed itself to the Government of Israel with a demand to insure the safety, well being and security of the population in the occupied regions. The resolution is in itself an accusation of the aggressor. The United Nations must compel Israel to respect international laws. Those who mastermind and commit crimes on the occupied territories of the Arab countries must be severely called to account.

Faithful to the principle of rendering aid to the victim of aggression and supporting the peoples who fight for their independence and freedom, the Soviet Union has resolutely come out in defense of the Arab states. We warned the Government of Israel both before the aggression and during the war that if it had decided to take upon itself the responsibility for unleashing a military conflict, that Government would have to pay in full measure for the consequences of this step. We still firmly adhere to this position.

Where the question is one of war and peace, of protecting the rights of peoples, there must not be a place for political zigzags. It does, of course, happen that to solve this or that problem the states chart several possible routes. But in such matters as the one considered now by the emergency session of the General Assembly, there is no alternative to the resolute condemnation of the aggressor and those forces that stand behind him, no alternative to the elimination of the consequences of the aggression. There is no other way to bring about the cessation of the aggression and rein in those who might wish to embark on new adventures in the future.

On may ask, Why is the Soviet Union so resolutely opposing Israel? However, gentlemen, the Soviet Union is not against Israel—it is against the aggressive policy pursued by the ruling circles of that state.

In the course of its 50-year history, the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. It is on this basis that we formulated our attitude to Israel as a state, when we voted in 1947 for the U.N. decision to create two independent states, a Jewish and an Arab one, in the territory of the former British colony of Palestine. Guided by this fundamental policy the Soviet Union was later to establish diplomatic relations with Israel.

A POLICY OF SEIZURE

While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward other countries, a policy of seizure of foreign lands and subjugation of the people living there.

But what is, in fact, the policy of the State of Israel?

Unfortunately, throughout most of Israel's history the ruling quarters in Israel conducted a policy of conquest and territorial expansion that cut into the lands of neighboring Arab states, evicting or even exterminating in the process the indigenous population of these areas.

This was the case in 1948-1949, when Israel forcibly seized a sizable portion of the terri-

tory of the Arab state, whose creation the U.N. decision had envisaged. About a million people found themselves evicted from their homeland and doomed to hunger, suffering and poverty. During all these years, deprived of a country and of means of subsistence, these people remained in the status of exiles. The acute problem of the Palestinian refugees, created by Israel's policy, remains unsolved to this day, constantly increasing tension in the region.

This was also the case in 1956, when Israel became a party to aggression against Egypt. Its forces invaded Egyptian territory along the same routes as today. At that time Israel also tried to retain the seized lands, but it was obliged to go back, beyond the armistice lines, under the powerful pressure exercised by the United Nations and the majority of its members.

The members of the United Nations are well aware that all through the years that followed, Israel committed aggressive acts either against the United Arab Republic or against Syria or Jordan. Never had the Security Council been convened so often as it was in those years to consider questions relating to conflicts between Israel and the Arab states.

As we have seen, the very recent aggressive war unleashed by Israel against the Arab countries is a direct continuation of the policy which the ruling extremist groups in Israel kept imposing on their state throughout the lifetime of its existence. It is this aggressive policy that is resolutely and consistently opposed by the Soviet Union together with other Socialist and all peace-loving states. The duty of the United Nations is to force Israel to obey the demands of the peoples.

If the United Nations failed in this, it would not fulfill its lofty function, for the purpose for which it was created, and the peoples' faith in this organization would be shaken.

SUPPORT FROM IMPERIALISM

It is only on the path of peace, on the path of renunciation of the aggressive policy toward neighboring states that Israel can assert itself among the countries of the world.

We would not have been consistent and fair in estimating Israel's policy if we did not declare with all certainty that in its actions Israel has enjoyed outside support from certain imperialist circles. Moreover, these powerful circles made statements and took practical actions which might have been interpreted by Israeli extremist solely as direct encouragement to commit acts of aggression.

For example, how else could one qualify the fact that on the eve of the Israeli aggression a plan was urgently devised in the United States and United Kingdom (and this was widely reported in the press) of establishing an international naval force to bring pressure to bear upon the Arab states? How else could one qualify the military demonstrations by the American Sixth Fleet off the coast of the Arab states, and the build-up of the British Navy and Air Force in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea area, or the increase of modern arms and ammunition deliveries for the Israeli Army?

The incitement campaign against the Arab states and their leaders was promoted especially in the United States and West Germany. In the Federal Republic of Germany, in particular, it was announced that discriminatory financial measures against the Arab states had been introduced. Recruitment of, so-called volunteers for Israel started in several West German cities.

DELAYING TACTIC SEEN

Incidentally, after the start of hostilities, when in the first hours of the armed clash the Soviet Union strongly condemned the Israeli aggressors and demanded universal condemnation of their perfidious acts, an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops beyond the armistice lines, the very

same forces which could not be termed other than accomplices of aggression, did all they could to help Israel gain time and carry out new conquests and attain its designs. As a result, the Security Council found itself unable to take the decision which was prompted by the existing emergency. This is why the responsibility for the dangerous situation in the Middle East lies squarely not only with Israel, but also with those who backed it in these events.

At the present time extremist belligerent circles in Tel Aviv claim that their seizure of Arab territories engineered by them provides them (this they have the effrontery to assert) with grounds to present new demands to the Arab countries and peoples.

An unbridled anti-Arab propaganda campaign, played up by the press of certain Western countries, is being conducted in Israel: the force of arms is extolled, new threats against the neighboring countries are voiced, and it is declared that Israel will heed no decision, including that of the current session of the U.N. General Assembly, unless it meets its claims.

The aggressor is in a state of intoxication. The long-nurtured plans of recarving the map of the Middle East are now put forward. The Israeli leaders proclaim that Israel will not leave the Gaza Strip or the western banks of the River Jordan. They contend that Israel intends to maintain its control over the whole of Jerusalem, and assert that in case the Arab countries are reluctant in complying with Israeli demands the Israeli forces would simply remain in their present positions.

ATTITUDE OF THE WEST

What is the attitude of the United States and British Governments to the Israeli claims? Actually, they are promoting the aggressor here as well. In what other way can the aggressor interpret their position in the Security Council, which blocked the adoption of the proposal on an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops behind the armistice lines?

The words in support of political independence and territorial integrity of the Middle East countries coming lavishly from the U.S. representatives could make sense only if those who uttered them would in no uncertain way reject the territorial claims of the aggressor and favor an immediate withdrawal of troops.

By putting forward a program of annexation, Israel seems to have completely lost a sense of reality, and has embarked on a very dangerous path.

Any attempt to consolidate the results of aggression is bound to fail. We are confident that the United Nations will reject attempts to impose on the Arab peoples a settlement that might jeopardize their legitimate interests and hurt their feelings or self-respect.

Territorial conquests, if they were recognized by various states, would only lead to new and perhaps larger conflicts. Consequently, peace and security in the Middle East would remain illusory. Such a situation cannot be permitted to arise, and one may rest assured that this is not going to happen. Attempts to consolidate the fruits of aggression will in the long run backfire against Israel and its people.

CONTINUED CHALLENGE

By occupying territories of the U.A.R., Jordan and Syria, Israel continues to challenge the United Nations and all peace-loving states. This is why the main task of this Assembly is to condemn the aggressor and take steps for an immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops beyond the armistice lines. In other words the task is to clear all territories of Arab countries occupied by the Israeli forces from the invaders.

The Israeli aggression has resulted in paralyzing the Suez Canal, an important

waterway which has been transformed by the invaders into a battlefield line. The Soviet Union voices a categorical demand that the Israeli forces should be immediately removed from the shores of the Suez Canal and from all occupied Arab territories.

Only the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the seized territories may change the situation in favor of a détente and the creation of conditions for peace in the Middle East.

Is it not clear that unless this is done and the forces of the Israeli invaders are evicted from the territory of the Arab states, there can be no hope of settling other unsolved problems in the Middle East?

Those who unleashed war against the Arab states should not cherish hopes that they could derive some advantages from this. The United Nations, called upon to serve the cause of preserving peace and international security, must use all its influence and all its prestige in order to put an end to aggression.

In its demand to condemn aggression and withdraw troops from the seized territories of the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan, the Soviet Government proceeds from the need to maintain peace not only in the Middle East. It should not be forgotten that there are many regions in the world where there are bound to be those eager to seize foreign territories, where principles of territorial integrity and respect for the sovereignty of states are far from being honored. Unless Israel's claims receive a rebuff today, tomorrow a new aggressor, big or small, may attempt to overrun the lands of other peaceful countries.

The peoples of the world are closely watching to see whether the United Nations would be able to give a due rebuff to the aggressor and safeguard the interests of the peoples of one of the major world's regions, the Middle East. The present developments in this region give rise to anxiety on the part of many states from the point of view of their own security. And this is quite understandable.

If we here, in the United Nations, fail to take the necessary measures, even those states which are not parties to the conflict may draw the conclusion that they cannot expect protection from the United Nations.

THE COST OF ARMS

In order to enhance their security they may embark on the path of an arms build-up and increase their military budgets. This will mean that funds earmarked for the development of the national economy and the improvement of the living standard of the people would be channeled to an even greater extent to the arms race. Those who cherish peace cannot and must not allow events to take this course.

There is another important aspect of the aggression perpetrated by Israel. The point is that this aggression was aimed at toppling the existing regimes in the U.A.R., Syria and other Arab countries, which by their determined struggle for the consolidation of national independence and progress of the peoples evoke the hatred of the imperialists.

On the other hand, this is countered by solidarity and support on the part of the peoples which have embarked on the path of independent development. Therefore, to permit the actions of Israel against the Arab states to go unpunished would mean opposing the cause of national liberation of peoples and the interests of many states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Soviet Union does not recognize the territorial seizures of Israel. True to the ideals of peace, freedom and independence of the peoples, the Soviet Union will undertake all measures within its power both in the United Nations and outside this organization in order to achieve the elimination of the consequences of aggression and promote the establishment of a lasting peace in the region. This is our firm and principled course. This is our joint course together with other Socialist countries.

BLOC PARLEY RECALLED

On June 9, the leaders of Communist and Workers parties and Governments of seven Socialist countries declared their full and complete solidarity with the just struggle of the states of the Arab East. Unless the Government of Israel ceases its aggression and withdraws its troops beyond the armistice lines, the Socialist states "would do everything necessary in order to aid the people of the Arab countries to deal a firm rebuff to the aggressor, to safeguard their legitimate rights, to quench the hotbed of war in the Middle East and to restore peace in that region."

No state, however far situated from the area of the aggression, can remain aloof from the problem which has been proposed for discussion by the present emergency session. The problem concerns war and peace. In the present tense international situation hours or minutes can settle the fate of the world. Unless the dangerous developments in the Middle East, Southeast Asia or any other place where peace is being violated, are curbed, if conflicts are permitted to spread, the only possible outcome today or tomorrow would be a big war. And no single state would be able to remain on the sidelines.

No state or government, if it genuinely displays concern for peace and the prevention of a new war, can reason that if some event takes place far from its borders it can regard it with equanimity. Indeed, it cannot.

LOCAL WARS PERILOUS

A seemingly small event, or so-called "local wars," may grow into big military conflicts. This means that every state and government should not only refrain from bringing about new complications by its actions—it must undertake every effort to prevent any aggravation of the situation and, moreover, the emergence of hotbeds of war, that should be quenched whenever they appear. This should be stressed especially in connection with the recent events in the Middle East, which have greatly complicated the already complex and dangerous international situation.

The Arab states, which fell victims to aggression, are entitled to expect that their sovereignty, territorial integrity, legitimate rights and interests that had been violated by an armed attack, will be reconstituted in full and without delay. We repeat that this means, first of all, the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories. This is the crucial question today, without which there can be no détente in the Middle East.

Elimination of the consequences of aggression also means restituting the material damage inflicted by the aggressor upon those whom it attacked and whose lands it occupied. The actions of the Israeli forces and the Israeli aircraft have resulted in the destruction of homes, industrial projects, roads and transportation in the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan. Israel is in duty bound to reimburse the full costs of all it has destroyed and to return all captured property. It is in duty bound to do this within the shortest possible time.

Can this session measure up to this task and can it attain it? Yes, it can. The General Assembly should pronounce itself authoritatively in favor of justice and peace.

The Soviet Union and its delegation are ready to work together with other countries, whose representatives have assembled in this hall. They are ready to work together with all other states and delegations in order to attain this aim.

Much depends on the effort of the big powers. It would be good if their delegations as well found common language in order to reach decisions meeting the interests of peace in the Middle East and the interests of universal peace.

June 20, 1967

RESOLUTION IS OFFERED

Guided by the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter and the desire to eliminate the consequences of aggression and restore justice as quickly as possible, the Soviet Government submits the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

"THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

"Stating that Israel, by grossly violating the United Nations Charter and the universally accepted principles of international law, has committed a premeditated and previously prepared aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and has occupied a part of their territory and inflicted great material damage upon them,

"Noting that in contravention of the resolutions of the Security Council on the immediate cessation of all hostilities and a cease-fire of June 6, June 7 and June 9, 1967, Israel continued to conduct offensive military operations against the aforesaid states and expanded its territorial seizures,

"Noting further that although at the present time hostilities have ceased, Israel continues the occupation of the territory of the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan, thus failing to cease the aggression and challenging the United Nations and all peace-loving states,

"Regarding as inadmissible and illegitimate the presenting by Israel of territorial claims to the Arab states, which prevents the restoration of peace in the area.

"1. Resolutely condemns the aggressive actions of Israel and the continuing occupation by Israel of a part of the territory of the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan, which constitutes an act of aggression;

"2. Demands that Israel immediately and without any condition withdraw all its forces from the territory of those states to positions beyond the armistice demarcation lines, as stipulated in the general armistice agreements, and should respect the status of the demilitarized zones, as prescribed in those armistice agreements;

"3. Also demands that Israel should re-stitute in full and within the shortest possible period of time all the damage inflicted by it aggression upon the U.A.R., Syria and Jordan, and their nationals, and should return to them all seized property and other material assets;

"4. Appeals to the Security Council to undertake on its part immediate effective measures in order to eliminate all consequences of the aggression committed by Israel."

The Government of the Soviet Union expresses the hope that the General Assembly will take an effective decision which would insure the inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab states, the restoration and the consolidation of peace and security in the Middle East.

The convening of the General Assembly emergency session is a fact of great international significance. If it were to happen that the General Assembly should find itself incapable of reaching a decision in the interests of peace, it would deal a heavy blow to the expectations of mankind regarding the possibility of settling major international problems by peaceful means, by diplomatic contacts and negotiations. No state that genuinely cares for the future of its people can fail to take this into consideration.

The peoples should rest assured that the United Nations is capable of achieving the aims proclaimed by its Charter, the aims of safeguarding peace on earth.

JARMAN ANNOUNCES HEARINGS INTO TV-RADIATION PROBLEM

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

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months there have arisen questions concerning the matter of X-radiation in connection with color television.

The answers that our Government experts in the field have given to these questions leave a great deal to be desired and only point out the need for a thorough look into the problem.

For that reason I joined with my colleagues on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. PAUL ROGERS of Florida, in sponsoring H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1967.

We have both discussed this matter with the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. HARLEY STAGGERS of West Virginia.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, I am now pleased to announce that there will be hearings held to study the problem of X-radiation in connection with electronic devices that have the potential of emitting radiation.

I feel that the viewing public has the right to be guaranteed that there will be no danger involved in television. And I feel that through these hearings we can establish just what action is needed to give this guarantee.

I anticipate that we should start the hearings in the last part of July or the early part of August.

ROGERS COMMENDS HEARINGS ON TV-RADIATION PROBLEM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for his effective action in calling hearings into the problem of X-radiation in connection with electronic devices which have the potential to emit radiation.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1967, I, too, feel that the American public should have every protection that can be provided.

The public needs to be assured that all necessary action needed to establish the proper level of radiation will be taken. I feel that the Public Health Service has been in error in not establishing these standards earlier considering the millions of people who come in contact with potential sources of radiation every day.

I also commend our distinguished Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, for assuring that these hearings will be held.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today walks the razor's edge of danger. And the ominous specter which overshadows our land is an enemy within the house of our country. They advocate revolution and they are effectuating it by riot, the latest chapter of which

was written in Atlanta, Ga., last night. Teddy Roosevelt, in 1904, said:

No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it.

America 1967 should reaffirm and brand these words into its soul.

Mr. Speaker, Negro Americans cannot afford special treatment. Consider the proudest and noblest Americans of them all, the American Indian; a living example of inequities followed by special treatment. This example illustrates what special treatment does to a man or to a people. Such treatment is an inequity to the people affected and rather than atoning for past inequities, amplifies them.

My grandfather, Mr. M. H. Brinkley, of Faceville, Ga., taught his children that the answer to many problems could be found in the Book of Proverbs, and last night I looked there and found these words:

As snow in summer, and as rain in harvest, so honor is not seemly for a fool. As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come. A whip for the horse, a bridle for the ass, and a rod for the fool's back. Proverbs 25:1-3

Mr. Speaker, our Nation cannot tolerate insurrection led by Stokely Carmichael, or anyone else, cannot afford to defer to him, cannot afford to honor him with preferential treatment.

In behalf of the people of the Third District of Georgia, as Representative of the Third District of Georgia, I have communicated with the Attorney General of the United States, as follows, believing that the latest episode of civil disobedience leaves no doubt as to the evidence against Stokely Carmichael, and leaves no doubt as to the legal remedy:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. June 20, 1967.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The "long, hot summer" as an excuse for violence is once again upon us. My concern has intensified from that of urgency to downright alarm.

Stokely Carmichael is touring the South preaching insurrection and rebellion as witness the shocking incidents in Prattville, Alabama last week and in Atlanta, Georgia, yesterday.

Carmichael has made it abundantly clear that he holds in complete contempt the laws of the United States and of the several states and believes that the Negroes must rebel and seize control of this country.

Federal law prescribes:
"Whoever incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or gives aid or comfort thereto, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States." (18 U.S.C. 2383)

It appears to me that a strong case can be made against Carmichael under this Statute. I call upon you in your capacity as Chief Legal Officer of the United States to investigate Carmichael's activities carefully and quickly and to initiate appropriate action under this or other Statutes.

Assuring you of my cooperation, I am,
Cordially yours,

JACK BRINKLEY,
Member of Congress.

DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

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

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today we have been considering a very important and very necessary piece of legislation, a bill to prohibit the desecration of the American flag. I am pleased to have authored legislation similar to the considered by the House today.

I would like to call to the attention of the House a resolution by the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, supporting this legislation:

RESOLUTION

Subject: Desecration of the American Flag.

Whereas: It has been called to our attention that there have been various American Flag burning incidents; and

Whereas: We have learned that there is presently pending in Congress certain Bills for the purpose of meting out punishment to those who would desecrate our Flag;

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That the Los Angeles County Council of The American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, this 2nd day of June, 1967, goes on record as favoring the passage of such laws and favoring the imposition of appropriate penalties on all those guilty of desecrating or burning the American Flag; and

Be it further resolved: That this resolution be amended to provide that copies of this Resolution be sent to both California Senators and to the Congressmen from the State of California.

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Los Angeles County Council of The American Legion, in regular meeting assembled, the 2nd day of June, 1967.

WILLIAM COULSON,
Adjutant.

TEACHERS CORPS PROGRAM DE-SERVES CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act, which includes extension of the National Teachers Corps for 3 years, may be scheduled for House action early next week. I urge passage by both the House and the other body.

If this legislation is enacted before June 30, \$3.8 million in frozen Federal funds will become available for summer college training of special teachers for schools in slum areas.

Recently, Cleveland School Supt. Paul W. Briggs wrote me explaining the success of the Teachers Corps program in my home city. Also the Cleveland Plain Dealer newspaper has printed an excellent editorial in support of the Teachers Corps. Under leave granted I submit the letter and editorial for consideration by my colleagues:

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 16, 1967.

Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN: The Cleveland Public Schools are engaged in a Na-

tional Teacher Corps project in cooperation with the University of Akron. This relationship was initiated in March, 1966, when the proposal for a Teacher Corps project was drafted jointly by the University and the school system. Four Teacher Corps teams, including fifteen interns and four master teachers, are assigned to junior high schools enrolling large percentages of disadvantaged youth. Their work has augmented in a very meaningful way the efforts of the regular faculties.

The principal beneficiaries, of course, are the children for whom the work of the Corpsmen is an extra dimension of support and motivation. The help which individual pupils have received has resulted in a noticeable academic improvement.

Corps members have also assisted greatly in establishing wholesome relationships with parents and other residents of their school communities.

The National Teacher Corps represents an outstanding effort to improve school opportunity for disadvantaged children. It approaches the problem in an area of crucial significance—the need for more and better prepared teachers.

This program not only offers a special training opportunity to the corps members, but its involvement of other teachers provides enriching professional experiences for the total school staff.

As a new thrust in preparing teachers to serve disadvantaged children, the National Teacher Corps is one of the more promising developments in teacher education as well as in school-university collaboration.

Our estimate of the Teacher Corps is indicated by our willingness to have several of our ablest teachers serve as team leaders and by our commitment to continue participation in the project.

We encourage your support of legislation to continue and expand the National Teacher Corps Program.

Yours truly,

PAUL W. BRIGGS,
Superintendent.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 1, 1967]

EXPAND THE TEACHER CORPS

Congressional failure to extend the National Teacher Corps would have as its principal victims the disadvantaged children of the country.

Even many opponents of the Great Society agree that this program designed to improve the quality of instruction in poverty areas has been strikingly successful.

Fate of the program whose authorization expires June 30 is now in the hands of a House subcommittee regarded as hostile to the corps idea.

Prospects are that the program will survive in curtailed form when, based on merit, it actually should be expanded.

The corps has 1,213 members at work in 275 schools across the country. About a dozen are assigned in Cleveland.

The program offers incentives and special training to teachers who have the talent and the compulsion to work with children in the poorer neighborhoods.

Included are 945 teacher-interns in elementary or secondary schools who are working for masters' degrees in nearby universities.

The corps was devised as one way of offsetting the pattern in which schools in more affluent neighborhoods have been luring the better teachers with higher pay and less trying conditions.

Delay on the legislation reportedly has already damaged the corps' summer recruitment and training program.

A major factor in unrest in impoverished areas has been a disparity in educational standards. In the one year of its existence, the teacher corps has shown an exceptional capacity to improve standards in the poverty schools.

Education is the answer to so many of the slum problems that Congress would be shortsighted indeed to curtail or scrap the teacher corps. It deserves to be expanded.

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

[Mr. LANGEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, because of the inquiries I have had with regard to my bill, H.R. 10443, which I introduced to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, I thought it would be appropriate at this time to insert some comments regarding this legislation into the Record. The bill follows basically the suggestion offered in testimony by the League of Cities this spring before the House Special Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am the ranking minority Member. It provides that nonpublic sources may contribute up to 23 1/2 percent of the total cost of a project, the other 10 percent coming from some non-Federal but public source.

The law, at present, provides for Federal assistance for capital expenditures on a two-third-one-third matching basis with regional, State, county, or local public bodies involved in the provision or improvement of mass transit facilities, including bus, rail, and rapid transit. Where no comprehensive transportation planning has been completed, a 50-50 matching grant is utilized for emergency situations. Although private transportation companies can benefit from the results of the grant, such as by leasing commuter cars bought by State and local transportation agencies or by utilizing newly created parking areas, the private company cannot contribute to the local share. This places the entire burden on the community, and it is this which my bill seeks to change.

The result of the 1964 act is that many small communities and cities without public transportation systems, and without the funds to draw upon, cannot assist their local transit companies, usually bus companies, to benefit from the act. The private companies are, however, unable to provide all of the necessary money for new equipment, et cetera, themselves, but could contribute part of the money necessary to cover these costs. My bill would allow the private companies to contribute.

I have included some local cash involvement in my amendment, to avoid any overt pressure on the private companies by communities, and to cut down on the possible flooding of HUD with applications on behalf of private companies by communities who would have nothing to lose by making such applications. The specific percentage to be provided is negotiable, and some exceptions may have to be devised for regional transportation authorities overseeing private systems.

June 20, 1967

promised to needy peasants oftentimes fails to reach them.

Perhaps the main finding from my trip is the great number of disunited groups in South Vietnamese society. The Buddhists are divided into two groups. Both of them oppose Communism; but one wing believes that the United States is fighting without the support of the Vietnamese people. In addition to the Buddhists there are two other sects, the Hao Hoa and the Cao Dal, which add to the factions in South Vietnam. Another group is a million Chinese who are fearful of China, their mother country.

The Catholics are still another group. Their laymen belong to a political group named, "Greater Solidarity Forces." The Catholics are hoping for peace and adhere closely to the counsel of Pope Paul. Besides these elements there is a labor union of nearly half a million. Further, there is a faction of intellectuals, educators, and college professors which, while they do not want Communism, are very critical because the United States is not solving the problem of unity that is so greatly needed in South Vietnam.

Besides these groups there is the jealousy that exists between the South Vietnamese public and the several Northerners who rule in South Vietnam. Still further, there are the groups of refugees, mountain tribes and peasants.

The military forces also represent a group which is resented by many who would like more civil liberty. These many groups in South Vietnam do not conflict too openly. The said part is—and this is a great fact about South Vietnam—they do not cooperate with one another. There is no common belief that binds them together, and no leader that they all look up to. In this state of disunity they are hard put to oppose the monolithic dogma of Communism which the Viet Cong teach to the peasants.

The coming elections are regarded with some hope, but there is much fear that they will be manipulated by the security officer, General Nguyen Loan.

The conduct of American troops is highly praised by observers in Vietnam. Our troops are doing their duty to the fullest. While there is much destruction by bombing in South Vietnam, most of the pockmarks from bombing that I saw from the air were out in the fields and not in the villages. I saw only four cases of persons in the hospitals who were burned by napalm.

I tried to find out why the Viet Cong fight so hard. It was generally agreed that only 10 percent of them are Communists, and the other 90 percent are Vietnamese nationalists. For 25 years the Vietnamese peasants have been fighting intruders—first, the French, then the Japanese, then the French again, and then oppressive governments of their own. All this has developed a dislike of outsiders that is sometimes transferred to United States soldiers. In many villages it takes a long time for the Vietnamese peasants to recognize that our soldiers are not trying to take from them.

The Viet Cong fight because they have suffered from the French occupation. Nearly all of the generals in the South Vietnamese army are men who fought on the side of the French. There is little opportunity for advancement in the South Vietnam army for anybody who doesn't have some college training. Uneducated, but able, peasants find more opportunity with the Viet Cong than they do in the South Vietnamese forces.

The pacification teams that the South Vietnamese government sends into the field—59-man cadres—are criticized in some cases for corruption and lack of dedication. They are unable by and large to stay in the country villages unless they are supported by platoons or companies of the South Vietnamese army.

That part of the war which is the pacification and winning of the peasants is very difficult. For centuries the central government, and outsiders generally, have been taking from the peasants high taxes, high rents, and all the rest, while giving almost nothing in return. It is the near impossibility of rooting out this distrust and resistance to outsiders and foreigners from among the peasants that makes the winning of the war such a long process.

I asked nearly everyone how long it would require to "win" the war. About half of the people I interviewed spoke of "three or more years". The other half said it would take "a long time". Nobody, however, would say what the "win" would be like. Would a complete pacification of the distrustful peasants be regarded as a "win"? Or would we have to defeat the North Vietnamese army?

At present that army faces our marines with three divisions at the Demilitarized Zone. I was told that North Vietnam has 14 divisions in reserve. I suspect that if we should succeed in pacification we would have to leave hundreds of thousands of our troops to maintain quiet after a so-called victory.

My own recommendations, which are offered with full awareness of the very complicated situation, would be as follows:

First, stop the bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally. If the bombing is weakening North Vietnam, I was told that this would make her more and more dependent on Red China.

Second, our forces ought to be regrouped in the bases at Danang, Nha Trang, Saigon, and coastal fortifications. Fewer of our boys will be killed in these positions and it will be a sign to the South Vietnamese that they have to join in straightening out their own affairs.

Third, the United States ought to call all factions in South Vietnam together. They should be urged to assume more of the burden of saving their country.

Fourth, the United States should invite all nations with any stake in Vietnam to participate in a solution. This should include the United Nations, the Viet Cong, and the Geneva Accord nations.

A new awareness that I bring back from Vietnam relates to the responsibility we have to those brave village officials and religious leaders in the countryside who have sided with us in spite of the Viet Cong terror. I think we have to make sure that these people are guaranteed protection under any settlement that is negotiated.

Finally, I'd like to pay tribute to the many dedicated Americans in the U.S. AID program and in private organizations who serve with such devotion in Vietnam. I hope their work continues if we ever reach a time of peace.

WE NEVER LEARN

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, "We Never Learn," which appeared in the Winter Haven Daily News-Chief of June 16, 1967.

Publisher and Editor William E. Rynerson expresses concern over the fact that we never do learn from the events that occur in connection with our foreign policy. This Middle East crisis is a regrettable, unfortunate thing. It is another one of those situations where we have been arming other people of the world through our foreign aid program and the ones we have not been arming,

we have been feeding while they received the armament they sought from the Soviet Union. Through our foreign aid program, as in the instance of India, we find truth remaining in the old adage about "biting the hand that feeds you."

I commend Mr. Rynerson's editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I hope that we will begin to learn some lesson from these recent events:

WE NEVER LEARN

The United States has rescued the Egyptians not only with food, which ran into the millions of dollars, but in 1956 when we actually backed off the Israelites, Britain and France on the matter of the Suez canal. But despite this help which kept the Nasser government in power and his people from starving, we find these ungrateful people burning our libraries, endangering American lives, tearing up our embassies and consulates and costing us millions of dollars for no good reason at all.

It's high time that we begin to re-evaluate our positions around the world. It is time we begin to think into the future. It's time that we let not only the people whom we help know that we are the ones keeping them alive, but it's time we let Russia and the communists around the entire world know that we are tired of their actions in stirring up trouble wherever they can to embarrass us. We imagine that their faces are even redder than normally over this Mideast fiasco which can be laid right at their doorstep. But mark these words—someone in our government will want to open trade with Russia and her satellites—poo-pooling the idea that they'd cut our throats in a second if they could figure out how to do it without being openly involved. Will we never learn?

LENOX BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Lenox, Mass., nestled in the heart of the Berkshires, has experienced many fine moments. This week Lenox, famed for its natural beauty all year round, celebrates its 200th anniversary. The official series of events opened June 18 with religious services in all churches and close with a gala parade on June 25, expected to be one of the largest gatherings in the history of the county.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to march in the parade with my fellow citizens. My duties, however, will take me elsewhere for the day, and so I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of some of the outstanding events in Lenox's history.

Lenox's first citizen, Jonathan Hinsdale, came from Hartford, Conn., in 1750 to get away from the world and the ever-increasing population of Hartford. Hinsdale's cabin, located south of Courthouse Hill, still is intact and stands as a monument to the town's first settler.

The early history of Lenox was peaceful, yet in 1755 all the inhabitants were forced to flee hastily to Stockbridge as a result of attacks by "marauding redskins acting in unholy collusion with the French."

The settlement of the conflict with France once again made Lenox safe, and the community began to thrive. In 1765 the present towns of Richmond and

June 20, 1967

Lenox were incorporated. The town was named Richmond after a liberal English noble, Charles Lenox, Duke of Richmond. On February 26, 1767, the eastern section, separated from the rest of the town by the central mountain range, was incorporated under the name of Lenox.

The list of Lenox's Revolutionary War patriots is imposing. The most famous was Col. John Paterson. Under Paterson's leadership the Lenox regiment built in 1775 the first fort for the siege of Boston. Paterson's men were later to cross the Delaware with General Washington and fight in the battles of Trenton and Princeton. By 1777, Paterson's regiment was cut almost to 200 men, one-third of its original strength. Judge Julius Rockwell commemorated these vallant soldiers at Lenox's celebration of America's centennial when he said:

And herein consists the great merit of these officers and men. They suffered, sickened, died, that we might live; that we might live in America under American government.

Rockwell also paid tribute to the mothers, wives, and sisters of these soldiers who were found everywhere encouraging their men. Says Rockwell:

They knew a free government would elevate the character of their sons and bless the homes of their daughters.

Lenox's achievements in religion and education were as splendid as her record on the battlefield. The First Congregational Church was erected in 1768 at the town's expense. The town meeting adjourned explicitly on August 3 of that year to witness the pounding of the first stake. Lenox then became the county seat for Berkshire County in 1787.

Lenox Academy, where to graduate was a virtual passport to any college, often even into the sophomore class, was founded in 1803. Mrs. Charles Sedgwick's School for Girls, later to become Lenox School for Boys, was established in 1828. These institutions, in addition to the rare physical beauty of the town, made Lenox a superior intellectual and cultural attraction.

The peaceful solitude of the Housatonic Valley was invaded by the railroad for the first time in 1838. The new connections with Albany, Boston, and New York opened the way for the vast and fashionable estates that soon supplanted the Yankee farmer. French palaces, Italian villas, and Elizabethan Halls quickly replaced the traditional symbols of New England.

In 1868 the county seat was transferred from Lenox to Pittsfield. The move was made primarily to accommodate the summer visitors who found the hubbub, jostling, and general confusion of the courthouse quite unpleasant. Thus the calm of the "gem of the Berkshires" was maintained.

The Gay Nineties marked the height of this social splendor. Parades, hunts, horse shows, and gold tournaments all added to the festive mood of the times. From 1883 to 1900 the valuation of the town more than doubled. Its worth in 1900 was \$3,750,004 as compared to \$1,599,411 in 1883. Symbolic of this era of the moguls was the completion of the huge Aspinwall Hotel in 1902. Crowning the ridge and commanding a view of the

valley from Mount Greylock to the dome, the Aspinwall stood, until its catastrophic destruction by fire in 1931, as a reminder of an era of luxury; an era when Lenox took all the polish wealth could put upon it.

The Lenox of the 19th century also stood high in the literary world. Catherine Sedgwick, sister-in-law of Mrs. Charles Sedgwick, moved to Lenox in 1821. There she wrote her first novel, "A New England Tale," which made her one of the pioneers of the new and independent American literature. Her presence also attracted a group of gifted English women to Lenox, among them Fanny Kemble, the noted actress who said of Lenox, "I never looked abroad upon the woods and villages and lakes without thinking how great a privilege it would be to live in the midst of such beautiful things."

Nathaniel Hawthorne spent a year and a half in Lenox. Occupying a tiny house overlooking a hillside, Hawthorne was so overwhelmed by the scenery that he remarked, "I cannot write in the presence of that view." Nevertheless, he completed "The House of the Seven Gables" with herculean determination in only 5 months. "Tanglewood Tales" and many other stories also were written in this house on Stockbridge Bowl, where Oliver Wendall Holmes was a frequent visitor. Other notable visitors to Lenox were Ralph Waldo Emerson, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Edith Wharton.

Lenox's interest in the arts has not only continued but expanded, now to include the world-famous music festival which takes place every summer at Tanglewood, the estate donated to the Boston Symphony Orchestra by Miss Mary Tappan and her niece Mrs. Rosamunde Hepburn in 1937. Combining the magnificent simplicity of the huge concert hall, called "The Shed" and the musical vision of Serge Koussevitzky, the orchestra's conductor at that time, the festival has become a unique musical event in the whole country, nay, the whole world.

Looking back, then, over 200 years of history, Lenox has much for which to be proud and thankful. She remains today a bastion of intellectual and cultural opportunity as a credit to the physical bounty nature has bestowed upon her. I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in expressing my deepest gratitude to Lenox on this, her 200th anniversary.

CLARKE SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF— 100 YEARS OF PROGRESS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, each of us in our daily lives faces innumerable problems and frustrations; some minor, some major, and too many of critical urgency. Our tensions and anxieties seem to mount day by day and, in this hectic 20th century, we have made an indispensable necessity of the aspirin tablet and the stomach alkaliizer.

But as burdensome and uncertain as life has become for many of us, our troubles pall somewhat in comparison to

those who must make their way, who must endure all of the troubles each of us faces in today's fast-moving world, with a major physical handicap. And our difficulties pall even more than somewhat in comparison to those whose handicap inhibits or completely destroys the function of one of our five major senses.

We can only guess, for example, at the day-to-day agony and the dimensions of courage needed to overcome it for one who has lost the power to hear. In an age in which more and more depends on oral communication, on the distinguishing of sounds for virtually every kind of communication, from a simple declaration of affection to an urgent warning of imminent disaster; it is difficult for those of us blessed with the power of hearing to imagine a world of utter silence.

It is, therefore, with a great deal of pride, and of gratitude and appreciation, that I call the attention of this body to an institution in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts that is dedicated to easing the burdens of the deaf; to bringing the miracle of communication to those who have lost the natural sense which so many of us take for granted.

I am happy to relate to my colleagues the story of the world-famed Clarke School for the Deaf, in Northampton, Mass., which is now celebrating 100 years of helping deaf children.

In the 1860's the deaf child faced a dismal future. Such children usually lost the ability to speak, if they ever had it, and were placed in an asylum. Their deafness was a very real prison for them and for society. In 1861 Gardiner Green Hubbard sought help for his young daughter, made deaf by scarlet fever. The only alternative he could accept meant sending his daughter to a special school in Germany. Seeing an obvious need, Hubbard started a personal campaign to enlist State help in properly providing for the deaf in this country. His efforts, unfruitful at first, became successful after he joined with Miss Harriet Rogers a tutor who had mastered the technique of oral education for the deaf. In 1866, Miss Roger's brother-in-law, Mr. Thomas Talbot, saw fit, as a member of the State Legislature of Massachusetts, to directly seek Governor Bullock's aid on behalf of his sister-in-law and Mr. Hubbard.

The time was right. A "gentleman from Northampton," Mr. John Clarke, who suffered from deafness, wanted to help deaf children. He offered the State \$50,000 for the establishment of a school for the deaf in Northampton. With this fortunate financial support, Clarke School and the Clarke Corp. became a reality in June and July of 1867. So it is that we now commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Clarke School and its pioneering efforts in the field of oral education of the deaf.

The events leading to the founding of the Clarke School involved a number of people, reflect the power of an idea in a determined group of people, and demonstrate the role that an alert and responsive government can play. The Clarke School continues to function

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

And they that know Thy name will put their trust in Thee: for Thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek Thee.—Psalm 9: 10.

O Thou in whose presence our spirits find strength, our minds are given fresh insights and our hearts feel the warmth of Thy love—at the gateway of another day we pause in silence before Thee. Incline our souls to seek wisdom and truth and mercy at Thy hands. Reveal to us the way we should go, the decisions we should make, the plans we should follow and may all our work be based upon intelligent conviction and dynamic faith.

Hear us as we pray for those who bear the burden of war and are ready to give their lives that we may continue to live as free men. May we not be heedless of their courage but be ready to bear with them and to support them that out of this turmoil there may come an enduring peace.

Cleanse our national life from discord and violence and suspicion. Keep us from hating one another lest in our ill will we destroy ourselves. Lead us, O Lord, in the ways of unity and peace and good will for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 601. Joint resolution extending for 4 months the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1577) entitled "An act to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations," together with all accompanying papers.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 67-11.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday, June 26, or any succeeding day in June, to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FORMULA FOR RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, never have the American people had a better opportunity to compare and to contrast the sincerity of their own Government and that of the Soviet Union regarding international peace than by reading in adjoining columns of their newspapers the concise and conciliatory address of their great leader, President Johnson, and the address of Premier Kosygin before the United Nations. Premier Kosygin once more betrayed the true motives of his Government to take advantage of the present crisis in the Middle East for the purpose of bringing more nations and more people under the sway of Russian power.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to record my approval of President Johnson's formula for restoration and maintenance of peace in the Middle East. Once more he has displayed great ability as a statesman, and his high qualities as the leader of the American people.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to join in the remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma and commend him for making them. May I add that I would hope that while Mr. Kosygin is in the United States he would use this opportunity, the great opportunity that presents itself, for the promotion of world peace, which is desperately needed in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and many other places on the earth, rather than using it as a crude propaganda effort for Russian power politics which we all understand so well. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his fine speech.

Let me include an editorial from the New York Times for June 20. However, I

believe that the President was eminently correct in delivering his address here in the Nation's Capital.

The editorial follows:

Mr. KOSYGIN AND Mr. JOHNSON

Since the hope had been so slight that he would show some genuine statesmanship in his address to the General Assembly yesterday, it cannot be said that Premier Kosygin's sterile and pedestrian performance was much of a disappointment. It can only be said that Mr. Kosygin failed in his responsibility as leader of one of the most powerful states on earth by rejecting this opportunity to advance the peace of the world in general and of the Middle East in particular.

This does not mean that the doors are automatically closed to an eventual peaceful and just settlement of the Arab-Israel question; but it does mean that Premier Kosygin did little yesterday—in striking contrast to President Johnson—to keep them open. It also means that the Soviet Premier felt it necessary to stand before the world tribunal and engage, in his quiet way, in a transparent distortion of history, in crude vilification, in crass propaganda in order to prove to the Arab states that the Soviet Union, after all, really is their friend. Without flamboyance, without emotion, the Premier of the Soviet Union nevertheless harshly reiterated the almost entirely negative position taken previously by his representative in the Security Council, a demand for return of the *status quo ante*, which could only insure an indefinite continuance of bloody turmoil throughout the Middle East.

A slight ray of hope that Mr. Kosygin might be willing, despite his public posture, to undertake some realistic discussions lies in the few phrases of his speech suggesting readiness "to work together [for justice and peace] with other countries," with special reference to "the Big Powers." This is small evidence to go on; but the inclusion of such phrases could conceivably be significant.

In contrast to the generally obdurate and accusatory line of the Soviet Premier, the President of the United States set forth a reasonable approach to the Middle East problem. Employing dignified and measured language, Mr. Johnson addressed himself not to a false reconstruction of the past, as did Mr. Kosygin, but to a realistic program for the future. We only regret that he did not come to New York to make his speech before the General Assembly.

The establishment of conditions for a lasting peace between Israel and the Arab states is the basic American concern, premised of course on the recognition that Israel not only has the right to live, but is going to go on living. Once that fact is accepted, the other pieces of the puzzle can be made to fit together—but only if the Arab states can be persuaded to accept it. The Soviet Union could do much, if it would, to persuade them. Then, and only then, the refugee problem, the arms problem, the water problem, the boundary problem, the free-passage problem and the troop withdrawal problem would be capable of solution.

The President stressed that the United States is ready to see any method of peace-making tried, both in and outside the United

H 7471

H 7472

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

Nations, and among any or all parties. He gives the impression of "playing it cool," which is just about the best way for the United States to act in a situation that has been far too hot too long. What is called for at the moment is no precipitate action by the victorious Israelis in respect to Jerusalem or anywhere else, by the Arabs in the desperation of their defeat, or by the great powers in maneuvering for position. This is, as Mr. Johnson suggested, a time for magnanimity by the victors, for patience by the vanquished, and for vision by the Parliament of Man.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD JUNE 29 TO JULY 10

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, if he has any information for the membership as to plans for the House over the Fourth of July weekend.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. I am very happy that the distinguished minority leader has made this inquiry, because I think the House is entitled to know what the plans are.

After the close of business on Thursday, June 29, we plan to adjourn by resolution until Monday, July 10. We will have a total of some 10 days' vacation during the Fourth of July period.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma reaffirm what I understand is the intent, that we will have business on Thursday, June 29?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And we will have business on Monday, July 10?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

THE ENDLESS SEMANTICS OF THE U.N.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the Nation is weary of the endless semantics of the U.N. Currently, it is engaged in a long and tedious series of charges and countercharges involving the Middle East. This is largely meaningless in that the U.N. has no jurisdiction, and further, it is discussing a problem which already has been resolved. The Israel forces in less than a week settled all the problems for the foreseeable future which have so long plagued the Middle East. If there is any change from the present status, it must be with the recognition and consent of Israel. No amount of talk in the United Nations can modify this situation one whit.

There is no reason to anticipate that Israel should or will bow to the far-fetched and even stupid demands that

are being made in the United Nations. Everyone recognizes this as an attempt at facesaving by Russia and her Arab allies. Unfortunately, if these facesaving speeches are played over and over long enough, there may be some people who will be convinced. We may even find the U.S. Government allying itself with some of these demands upon Israel. We allow ourselves to be backed into strange corners at times to the mystification of even our best friends.

Efforts have been made to arouse concern in the United States over the fact that oil from the Middle East is no longer available. I would remind those who appear disturbed that producers in the United States would welcome an opportunity to place more oil on the market; so would South American producers. I would also call attention to the fact that the Arabs have little else to sell but oil. They will be needing a market. The Communist world cannot absorb their output. They will be needing a market much sooner than we need their oil. And, before we again accept their oil, it should be stipulated that there will be reparations for all the damage and destruction to American property, whether it be for the personal effects of U.S. refugees from Cairo or refineries owned by American oil interests.

The question of access to water routes is even more academic. Israel controls the important water routes. This should be guarantee enough that there will be free access to the Suez and to the Gulf of Aqaba in the future.

The President of the United States has said the issues affecting the Middle East must be resolved within the area by the affected powers. In other words, there is very little other than confusion that the U.N. can contribute to peace in the Middle East.

In the meantime, we are paying nearly half of the cost of all the maneuvering and backing and filling which is taking place there.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Aid to Highways and the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman notify the House whether the request has been cleared with the minority member of the committee.

Mr. HOWARD. It has been cleared with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR CONSTRUCTIVE STATESMANSHIP, NOT DEMAGOGY

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that Premier Kosygin came all the way to New York to deliver the divisive, destructive speech that the world heard yesterday. If his purpose was merely to curry favor with his Arab clients—as it certainly seemed to be—then he should have gone directly to Cairo and Damascus and saved himself a lot of travel.

Now is the time for constructive statesmanship, not for demagogy.

We are faced with a situation in the Middle East that demands solution, not recrimination.

As Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, so eloquently inferred, the chief villain in this crisis has been the Soviet Union and its irresponsible shipments of war materiel to the Arab nations. The Soviet Government started the trouble by pouring into the Arab world billions in instruments of slaughter, when these billions should have been spent for education, for food, for homes. His Government would be performing a real service to the Arab States if he reversed his grievous policies and began to spend Russian money to make a better life for the Arab refugees to which his Government have contributed not a cent and the other Arab people. It is a shame that he is wedded to practices which will only exacerbate relations between Arabs and Israelis and their conditions of life.

In contrast, the early morning speech of President Johnson, offered a much more prudent and constructive policy for the disputing nations as he held out the hand of peace through his five great principles. Recognition of each nation's right to live, justice for the refugees, respect for maritime rights, opposition to the arms race, and respect for political independence and territorial independence are principles which can and should be embraced by all the nations in the Middle East.

Premier Kosygin made a serious mistake to come to New York to deliver words of hatred. Now it is time for a restoration of sanity.

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE VIETNAM ERA

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7473

the following conferees: MESSRS. TEAGUE of Texas, DORN, HALEY, BARING, ADAIR, and AYRES.

PROTECTION FROM RIOTS AND MOB VIOLENCE

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, again this summer we are witnessing a wave of riots which are sweeping across the Nation and bringing destruction of private property, looting, burnings, injury, and even death to innocent citizens. Just this week rioters have killed, wounded, and destroyed persons and property in every section of our country. These rioters do not represent freedom of peaceful assembly, legitimate protests, or responsible picketing in pursuit of constitutional rights or economic justice.

We have been given ample warning that no community will be safe from these well-organized and well-trained rioters that have been provided insidious know-how, money, and equipment. They can cross State lines and descend upon peaceful communities jeopardizing the health, happiness, and general welfare of our people.

Our local policemen, sheriffs, and State law enforcement agencies are doing a magnificent job in upholding law and order throughout our Nation. Our State and local law enforcements can deal with local crime and local mobs, but when mob leaders cross State lines bringing with them their trained "demonstrators" and rioters, then local law enforcement agencies and officers need help.

Yes, we are faced with stark mob violence which is often instigated by professional agitators crossing State lines for the purpose of creating anarchy and a breakdown in law and order by force.

When communities are invaded by mobs from other States it is a threat to the general welfare and warrants the urgent attention of Congress. When Molotov cocktails are hurled into private homes and places of business, and pitched battles instigated by mob leaders rage in the streets, the United States becomes an object of ridicule all over the world.

Our men in Vietnam and those standing guard for freedom throughout the world are greatly embarrassed and their morale shaken by such mob violence. The international Communist conspiracy in its diabolical scheme to conquer the world is thus aided by violence and anarchy in the cities of our country.

I supported the amendment last year which would have made it a Federal crime for any person to across State lines for the purpose of exciting riots and mob violence. Mr. Speaker, the same legislation is now before the Rules Committee in the form of H.R. 421. I urge the committee to grant a rule permitting this legislation to come before the House for consideration. The situation is urgent. Law abiding citizens need the support and reassurance of their Congress in the critical months ahead.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." 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.

STATESMANSHIP IN AND OUT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all those who had the opportunity to hear or to read President Johnson's remarks of yesterday morning must agree that he was fair, he was honest, he was the statesman par excellence.

Once again, he proved that he and the United States want nothing anywhere more than we want peace everywhere—peace in the Middle East—peace in Southeast Asia—peace everywhere—but peace with justice.

He ignored the epithets thrown at us. He disregarded the incitement to hate by those who would destroy us. He humbly held out in good faith the hand of friendship and showed the world the path to good neighborliness and togetherness and helpfulness.

Almost immediately thereafter the world that watched and listened to the proceedings at the United Nations saw and heard a vituperative exhibition by Communist Russia that was the complete antithesis of our President's posture.

Kosygin was unfair, dishonest, and most unstatesmanlike.

He typified the worst of the big bullies. His threatening diatribe was intended to frighten and scare.

His reference to Hitlerian tactics of murder, ravage, arson, and wanton destruction reminded us of the days when the Russian Communists were cooperating hand in glove with the Nazis until Stalin and Hitler fell out.

The only thing that makes the Arabs and the Communists appear to be brothers is their identical capacity to spume hate and their vile and vicious incitement to destroy a world that God intended for brotherly love.

They cannot succeed. They will not succeed.

The world will yet attain peace with justice despite the intransigence and truculence of the aggressive Arabs and the covetous Communists.

VOTE AGAINST PREVIOUS QUESTION ON RULE TO OPEN WAY FOR AMENDMENTS ON DEBT CEILING BILL TO PREVENT SECRETARY OF TREASURY PAYING U.S. DEBTS TWICE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question when the closed rule on H.R. 10867, the debt ceiling bill, is offered tomorrow.

A vote against the previous question on the rule is necessary so that we may open the way for amendments to the debt ceiling bill.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to offer an amendment which will provide:

First. That the Secretary of Treasury be prohibited from paying any obligation of the U.S. Government more than once; and

Second. That the Secretary of Treasury be prohibited from paying interest on any obligation of the U.S. Government that has already been paid in full.

My proposed amendment, of course, would require that the U.S. Treasury cease to pay \$1.9 billion annually in interest on \$45 billion worth of bonds being held in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds are part of the Federal Open Market Committee's portfolio and they have been paid for in full once.

Mr. Speaker, a vote against the previous question will enable the House to express its opposition to the paying of any Federal debt twice or the paying of interest on obligations that have been paid in full.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 I was in my district and am not recorded on rollcall votes Nos. 139, 140, 141, and 142.

If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 139—"yea."

On rollcall No. 140—"yea."

On rollcall No. 141—"yea."

On rollcall No. 142—"yea."

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RE-ORGANIZATION ACT: BETTER AND MORE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the battle for more representational government for the District has been underway for years in the Capital City of the United States. Today the issue is whether of not the 90th Congress will support President Johnson's proposal to modernize and strengthen the government of the District of Columbia.

While not a substitute for the long sought objective of home rule, the re-organization plan will give the District strong executive leadership and a "broadly representative" city council.

The President has proposed a single Commissioner to replace the present three-man Board of Commissioners. This Commissioner—chosen from outstanding

H 7474

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

candidates from all over the country—will be similar to a mayor in his executive responsibilities and actions. He will be joined by a nine-member Council—similar to city councils in most urban communities—which will make rules and regulations for the city—the local ordinances—as will as budget recommendations. Appointments to the Council will be made with a view toward achieving a membership broadly representative of the District community.

This proposal is essential if we are to have a local government capable of meeting the needs of District residents. The time is long overdue for such positive action. And I think the 90th Congress must be responsive to a proposal that is so fair and just.

This proposal will help restore some of the basic rights of 800,000 Americans who reside in Washington. It is a proposal that is warmly endorsed by the civic and religious and business leaders of this community. It is a proposal favored by the overwhelming majority of District residents.

Even the opponents concede that reorganization of the District government is necessary. Resolutions of disapproval should not rest on an alleged jurisdictional basis. The District of Columbia Committee remains free at any time to make improvements in the plan. Many of us on the committee will support these improvements but do not believe we should stop this plan or take a chance that nothing will be done.

I hope we will pass this plan and then continue with the job in committee to correct those deficiencies which have not been or could not be reached through the reorganization plan.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the contrast between the leader of the free world and the leader of the Communist world was never more clearly manifested than it was yesterday, when both addressed themselves to the issue of peace in the Middle East.

President Johnson's words were full of hope. They embodied an objective approach to the grievous problems that have beset the Middle East, largely as a consequence of the mischief making of Moscow. President Johnson faced the Middle East question realistically, without dogma, without any effort to acquire gross partisan gain. He showed wisdom and strength.

Premier Kosygin, in contrast, presented a grim message to the United Nations, grim because it was so devoid of the spirit of conciliation that must be forthcoming from the Soviet Union if there is to be peace and progress, where, in the past, there has been war and poverty. Premier Kosygin gave us an exercise in absurdity, an experience in fanaticism, a demonstration of demagoguery. He did nothing whatever to advance the cause of a Middle East settlement.

We must face the fact, I feel, that there will be not stability in the Middle East until the Soviet Union decides that its people and its assets are more than pawns in the cold war. As soon as Russia recognizes that its own interest is served by stability, then we can all work toward that worthy end.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the President will not abandon his support of the justified interests of Israel, a country which I believe will be magnanimous in victory just as it was self-reliant in crisis. Israel resolved the military problem in the Middle East. This Government must remain at Israel's side while the diplomatic battles are waged to prevent still another recurrence of war in our day.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 126 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES R. BEVERLEY, FORMER GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

(Mr. POLANCO-ABREU ask and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico was saddened this past weekend by the death of its former Governor, James R. Beverley, who for the better part of his life served public purposes in the island and contributed heavily in civic functions benefiting the Puerto Rican people, although he was a Texan by birth.

James Beverley came to Puerto Rico in 1925 and took up posts as Deputy Attorney General, Special Adviser to the Public Service Commission, and Attorney General until 1931, when he was appointed Governor by President Herbert Hoover. He left that office in 1933, but his public service was really just beginning.

Governor Beverley had fallen in love with Puerto Rico, and he remained on the island where his children were born and raised and where he made his permanent home and enjoyed the lasting affection of his fellow Puerto Rican citizens.

Upon leaving the office of the chief

executive, Governor Beverley established a law firm, today known as Beverley, Castro & Rodriguez Lebron. His son William, joined this firm years ago.

Throughout his life as a leading attorney in Puerto Rico, Governor Beverley took an interest and an active part in Puerto Rican public affairs, and he was active also in politics according to the dictates of his persuasion.

The efforts to which he devoted himself included those of executive positions which he held in various corporations, those as a member of the Puerto Rico Bar Association and the Bankers Club, those as chairman of the board of trustees of Inter-American University and as a member of the board of the Presbyterian Hospital in San Juan, and those which he enjoyed so much in working with the Boy Scouts organization.

Governor Beverley in 1962 was awarded a certificate of merit by the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce in recognition of his many contributions in political, social, and civic matters.

Governor Beverley became one of Puerto Rico's leading private citizens through his honesty, energy, and dedication to the principles in which he believed. He will be sorely missed in our community, and I join with his many friends in extending deepest sympathy to his widow, Mary, and to James and William, his sons.

CHRIS KRAFT CHOSEN VIRGINIAN OF THE YEAR

(Mr. POFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to salute Christopher C. Kraft, Jr., Director of Flight Operations for the NASA space flight program, who has just been named Virginian of the Year by the Virginia Press Association.

Virginia is proud of her native son. I am particularly pleased at this honor, because Chris Kraft is a graduate of Virginia Tech at Blacksburg in the congressional district I am privileged to represent. Indeed, he is the recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Citation from Virginia Tech. I was thrilled to attend the campus ceremonies which honored him.

Among his other awards are NASA Distinguished Service Medal, the Arthur Fleming Award as one of the 10 outstanding men in Government service, his selection by Life magazine as one of the 100 outstanding leaders of the Nation, and an honorary doctorate in engineering from the Indiana Institute of Technology.

I am sure that all Americans will join in paying tribute to Chris Kraft when he receives the Parks-Mason Memorial Award in Richmond on Saturday, June 24. The award itself is a material manifestation of the affection in which he is held. A silver printer's stick mounted on a piece of wood from the historic Gunston Hall, home place of George Mason whose Virginia Declaration of Rights was the forerunner of the Bill of Rights, will bear the initials CCK in his honor.

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8501

Cuba today is neither free nor independent. She is a real and present danger to the security of the Western Hemisphere and to every country of Latin America.

Despite the assertions of some, Cuba is neither an old myth nor a nuisance and that fact should have been made abundantly clear by the tricontinent conference of African, Asian, and Latin American Communists. This conference seems proof enough of the very imminent danger which Cuba poses for the hemisphere.

This conference, held in Havana on January 3, 1966, brought together the most pro-Communist, anti-American forces ever assembled in the history of the Western Hemisphere. At this meeting, the delegates, following Moscow's lead, openly dedicated themselves to the violent overthrow of those governments which do not meet with their approval.

This conference was not called to begin subversive operations; its aim was consolidation and coordination of the subversion and guerrilla activity that already exists.

As recently as May 18, 1967, the Cuban Communist Party's 100-member central committee stated:

We are lending and will continue to lend aid to all those who fight against imperialism in whatever part of the world.

Almost daily, the newspapers bring to us more news of the subversive activities being carried on throughout Latin America from communism's base in Havana.

A letter recently published in Havana allegedly written by Maj. Ernesto Che Guevara, sets forth a strategy of worldwide insurrection intended to "spread the forces of the United States" and thus relieve the pressure on North Vietnam. It would seem that such is indeed the policy of the Communist world and that they by no means have given up.

Thus, the battle against communism does not exist just in Vietnam. It is, as they told us long ago, a never-ending, all-encompassing involvement.

The view of Cuba as a mere ideological pest is totally out of keeping with the facts. Save for the United States and Canada, Cuba possesses the most powerful military force in the Western Hemisphere. Aided technologically and financially by the world Communist movement, Cuba's army and military hardware have dominance over any Latin American nation. But it is in subversion and terror that Cuba is the greatest threat.

Castro, an intelligent, dedicated, and zealous revolutionist, is a powerful leader, well aware of the end that he seeks. And Cuba, to the rest of the Communist world, represents a victory—an outpost only 90 miles from her most bitter enemy.

Communism is a patient ideology. It is willing to wait the years that it will take to bring the rest of Latin America under the hammer and sickle.

At this point, Mr. President, I would like to insert in the Record the timely articles of Mr. Rowan on the increasing threat of Cuba, and the press report of the recent OAS action to which I have alluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, certainly candor would require that we act on what is so clearly visible to those such as Mr. Rowan who have examined the situation. Cuba is a threat—a threat that requires a drastic change from our current policy of avoidance and blindness.

Certainly it would seem that our current policy toward Communist Cuba needs careful reexamination. For it is indeed a necessity that we not permit the present war in Vietnam, nor the crisis in the Middle East, to blind us to the clearly defined developing crisis in Latin America. It is obvious that as the Communists continue to spread violence and tyranny throughout the Western Hemisphere, a showdown seems inevitable. It will necessitate courageous diplomacy and visionary planning and possibly force to maintain the freedom of our Western World. It would be well to begin now preparing for such action despite any other crisis or other conditions anywhere in the world.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1967]

OAS VOTES INQUIRY INTO CUBA "DANGER"

Communist Cuba, already condemned, boycotted and excluded from the Western Hemisphere family as a subversive force, was indicted anew yesterday by the Organization of American States for landing an invasion force in Venezuela last May 8.

The OAS Council voted unanimously to support Venezuela's request for a new inquiry into what that country's OAS Ambassador, Pedro Paris Montesinos, called "a real, certain and serious danger" menacing all Latin American nations.

The members of the 21-nation Council acted as representatives of the Foreign Ministers of the Americas in a special consultative conference to consider a long list of Venezuelan grievances against the Fidel Castro regime.

Venezuela asked for appointment of a special OAS mission to seek "additional information" about its charges through an on-the-spot investigation.

Mexico voted for the proposal, although it is the only OAS nation that maintains diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba.

CUBA'S ACTIVE SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Some weeks ago Mexican security police swooped down on Victor Hugo Martinez and arrested him for arms smuggling. Martinez, a member of Guatemala's Communist Party, had been shipping arms from Mexico to rebels in Guatemala.

Mexican police staked out at Martinez's house and were soon rewarded with an interesting visitor.

Julian Lopez Diaz, third secretary and cultural attache of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, came to call on Martinez. Mexican police grabbed him and found that he had \$6,000 in small bills in his pocket.

Lopez, a former Cuban intelligence agent in Chile, had been directing the entire Cuban arms smuggling program from the embassy in Mexico. The Mexican government ousted him. But not before Mexican agents learned that Lopez's wife was Irina Trapote, the daughter of Victor Trapote, a Soviet undercover agent.

And Irina is the ex-wife of Ramiro Valdez, Cuba's minister of the interior and the boss

of both the secret police apparatus inside Cuba and the agents and other machinery designed to "export revolution" to other countries.

Three weeks ago, four Cubans were surprised delivering men and supplies to the shores of Venezuela. Two who were seized alive confessed to being military officers and members of a special commando unit in Cuba's General Directorate of Intelligence (DGI).

The two commandoes were carrying \$10,000 in United States bills. Castro confirmed that they were "Cuban volunteers" and said he was "proud of 'em."

In Bolivia four days ago, the army claimed that 17 Cubans are fighting with a guerrilla group that has killed 30 Bolivian soldiers in recent jungle clashes. Bolivians claim Cuban-trained Brazilians, Argentinians and Peruvians are also in the rebel group—and that the whole band is financed by Castro.

I have been told by authoritative sources that Cuba's DGI is now spending \$1.1 million a month to support stepped-up guerrilla warfare in Latin America. Most of the money is to train insurgents, with some 3,000 latinos already trained in Havana and returned to their native countries since Castro came to power.

If Cuban subversion worsens, as many diplomats say it will, a name to remember is Manuel Piniero, known as "Barba Roja," or "Red Beard." Piniero (educated at Columbia University and married to a Connecticut girl, Lorna Birdsell) is director of the DGI and as such heads a Cuban espionage apparatus far more elaborate than either United States citizens or Latin Americans realize.

A half-dozen Soviet advisers are attached to the DGI and the Russians clearly are financing Piniero's operation, directly and indirectly.

Castro has publicly listed Bolivia, Colombia, Guatemala and Venezuela as targets for revolution.

Bolivia appears to be the area of prime concentration now, primarily because it is militarily weak and its political structure is fragile and beset by rivalries.

But the apple of Castro's envious eye is Venezuela. He would like her oil to give Cuba the strong economic base with which to carry out what Castro thinks is his role as saviour of Latin America.

But Venezuela is also the prime target because it is the best example of a democracy in the area and the Communists feel it cannot be permitted to thrive.

Orthodox Communist parties in Latin America used to complain about the Fidelistas coming into their countries and stirring up trouble "prematurely." The orthodox Communists now are cooperating, in intelligence and other programs, with Castro's forces. This suggests that the Russians may no longer be restraining Castro, and may even have authorized the party apparatus to cooperate.

Interestingly, Cuba recently made public a proposal, supposedly written by the long-missing Ernesto (Che) Guevara, to open up major rebellions in Latin America so as to take the pressure off Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the DGI is busy spreading agents all over Africa. Some 700 uniformed Cubans are now in Congo Brazzaville. Another 700 Africans have been trained in Havana and returned to their home countries.

Significantly, all the Cubans sent to Africa by Castro are Negroes.

Very clearly, the little Caribbean island of Cuba looms large in Soviet plans for the expansion of world communism.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 16, 1967.]

NEW CUBA CRISIS LOOMS AS SOVIET AID RISES (By Carl T. Rowan)

More than any other man, Cuba's Fidel Castro must have watched with gnawing

S 8502

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 20, 1967

uneasiness as the Soviet Union led Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser into catastrophe—and then abandoned him.

For Castro is to Latin America what Nasser was to the Middle East—and then some.

I have learned exclusively, from diplomatic and other sources, that the Russians have increased sharply their military shipments to Cuba. In the last few months they have delivered more than 20,000 tons of arms to their bristling Caribbean satellite.

At the same time, Castro has escalated to unprecedented levels Cuba's efforts to "export revolution" not only to the other Latin countries but also the continent of Africa.

Not only does the Soviet Union have 2,000 military advisers and 2,500 "economic technicians" manipulating Cuba's armed forces and economy; the Russians have attached key men to Cuba's General Directorate of Intelligence, the unit charged with fostering communism on Venezuela, Bolivia, Colombia, and other countries.

The critical question here, and in other free world capitals, is: How much are the Russians encouraging Castro's increasingly bold ventures into Latin America? On the surface, the Russians appear to be a restraint on Cuba's bearded ruler, but diplomatic and intelligence reports show that the Russians are deeply involved, financially and otherwise, in most of Castro's efforts.

There is a growing feeling in diplomatic circles that another great power clash over Cuba lies not too far down the road.

With this thought in mind, I have explored several diplomatic and other sources to try to ascertain just what is Cuba's internal situation today; just what is Cuba's military posture; how influential a role are the Russians playing; what efforts are being made by the Fidelistas to carry Cuban-style revolution to the rest of the hemisphere.

A first clear point is that in the four years since the great Cuban missile crisis, the Soviet Union has turned this little Caribbean satellite into a bristling military fortress.

American military analysts knew, even before the recent stepup in arms deliveries, that Cuba has become the most potent military force in Latin America.

With 175 jets, including 60 MIG21s, the Cuban air force is clearly dominant in the entire continent. And Cuban superiority has grown because of regular Soviet additions while the United States holds to a policy of not selling jet fighters to Latin American countries.

Cuba's army of 90,000 regulars and 85,000 "ready reserve" members is now the best equipped, most modern and second largest (after Brazil) in Latin America.

In addition, Castro has assembled a national guard of 100,000 and a 7,000-man navy that boasts modern Soviet subchasers and 18 of the potent Komar class patrol torpedo boats, which the Russians still have declined to give to North Vietnam.

Castro's Communist redoubt is now protected by 24 Soviet surface-to-air missile sites and an arsenal of 600 missiles. The Cubans recently changed from inslandwide deployment of these missiles to provide for concentrated protection of Havana, Santiago, Santa Clara and Holguin.

Some analysts say the recent increase in Soviet arms deliveries is not especially ominous. They say the Russians are just replacing or refitting, arms delivered earlier.

But there is considerable uneasiness about where Castro's egomania and his need to maintain control of the military will carry him. The fear is that he must give his military men something to keep them busy—thus more and bolder incursions into Venezuela and other countries.

And that could spell crisis—sooner rather than later.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SEEKS PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST—THE RUSSIANS STIR UP TROUBLE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the contrast between American policies aimed at peace in the Middle East and Russian efforts aimed at stirring up trouble and division, were nowhere more clearly illustrated than in President Johnson's statesmanlike speech this morning.

President Johnson has clearly placed the United States on the side of peace and cooperation and a reasonable solution to the many problems of the Middle East.

His statement this morning was consistent with American foreign policy—before and during and after the recent Israeli-Arab war.

President Johnson has concentrated from the first on a peaceful resolution of differences between the Arabs and Jews.

The President asked for reasoned agreement at the United Nations.

He repeated America's intention to support the territorial and political integrity of all the states involved, the right to life of all states, the peaceful resolution of refugee problems, the right of innocent maritime passage, and the limitation of the spiraling arms race.

As President Johnson said, none of the five principles he proposed for peace is new. Indeed, the United States has been working toward a realization of those principles for decades—in Europe, in Asia, and in the Middle East.

The United States must appear to the world as a peacemaker.

I think the free peoples of the world will judge the President's speech in the tone it was presented—rational, balanced, fair, with liberty and justice for everyone involved.

I commend the President for his controlled intelligent response to a threatening world situation.

I commend him for stressing the justice of the right to national existence.

I commend him for the humanity he has shown to those unfortunate victims and refugees who are always the losers no matter which side wins.

We have a splendid opportunity to reassert the American presence in the Middle East in the interests of peace.

I join the President in that noble effort.

THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would commend President Johnson for his nomination of a distinguished American to the Supreme Court. Mr. Thurgood Marshall's long legal career as private counsel, Federal judge, and Solicitor General of the United States, has amply prepared him for the task. He has distinguished himself in each of these positions.

It was Mr. Marshall who argued the landmark case of Brown against the Board of Education, which declared segregated education to be incompatible with constitutional demands that all citizens be provided equal protection of

the law. It marked a greater legal and social awareness of the difficulties faced by an important segment of our population in a society which all too often judges a man by the color of his skin rather than by the caliber of his character. Happily, that day is passing, as Mr. Marshall's nomination in itself confirms.

Mr. Marshall is of the highest caliber; his capabilities have been demonstrated, and he will be a worthy addition to the Supreme Court, providing this Nation with the same high degree of excellent service that we have seen from him in the past.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PRIME MINISTER ON THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the deeply contrasting speeches of President Johnson and Russian Prime Minister Kosygin on the Middle East crisis demonstrated the basic differences between American and Soviet international goals.

President Johnson calmly and effectively presented five essential points which could guarantee a lasting peace in the area.

He based that settlement on territorial integrity, justice for refugees, respect for international maritime rights, the right to national existence and limitation of the arms race.

The President asked the warring parties to reason together.

He accused nobody. He addressed himself not to a "false reconstruction of the past—but to a realistic program for the future."

And he offered the resources of the United States to help in the reconstruction of relationships in the Middle East which must emerge if peace is to endure.

In contrast to President Johnson's responsible stand, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union sought propaganda advantage, distorting facts, appealing to emotionalism, seeking no solutions, but trying to score points against the United States and the West.

President Johnson's speech on the Middle East has demonstrated to the world that the United States is willing and ready to offer its good offices in securing peace—in the Middle East, in Vietnam, and in every area of the world where arms instead of reason have been used to attain goals.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD one of the finest editorials I have read on American efforts to secure justice in the Middle East—an editorial from the New York Times.

I congratulate the Times for its support of President Johnson in this trying situation.

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

MR. KOSYGIN AND MR. JOHNSON

Since the hope had been so slight that he would show some genuine statesmanship in his address to the General Assembly yester-

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

day, it cannot be said that Premier Kosygin's sterile and pedestrian performance was much of a disappointment. It can only be said that Mr. Kosygin failed in his responsibility as leader of one of the most powerful states on earth by rejecting this opportunity to advance the peace of the world in general and of the Middle East in particular.

This does not mean that the doors are automatically closed to an eventual peaceful and just settlement of the Arab-Israel question; but it does mean that Premier Kosygin did little yesterday—in striking contrast to President Johnson—to keep them open. It also means that the Soviet Premier felt it necessary to stand before the world tribunal and engage, in his quiet way, in a transparent distortion of history, in crude vilification, in crass propaganda in order to prove to the Arab states that the Soviet Union, after all, really is their friend. Without flamboyance, without emotion, the Premier of the Soviet Union nevertheless harshly reiterated the almost entirely negative position taken previously by his representative in the Security Council, a demand for return of the *status quo ante*, which could only insure an indefinite continuance of bloody turmoil throughout the Middle East.

A slight ray of hope that Mr. Kosygin might be willing, despite his public posture, to undertake some realistic discussions lies in the few phrases of his speech suggesting readiness "to work together [for justice and peace] with other countries," with special reference to "the Big Powers." This is small evidence to go on; but the inclusion of such phrases could conceivably be significant.

In contrast to the generally obdurate and accusatory line of the Soviet Premier, the President of the United States set forth a reasonable approach to the Middle East problem. Employing dignified and measured language, Mr. Johnson addressed himself not to a false reconstruction of the past, as did Mr. Kosygin, but to a realistic program for the future. We only regret that he did not come to New York to make his speech before the General Assembly.

The establishment of conditions for a lasting peace between Israel and the Arab states is the basic American concern, premised of course on the recognition that Israel not only has the right to live, but is going to go on living. Once that fact is accepted, the other pieces of the puzzle can be made to fit together—but only if the Arab states can be persuaded to accept it. The Soviet Union could do much, if it would, to persuade them. Then, and only then, the refugee problem, the arms problem, the water problem, the boundary problem, the free-passage problem and the troop-withdrawal problem would be capable of solution.

The President stressed that the United States is ready to see any method of peace-making tried, both in and outside the United Nations, and among any or all parties. He gives the impression of "playing it cool," which is just about the best way for the United States to act in a situation that has been far too hot too long. What is called for at the moment is no precipitate action by the victorious Israelis in respect to Jerusalem or anywhere else, by the Arabs in the desperation of their defeat, or by the great powers in maneuvering for position. This is, as Mr. Johnson suggested, a time for magnanimity by the victors, for patience by the vanquished, and for vision by the Parliament of Man.

ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, William Attwood, who was Ambassador to Guinea from 1961 to 1963, and Ambassador to Kenya from 1964 until early

this year, has written an excellent article in the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly about the State Department and the Foreign Service. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Labyrinth in Foggy Bottom," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Attwood observes that—

Some of State's shortcomings are its own fault, some could be corrected by Presidential action, and others are the result of congressional suspicion and niggardliness.

He goes on to list some of these shortcomings and then states:

Under the circumstances, I don't see how we can expect creative, enterprising, and strong-willed people to continue to enter the Foreign Service at the bottom of a ladder that is arduous to climb and not very rewarding when and if you reach the top.

Mr. Attwood concludes by summarizing the recommendations in his article which include trimming overstaffed posts and bureaus; reducing the production and distribution of paper; dismantling the "AID bureaucracy" and putting foreign economic assistance under the State Department; and coordinating the activities of all Federal agencies concerned with foreign affairs.

These recommendations were not made by a budget or management specialist, or by an outside observer who has had only slight contact with the Foreign Service, or by a representative of any special interest group either in or outside the Government. They were made by a man who spent 5 years in the State Department and who headed two embassies.

I believe we can no longer ignore the problems of administration in the field of foreign affairs. From everything that I hear, and that I read, morale is apparently poor within the Foreign Service; the Department of State has become hamstrung by bureaucratic procedures and USIA and AID employees are frustrated and dissatisfied with their status. I think that the time has come to make a comprehensive study of this country's requirements, present resources, and future needs not only in the Department of State and Foreign Service but also in USIA, AID, the Department of Defense, and the other principal Government agencies involved in foreign affairs.

With this aim in mind, I wrote the President last October suggesting that he consider appointing a high-level, blue-ribbon Presidential Committee to take a new, thorough and objective look at these organizational problems. I know that a number of other high-level studies have been made of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. I have the impression, however, that some of these studies are out of date, others did not do a particularly thorough job and still others made recommendations that were either not accepted or were too general in nature to provide effective solutions. I suggested to the President that the needed reform could not be accomplished piecemeal by administrative specialists and proposed that there be a

thorough study by people with broad, relevant experience both in the Government and outside it whose own positions in life were independent and who were interested only in seeing that the United States has the best possible organization to conduct its foreign relations. I also suggested that the Committee include a few Members of both the House and the Senate to help insure that the Committee's recommendations would be adopted.

I would think that the Department would be glad to see such a committee established and would feel a responsibility to its employees to see that the best available minds in the United States were set to work on these organizational problems. It seems to me that these problems, including the problem of the relationship between the personnel systems of the Department of State, AID, and USIA, are so pressing that they will require solutions in the very near future. I would think that the Department would prefer to participate in the process of reaching these solutions rather than to wait and find these solutions imposed on them.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record an article from the January 27 issue of the New York Times entitled "State Department Study Finds Diplomats Avoid Policy Debates."

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

THE LABYRINTH IN FOGGY BOTTOM—A CRITIQUE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By William Attwood)

(NOTE.—A widely traveled journalist and onetime aide to Adlai Stevenson, Mr. Attwood served the Kennedy Administration as Ambassador to Guinea (1961-1963), was Special Adviser to the United States U.N. delegation (1963-1964), and was President Johnson's Ambassador to Kenya from the beginning of its independence until this year. He is now editor in chief of Cowles Communications, Inc. This article is drawn from his book "The Reds and the Blacks," to be published in March by Harper & Row.)

I think it was Ernest Hemingway who said that the only way you can really get to know a foreign country is to earn your living there. In my work and my travels up until 1961 I had been in and out of the State Department and a good many of our overseas missions. I had friends in the Foreign Service and knew of their frustrations. Abroad, I had sweated out the McCarthy period with them; in Washington, I shared their laments about the red tape and deadwood in high places that impeded action and stifled initiative. But it wasn't until I joined them on the payroll—until I began earning my living there—that I really began to understand what went on in the State Department. Not many Americans do—which happens to be one of its problems.

Some of State's shortcomings are its own fault, some could be corrected by presidential action, and others are the result of congressional suspicion and niggardliness. Unlike several other branches of the government, State has no constituents—nobody who wants to increase its annual appropriation—no aircraft companies or farm lobbies or veterans' organizations to fight its battle on Capitol Hill. And State never seems to put its own case across either to Congress or to the public. Reasonable requests for more funds somehow come out sounding like

a cookie pusher's plea for a bigger booze allowance.

And so, while I may sound critical, my purpose is to shed some light on what goes on in the labyrinths of Foggy Bottom, and try to stimulate some concern about how to induce qualified and talented people to go to work for their government and help formulate and carry out an intelligent foreign policy.

The State Department is relatively small. Its 25,700 employees, of whom 3,520 are Foreign Service Officers, and its annual budget of \$393 million make it the second smallest department of the government. (Labor has fewer people, and Justice a smaller budget.) It is also the most far-flung—with 117 embassies, 69 consulates general, and 79 consulates scattered around the world—and the most verbose—a large embassy on an average day will receive more than 400,000 words, the equivalent of an 850-page book, and in Washington the Department's distribution section makes copies of 70,000 incoming messages a day. So perhaps the best way of explaining what's wrong with the State Department is to start with the paper.

Paper work is invented by bureaucratic-minded people who, like Frankenstein, later become its victims. These are people to whom an overflowing in-box is a daily challenge and an empty one a daily achievement; for whom a satisfying week's work consists in initialing as many reams of paper and deferring as many decisions as possible; with whom you can talk of "action" only in terms of setting up a committee, hopefully one that will spawn subcommittees. The chief considerations of a bureaucrat are to abide by the letter of the regulations, whatever the consequences, to keep a clean desk, and never to "make waves."

There are fewer bureaucrats in the State Department than in other swollen government agencies—AID, for example—but enough to make you wonder at times how a new idea ever bubbles to the top. The reason, of course, is that there are generally a few activists at every echelon who enjoy results and do not regard moving paper as an end in itself. Keeping these activists in the bureaucracy and recruiting new ones should be a priority objective of every incoming Administration.

The production of paper is excessive at both ends and self-generating. Reporting requirements from the field keep embassy officers desk-bound when they should be getting out and around. Most of these reports are copied, distributed, and filed away without anybody's reading them except, possibly, some specialist in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Telegrams get more attention because they are shorter, but only a few percolate up to the sixth and seventh floors or to the White House. (Former Ambassador J. K. Galbraith once told me the only way to get a telegram read in the White House was to put a four-letter word in it.) Since so much of what is reported is of no practical or immediate use, I have often wondered why Washington does not deal with its overseas missions the way a news service editor deals with his overseas bureaus—which is to ask for special reports when the need arises rather than to expect correspondents in the field to keep filing everything they can find out about anything. Conversely, the men in the field should be spared the eyestrain of having to read or even glance at most of what comes from Washington by pouch. (Our weekly CIA summary—naturally, stamped "secret"—seldom contained anything we hadn't already read about in the New York Times Sunday news digest.)

Perhaps the only way to stop the flow of paper is to penalize anybody who writes reports that could possibly be avoided. But it won't happen; there are too many people who need to produce paper in order to justify their presence on the payroll. (A Foreign

Service Officer named Holmes Welch recently defined the Welch corollary to Parkinson's Law as follows: *Every producer of paper added to the government roster creates the need for an additional consumer of paper.* But the latter, when hired, turns out to be a producer too.) What happens to all the paper? It piles up.

Aside from reports, there are other kinds of paper that clog the machinery and waste time, money, and manpower. Travel and expense vouchers are just two examples. When a Foreign Service Officer goes from point A to point B, he must make out a form accounting for every minute of his time in transit (0916—departed terminal, airport tax: 70 cents; 0955—arrived chancery, bus: \$1.25). Per diem rates vary, depending on where he is and whether he happens to be stationary or in motion. The resulting voucher is both complicated and time-consuming for everyone involved in preparing and reviewing it. It has been estimated that the government spends about \$10 to process an average voucher, which can easily double the cost of the reimbursement. It can even more than double it, as in the case of a junior officer I knew in Spain whose quarterly entertainment allowance, which had to be accounted for, was only \$3.

The obligation to justify every penny spent not only is wasteful but can be embarrassing. A senior officer who is trusted to handle top secret documents does not have his government's confidence where a dollar is concerned. I remember being invited to a meeting with the Guinean Foreign Minister while serving at the UN. The taxi fare to the Guinean mission and back came to \$2.40. A few days after I submitted the required voucher, somebody from the administrative section called me about my taxi ride: "We have no record, Mr. Ambassador," said the voice archly, "of any reception being given at the Guinean Embassy on that day."

My favorite story is about the Foreign Service Officer returning to Washington on orders. His mother, who was not on government orders, traveled with him. In making out his voucher, he carefully separated his own from his mother's expenses. But the last item was a taxi from Union Station to his hotel. In Washington, there is a different fare if two people occupy the cab. Back came a query: "Did your mother ride in the cab with you?" His reply made bureaucratic history: "No. I took the cab. My mother walked and carried the bags."

The sensible and economical way to handle this kind of paper work would be for the government to calculate the cost of moving an employee from point A to point B. Anyone traveling that distance would then be given a flat sum to travel as he wished just so long as he got to his destination on time. Time and money would be saved. But it might be necessary to get rid of a lot of people whose jobs depend on processing the paper under the present system. The Deputy Undersecretary of State for Administration told me he was not even able to introduce air travel cards as an efficiency measure; the General Accounting Office has a vested interest in keeping the system cumbersome.

Similarly, ambassadors should be given representational funds to use at their discretion without having to make out forms in quintuplicate listing and justifying every social function for which they and their staffs require reimbursement. No diplomatic missions have such big administrative staffs as ours; other countries generally treat their ambassadors like men of integrity and judgment—as George Washington treated Benjamin Franklin when he sent him to Paris with 50,000 francs and no budget and fiscal officer to bird-dog him. But that was back when the U.S. government was too small to afford a bureaucracy.

The average Foreign Service Officer is forty-one and makes \$13,900 a year. When

you take into account the education, the training, and the wide range of skills that the State Department requires of its officers, and when you consider what private industry offers talented executives in the way of salary and advancement, the wonder is that our government is still able to induce young people with drive and imagination to make diplomacy their career. Despite occasional directives commending boldness and courage, most FSO's have become convinced from experience that the way to move up the ladder is to play it safe. As Averell Harriman has said: "I have seen men's careers set back and, in fact, busted because they held the right views at the wrong time, or for accurately reporting facts that were not popular at the time." Caution, of course, becomes a habit as well as a necessity for a man in his forties who needs that next promotion to put his children through college.

A good many of our senior FSO's are also suffering from the McCarthy syndrome; they have never quite recovered from the experience of seeing some of their patriotic colleagues hounded and persecuted by the late senator without either the President or the Secretary of State being willing to stick up for them. Moreover, a potential executive who because of the seniority system is not given the opportunity to exercise his executive ability in his middle years becomes bleached out. If he does get to be a chief of mission, he has often lost the capacity for controlled indignation—for sticking his neck out—that is vital to effective leadership.

A system which rewards seniority rather than ability can produce absurd situations. I have a friend who was made an FSO-1 at thirty-nine. The next rung on the ladder is Career Minister. According to existing regulations, he could not become a CM until he was fifty. Yet the regulations also stated that an officer who is not promoted for ten years is subject to "selection-out"—a euphemism for being fired.

From what I have seen of the State Department, the greatest concentration of executive talent can be found in the thirty-five to forty-five age bracket. But most of these men and women are upper-middle-level FSO-3's and -4's. Above them in the hierarchy, as of December, 1966, were 7 Career Ambassadors, 52 Career Ministers, 313 FSO-1's, and 452 FSO-2's. With about 36 ambassadorships available each year—of which a quarter are filled by political appointees—the chances of a substantial number getting top jobs in their most productive and vigorous years are practically nonexistent.

What is also discouraging to talented middle-grade officers is that the higher echelons are cluttered with deadwood—with people who drifted up the ladder because somebody on a promotion panel wanted to give good old Joe or Charlie a break. (I know of one of these good old Joes who was finally moved out of an African post—he had refused to entertain Africans in his house—and was transferred to a bigger post commensurate with his rank.) The deadwood are usually officers with bland records, with no black marks on their efficiency reports, with no history of ever having gotten out of line or rocked the boat or questioned their instructions. A good energetic officer, on the other hand, can be passed over for promotion, if he lacks friends in the Establishment, on the basis of one negative efficiency report written by one superior who might not have liked the way he dressed. (I personally interceded in one such case.)

Some officers who manage to reach the top after long years of patient subordination tend to become martinetts—like British public-school boys hazing their juniors because they were once hazed themselves. And their wives can be even more dictatorial: I have known of some who ordered the wives of staff members around like servants; one who put

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8519

row houses, or detached units, equity must also be extended to an appreciable number of the poor who live in the great blighted areas of our cities. And finally, if cities are to live, privately-financed rental units must be made available at the very cores. There must be a blending of public and private housing for rent, along with private apartments and homes for sale. The resulting cultural exchanges and visability of a better life with its implication of attainability will serve to renew hope within the poor and raise their levels of aspiration.

However, private investors are reluctant to move boldly into this area of city development. Fears that families who can afford private housing will not move to the inner city, and that those who do will not keep up the property restrain the real entrepreneurs from serving the greatest of all social needs.

The Board for Fundamental Education has pioneered in self-help housing in this country and is certain this technique can be effectively applied to the relief of the housing problems of our nation, both in the urban and rural community. Under the BFE program aspiring homeowners are trained in home building skills and organized in supervised construction teams to build a home for each member of the team. Land is purchased jointly to reduce the cost, and building materials are secured in the same manner. At the time the new owners move in, they hold up to 39 percent equity in their homes by virtue of their labor. The program enables families to own homes who otherwise might never amass the resources to do so. And because of the tremendous savings, the program makes it to meet their needs in terms of size and appointments. A builder-owner, without making a down payment, can move into a \$15,000 home with a mortgage of only \$10,000, or less. This means families with incomes of \$4,000 can own adequate homes.

The Board for Fundamental Education has been described in a Ford Foundation study of self-help housing in the United States as "the only organization in the country with a meaningful self-help housing program."

In a program in its urban demonstration center of Indianapolis, Indiana, BFE transformed two ugly slums into new communities where more than 400 homes ranging in value from \$12,000 to \$15,000, were built under this program. In each instance as the area was developed toward its final form, private investors came into these slums areas and constructed apartments for rent, and detached homes for sale, along with shopping facilities. These neighborhoods today are among Indianapolis' proudest.

The success of a self-help housing venture depends in large measure on the support the owner-builders receive from the financial and business interests of the community in which the effort is undertaken, together with the support services given by the sponsoring group. Ideally, a non-profit corporation, capitalized with a reasonable revolving fund, should be organized to guarantee sound fiscal and business management for the operation.

Within the Board for Fundamental Education concept and practice, full support is given to families from the day they apply for the self-help program through their move in, with visitations, counseling, and BFE-sponsored community affairs long after the homes are completed. In order to prepare the families for home ownership, a series of educational seminars are held. Subjects of the sessions include insurance, home decoration, community organization, city services, obligations as mortgages and citizens. Social workers are employed to help families in qualifying themselves to participate and to assist families who may encounter difficulties during and after the building period.

Another dimension, and perhaps equally important aspect of the self-help approach, lies in the rehabilitation of existing homes. Owners can be taught to replace roofs, re-

pair weatherboard, point up bricks, and generally renew their homes. Performed within the team concept, the participants would purchase materials jointly and experience significant savings both in purchasing and labor, through the non-profit corporation.

File
ADDRESS BY DR. MARVER BERNSTEIN ON MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on June 7 it was my honor, in company with the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] to address the rally for Israel in Lafayette Park, under the auspices of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. It was a dramatic and inspiring demonstration of faith on the part of the thousands of Americans who had gathered there from all parts of the Nation, and I was deeply moved by the experience.

In a more sober setting on the previous day, Dr. Marver H. Bernstein addressed the Conference of Presidents and other assembled leaders on the issues of the Middle East crisis. Dr. Bernstein is dean of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, and it was a great regret to me that I was unable to be present when this distinguished New Jersey scholar spoke. But I later read Dr. Bernstein's talk and found it to be an exceptionally candid and incisive analysis of recent history in the Middle East. So that others who did not hear him may have the benefit of his insights, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

PERSPECTIVE ON AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Address by Marver H. Bernstein)

Contrary to the established conventions of political meetings, I suggest to you a brief experiment. I ask you to assume for a few moments that the time is June 1965, to put aside present concerns momentarily, and try to understand what American policy in the Middle East has been. I propose a brief exercise in developing perspective that may offer some guidance to us as American citizens as we undertake the mammoth task of achieving a basic shift in U.S. policy toward Israel that all of us seek. For without a major change, American policy will fail as it failed to prevent the Arab-Israeli war of 1967.

The United States has been hesitant and inhibited in its response to Israel's view of its security needs. Why? The answers are to be found in an analysis of American policy in the Middle East.

The overriding goal of American policy can be simply stated. It has been to maintain a prudent security equilibrium in the Middle East and to promote internal stability in the region. These terms are very imprecise. They confer maximum discretion on the President and the State Department, not only because the Executive Branch must struggle to maintain its initiative vis-a-vis Congress, but also because the fluidity of the Middle Eastern situation requires it. The American interest lies not in instability but in peace. The critical issue, of course, is stability for what and on whose terms.

How is the goal of a prudent security equilibrium to be reached or promoted? Essentially four approaches have been utilized. The first is guarantees of the independence and territorial integrity of Israel. The second includes a pattern of actions and policies designed to minimize Soviet and Chinese

penetration of the Middle East. The third is the use of foreign aid as a tool for maintaining equilibrium, reducing Soviet penetration, and promoting economic growth. The fourth is the maintenance of open channels of communication with Arab governments to enable the U.S. to exercise some influence over their behavior and beliefs. In this connection any overt alliance of the U.S. with Israel would appear to polarize the Middle East and would send the Arab states rushing off to Moscow.

What have been the main characteristics of American policy in the Middle East? I would like to outline some nine features of American policy:

1. In the effort to maintain an equilibrium in the Middle East which is at least neutral with respect to the U.S.-Soviet conflict, the American position often seems very kind to the Arabs and very harsh toward Israel. Why is this the case? Part of the answer lies in recognizing that Israel is pro-U.S. and Nasser is usually anti-U.S. It seems striking and ironic, therefore, that the U.S. should reward its enemies more than its friends. In any case, as William S. White wrote in the *Washington Post* on January 29, 1965:

"Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time."

Be that as it may, the main drift of our policy for three administrations has been one of exceptional kindness to Nasser's Egypt, not primarily because the U.S. strongly prefers Egypt to Israel, but because the U.S. conception of the problems of achieving a security balance in the Middle East required it.

2. The Under Secretary of State, George Ball, told the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 1, 1965:

"What happens in the Near East is of critical importance to our strategic sea, air, and land routes, to our vast oil investment; to the security of Israel and other countries in the area."

The U.S. position reflects a tendency—which the U.S. shares with other Western countries—to overrate the political, military and economic importance of the Middle East. To be sure the Middle East is the link connecting three continents; it is the intersecting point of land, water, and air routes; it does contain the major oil reserves of the world. But these have all become less rather than more strategic on the contemporary scene. The demand for oil has increased greatly in recent years, but so have resources outside of the Middle East increased greatly—in North Africa, in Iran, in South America, in Canada and elsewhere; and natural gas discoveries have also helped to supply the growing needs of European industry. While nuclear energy is some distance off, and the demand for oil will increase in the years ahead, we seem to give more attention to protecting American oil investments in the Middle East than considerations of military strategy require.

3. A pedestrian and obvious fact of contemporary Middle Eastern history is the persistent inability of Arabs to unite politically despite the strong belief that unity is their natural condition. But, in addition, there is a conception that it is not so obvious. It is the persistent notion that Arab unity would be in the interests of the U.S. and its allies and also in the interests of Israel as well as the Arab countries, despite the fact that a unified Arab world would seem more likely to be anti-U.S. than either neutral or pro-U.S.

The dominant theme of Nasser, as the top leader of Arab nationalism, has been Arab unity. Unity has been held forth as the ineluctable destiny of the Arab world, but clearly Arab unity has been the exception, not the rule, in Arab history. The factors that divide and distinguish the Arab coun-

tries appear to be far more substantial than the one factor that unites them—hatred of Israel. As Abba Eban recently wrote, nothing has divided the Arab world more than the effort to unite it.

The U.S. position has maintained that a prudent security equilibrium in the Middle East is more likely to be achieved under conditions of Arab unity than Arab diversity and political pluralism. The case usually rests on the view that economic growth would be fostered by unity and would itself create pride in economic achievement and thereby minimize or reduce anti-Israel slogans as the goal of unity. However, a strong case can be made that a pluralistic diverse Arab world of separate governments could more easily accommodate an Israel-Arab understanding. A Middle East convulsed by an Egyptian bid for centralized control scarcely seems a congenial setting for achieving such understanding.

4. The U.S. experience in the Middle East postdates the full blown emergence of the Palestine issue. The U.S., compared with England and France, has had only minimal experience in dealing with Middle Eastern problems. Perhaps because of its lack of regional experience, the U.S. is tempted to be overly impressed with psychological and sociological factors in the Arab picture. I refer, for example, to the trauma and bitter frustration of the Arabs resulting from the humiliating defeat by the Israelis; the dream-like quality of their hopes and fears; their enormous pride and sense of personal dignity; and the great gulf between their verbal ferocity and their timid deeds.

Awareness of these factors may help to account for the tendency of the experts to discount the militancy reflected by the violent statements of Arab leaders. Among knowledgeable experts there is often a characteristic paradox in value judgment: an admiring attitude regarding Arab culture and historical development and sympathy for strivings for personal dignity; and at the same time terrible bitter disappointment with the lack of Arab achievement and fulfillment. Caught in this value paradox, the experts in the State Department often seem to interpret Nasser's violent aims as merely hortatory; in other words, not really to be taken serious. We are often not quite sure what Nasser really means; hence, the words are rarely taken to mean what they plainly say. Israel is scarcely to be criticized if it takes the view that it cannot discount the plain meaning of the words as completely as the diplomats appear to do.

5. Clearly the American experts in international affairs tended to believe that Israel has exaggerated in assessing the immediacy of the threats to its existence. Why is this the case? Part of the answer lies in the respect for Israel's effectiveness as an independent nation coupled with the lack of confidence in the capacity and human resources of Arab countries. Perhaps another part of the answer is that the U.S. is more acutely aware than many in Israel are of the unsettling effects of Israel's policy regarding retaliatory or preemptive raids and attacks. The U.S. believes that Israel exaggerates threats to its existence and is therefore too quick in embarking on retaliatory raids. The American view is that Israel is insufficiently aware of the consequences, adverse to the interests of Israel and the West, flowing from its militancy. World opinion often perceives the killings but not the provocation, and the U.N. machinery has not proved to be helpful to Israel in evaluating Arab complaints and charges.

6. There has been a tendency to exaggerate the consequences of Nasser's strong and spirited drive for modernization and industrialization. The fact is that time has been running out for Nasser. Military expenditures have become almost insupportable. The Yemen campaign has been a dis-

mal failure and extremely costly. The population explosion runs ahead of the pace of economic growth. The level of economic activity has increased in absolute amounts but has declined on a per capita basis. In this context the inner logic of Nasser's position seems to move toward war or military expansion.

7. Nasser has proved to be a very formidable opponent in dealing with the U.S. He has been a first-rate bargainer and bluffer. He has effectively manipulated the U.S. and Soviet Union in order to obtain maximum financial and military aid for Egypt. He knows that he has advantages in bargaining only in the context of crises, which he is very adept at manufacturing. Nasser succeeded in using the cold war to internationalize Arab affairs. He has thereby gained a lever to exact better terms from both the West and the East. The American goal of Arab unity in turn plays into the hands of Nasser whose policy can succeed only by making Arab unity a leading international issue. Nasser has effectively demonstrated Egypt's nuisance value by showing that he is dangerous and must be bought off at a high price.

There are some elements of high tragedy here. Nasser is personally incorrupt, a highly effective ruler, who has led Egypt through a major social revolution. He has developed new industries, exterminated the great landowners, bolstered the educational system, and nurtured a new middle class of military officers, young professionals and bureaucrats. On the other hand, labor productivity in Egypt is very low and consumption is pitifully low. Poverty remains intense. Egypt is not slowly catching up with a Western standard, but rather is steadily falling behind. The country lives on borrowed money and neither capitalism nor Communism seems to work. It is critically important that Nasser keep up the morale and perquisites of the new middle class, but he cannot do so in the context of economic retrenchment. The economists advise Nasser that such retrenchment is mandatory for economic survival. But as a military leader of high ambition with a mission to fulfill, his only way out may be through continued expansion in Israel or elsewhere.

8. The case for financial aid to Egypt and other Arab countries has been justified by general humanitarian considerations, but is otherwise rather weak. The basic postulate of foreign aid is that Western security is promoted best by helping countries maintain independence and becoming viable economically; and if the West does not help, the East will. The U.S. also appeared to believe, with some justification, that however hostile Nasser may be to the West, anyone replacing him would probably be worse. Leaving aside the desire of the U.S. on humanitarian grounds for helping a desperately poor country, the case for foreign aid to Egypt seems weak. Had Nasser received no aid whatsoever from the West, it is difficult to imagine that he could have been more hostile.

9. In 1964 and 1965, in contrast to the French and West German attitudes and policies toward Israel there appeared a noticeable wavering and weakness as well as some clumsiness in London and Washington in dealing with the excesses of the Egyptians and the Syrians. Certainly American reaction has been very cautious when American libraries have gone up in flames. U.S. diplomats appeared to have considered German recognition of Israel in 1964 as a matter of doubtful wisdom. U.S. diplomats urge Israel not to resort to arms in meeting the attacks of the National Liberation Army and not to resist Arab water diversion projects. The State Department seemed to take the view that it will be a long time before it can be determined whether the Arabs will really be violating the Johnston Water Plan.

The Israelis have a valid claim in believing that the U.S. will prefer to avoid strong clear action strengthening Israel's security, and at the same time be willing, however reluctantly, to tolerate intolerable effrontery and vilification on the part of Arab leaders. We must, therefore, expect that Israel will often be disappointed with the attitude of American officials toward its security needs. In the minds of American officials Israel's needs must always be measured against the probable reaction of Arab leaders' reactions which American officials regard as extremely important.

It was a dominant consideration in the Eisenhower-Dulles policy that the Arabs are more fearful of Zionism than they are of Communism. Dulles believed that the U.S. must counter the Arab belief that the U.S. supports the aggressive expansion of Israel. Recognition of this belief and fear has mightily inhibited American action and policy in Israel. At the same time the U.S. has been ready to use economic aid to influence the government of Israel. For example, it delayed for a long time the move of the Foreign Ministry to Jerusalem; it stopped hydro-electric development on the Jordan River; and its reactions to the Qubya Raid of October 1953 did deter subsequent militancy on the part of Israel.

Given the deep complexity of Middle Eastern issues, it has been difficult for American Jews to understand U.S. policy. I speak not of approval but understanding. The main difficulty has been the failure to understand that the American attempt to achieve a prudent security balance in the Middle East has prevented the U.S. from meeting Israel's security needs as Israel defines them. Israelis tend to understand better than American Jews do why it is practically inevitable that the American response to Israel's stated security needs will fall short of Israel's demands. The problem is not that they fall short—this is probably inevitable—but rather how short the American response will be.

I now turn very briefly to the present, June 7, 1967. How has the American policy of friendly detachment and concerned neutrality expressed itself during the past three weeks? The record shows the following:

1. The U.S. will not permit the annihilation of Israel, but short of that decisive threat, it will undertake no initiative unilaterally.

2. For a long time, the United States did not expect war between the Arabs and Israel, and thought that the Israelis exaggerated Nasser's threats of extermination.

3. The United States did not expect the United Nations to arrange an accommodation, but it nevertheless turned to the U.N. to avoid diplomatic isolation.

4. It became uncertain in the final week-end in early June before war broke out whether the United States could hold Israel in check without making some strategic commitment to Israel.

5. It actively explored various proposals to reopen the Gulf of Aquaba through some facesaving compromise that would recognize Egypt's sovereignty over the Strait of Tiran, yet assure Israel's access to the Sea. It also considered Thanet's proposal to place U.N. truce observers on both sides of the frontier, Arab and Israeli.

6. The U.S. became increasingly perturbed by the emergence of the Soviet Union as the champion of the Arabs, by its historic expansionist drive toward the Mediterranean, and by its attempt to control half or more of Europe's oil imports.

7. Repeated guarantees of Israel's security failed to prevent the present hostilities, and Israel consequently saw a better chance to resolve the issue of national survival through war rather than diplomacy. To understate the point, events would seem to support Israel's strategic judgment.

What lesson is to be learned from this review of the American posture of concerned neutrality and friendly detachment in the Middle East? It can be stated simply:

The traditionally ambivalent U.S. policy has failed. Therefore, the President, the State Department, and the Congress must be advised and persuaded to use the opportunities provided by Israel's military victory to achieve a massive reduction of the tensions that underlie the war:

1. It means a recognition of the illusory character of Arab unity and the political unreliability of Arab leadership;

2. It means a lifting of both the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal;

3. It means, above all, a peace treaty between Israel and each of the Arab states that recognizes the legitimacy of Israeli statehood; and

4. It means a readjustment of boundaries to meet Israel's urgent security needs, including the Gaza strip, the area around Latrun and the hills directly to the north and west, of Jerusalem, and the Old City of Jerusalem itself, with appropriate guarantees for the safety of Christian and Moslem holy places.

These objectives will not be achieved if the United States conforms to its traditional policy of concerned neutrality. We need to be quite clear about these matters. Effective movement toward achieving Israel's legitimate goals calls for a substantial shift in American policy.

The obstacles to such a marked change in policy are indeed great. They include American preoccupation with Viet Nam; the horrible complexities and confusions of foreign policymaking in the U.S.; traditional Foreign Service sympathy for Arab interests; the heightened enmity of the Arab countries for Israel; the considerable Afro-Asian support of the U.A.R., the unfriendliness of the U.N. arena for the resolution of issues directly involving Israel.

But there are also some factors influencing the kind of policy change that circumstances now require. One is the emergence of new leadership in Israel composed of men who have been taught to rely not on international guarantees but rather upon their own courage, initiative, and resourcefulness. Another is the strong moral, political, and financial support of American citizens for the continued independence and security of Israel free from the dangerous challenges that have persisted for nineteen years of statehood.

These obstacles will be overcome only with skillful political action and the most generous levels of financial support. And that is why all of us are here tonight.

LAND MOBILE RADIOS AND CRIME PREVENTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business, on which I serve, recently held hearings on the impact of crime on small business. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, prepared for those hearings, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE USE OF LAND MOBILE RADIO BY BUSINESSMEN TO ASSIST IN CRIME PREVENTION

(Statement of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio Before the Selected Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate)

The importance of small business to this nation's economy has long been recognized by the leaders of this country. President Johnson cited the importance of small business to the nation's economy and to the

nation's continued prosperity and security, during the swearing in ceremonies of the present Administrator of the Small Business Administration on May 19, 1966. The President stated:

"Small business is part of the American way of life. A man's desire to become his own boss has always been part of our national dream. If we lose that, we will lose something that is very precious to all of us . . . this administration and its leadership in the Congress, . . . are interested in helping (the small businessman) . . . We are concerned with the man who operates the small business."

Congress has also recognized the importance of the small business community to this nation. Both the House and the Senate have established committees such as this committee to investigate the Congressional concern for the small businessman. Congress has also, of course, created the Small Business Administration and supplied that agency with the funds needed to assist the small businessman.

At the same time, the small businessman, who is well known for his industry and intelligence, has not relied solely on others to seek solutions to his problems. Small businesses actively participate in community, civic and trade associations, endeavoring to find their own solutions to specific problems and better ways to serve their customers and their communities.

The National Association of Business and Educational Radio (NABER) is one such organization. NABER is an association of two-way radio users, most of whom are small businessmen. Our membership also includes educational institutions, doctors, police, fire departments, and the wide range of the public that use two-way radio to conduct their business, perform their services or carry out their duties. The one thing our members have in common is that they are all licensed by the Federal Communications Commission in the Business Radio Service.

The purpose of NABER, in its broadest terms, is to assist its members to obtain the most productive use of their two-way radio systems. As I have pointed out, many of our members are small businessmen who use two-way radio in their work primarily to cut their costs, increase their efficiency, and provide better service to their customers. But this is not its only use. It is being used today in cooperation with local government officials in a direct attack upon crime which has become so costly to the small businessman. Increasingly over the past few years, crime has become a major obstacle to the successful establishment or continuance of a small business as a going concern. NABER heartily subscribes to the Chairman's statements that "small business victims of crime throughout the nation need help" and that "(t)hey have a right to be secure in their persons and their property, not only as small businessmen, but as citizens as well."

This Committee is acutely aware of the problem. On April 24th, the Police Chief of the District of Columbia, John B. Layton, stated before this Committee that the situation described in the testimony of the small businessmen appearing before this Committee was a "deplorable condition." Chief Layton stated that his force was "working to alleviate" the condition. Indeed, the police departments around the country are doing all they can to combat a rising crime rate.

If someone devised a plan that would enable law enforcement officials to predict where or when the next crime would be committed, much of the crime in this country could be eliminated. This would be ideal. At the present, however, greater reliance must be placed on methods designed to report crimes or suspicious acts which may become crimes and to locate and apprehend those who may be guilty as soon as possible.

Since the 1920's the police have used two-

way radio to help them in the war against crime. Now, as more and more businessmen are equipping their trucks and cars with two-way radios, there are hundreds of vehicles operated by private citizens on the streets of our cities everyday capable of supplementing the radio systems of the public authorities by being the eyes and ears of the community for purposes of public safety and crime control. Since the police or other public authorities cannot possibly be every place at once, the private businesses that do use two-way radio can tremendously increase the ability of the community to observe and quickly report crime to the local authorities. They can also report fires, accidents, trees blocking roads and similar events which need rapid attention.

As a representative example of the diversity and many different types of users of two-way radio, I would like to have included as part of this statement a list of two-way radio users recently applying for licenses by the FCC in a one-week period. According to a recent public notice issued by the FCC, these applications are coming in at the rate of 20,000 per month. Just take some of the new two-way users in Florida, for example. The following are typical of the small businessmen who use two-way radio in their businesses:

Biochemistry Associates International, 1150 N.W. 14th Street, Miami, Fla.
Newell Construction Co., Inc., 7292 S.W. 42 Terrace, Miami, Fla.
Panama Pools, Inc., 15625 W. Highway 98, Panama City, Fla.
Flower Tree Nursery, Box 1469, Eustis, Fla.
Warrington Plumbing Co., 910 W. Main Street, Pensacola, Fla.
Earthmoving & Excavating Co., 9500 W. Sample Road, Coral Springs, Fla.
State Fertilizer Co., Box 1514, Lakeland, Fla.
Cypress Gardens Citrus Products, Inc., Box 1312, Winter Haven, Fla.
Howard TV Rentals, 2815 Main street, Jacksonville, Fla.
Colonial Concrete Co., Box 4556, Jacksonville, Fla.
Huntsville Building Materials Co., P.O. Box 567, Huntsville, Ala.
Burford Equipment Co., P.O. Box 1591, Montgomery, Ala.
Farmers Supply Co., 715 Noble Street, Anniston, Ala.
Priest Company, 2207 Meridian Street, Huntsville, Ala.
Anderson Tractor Co., 216 College Street, Troy, Ala.
Collier Wholesale Drug Co., No. 2 North 4th Place, Birmingham, Ala.
Fred Brasher Plumbing, 726 Fulton Street, Alexandria, La.
Stephenson Floor Covering Co., Inc., 3911 Southern Avenue, Shreveport, La.
Builders Center, Inc., 12911 Florida Street, Baton Rouge, La.
All-Vend, Inc., Box 8272, New Orleans, La.
C. J. Hansen Co., 3552 Silverton Road, Salem, Oregon
Conroy Packing Co., 960 Young Street, Woodburn, Oregon
Klinge Shell Distributor, 1414 E. Salem, Albany, Oregon
Irrigation Service, Route No. 1, Box 373, La Grande, Oregon
Southern Nevada Communications, 2142 S. Highland Avenue, Las Vegas, Nev.
Wesley Mfg. Co., 2405 East Second Street, Reno, Nev.
Roaden's Garage & Body Shop, 1765 Lewis Street, Reno, Nev.
Sierra Nevada Communications, Inc., P.O. Box 7312, Reno, Nev.
Rish Equipment Co., P.O. Box 353, Charleston, W. Va.
C. W. Stickley Inc., P.O. Box 946, Fairmont, W. Va.
Hibbs Radio Communications, 205 S. Main Street, Philippi, W. Va.

Kesterson Fabric Core Service, Inc., 1722 Latrobe Street, Parkersburg, W. Va.
 Boy Scouts of America, 1227 9th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.
 Wagley Construction Co., Star Route #1, Kenai, Alaska.
 Lindsey, Inc., Box 4081, Anchorage, Alaska.
 Pete's Spenard Texaco Service, 3304 Spenard Road, Spenard, Alaska.
 Fingie's Fuel Service, Inc., 660 Rahway Avenue, Union, N.J.
 Walter J. Firrell Plumbing, 319 Landis Avenue, Vineland, N.J.
 Fri-Boro Corporation, P.O. Box 125, Bound Brook, N.J.
 Rutgers Electronics Inc., 2090 Woodbridge Avenue, Edison, N.J.
 Berman Electric & Elevator, Inc., 831 Williamson Street, Madison, Wis.
 Hoida Lumber Co., 1545 Willon Street, Green Bay, Wis.
 Handicabs of Milwaukee, 5220 W. Center Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Sheboygan McDonald's Inc., 2307 North Avenue, Sheboygan, Wis.
 Trucks Radio Engineers, Box 95, Clovis, N. Mex.
 A.L.S. Electronics, P.O. Box 11373, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
 Million Electric Co., Inc., P.O. Box 618, Fairview Station, Espanola, N. Mex.
 Caprock Communications, Inc., Box 1560, Hobbs, N. Mex.
 Lawton Coca Cola Bottling Co., 511 N. Second, Lawton, Okla.
 Brown Distributing Co., 429 Columbus, Muskogee, Okla.
 Miami Implement Co., 504 First Street, N.E., Miami, Okla.
 Swansons Fire Co., Inc., 1000 N. Hudson, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Act Fuel Oil Co., Inc., One Coffey Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Xaverian High School, 7100 Shore Road, Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Master Fuel Co., 141 John Street, Babylon, N.Y.
 D & S Pump & Supply Co., Inc., Brewster, N.Y.
 Valente Excavating, Inc., Box 66 R.D. #4, Troy, N.Y.
 Kellner Car & Limousine Service, Inc., 30 W. 60th Street, New York.
 Dairy Industry Refrigeration Co., 5224 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 American Pool Service Corp., 210 N. Aberdeen Avenue, Wayne, Pa.
 Russell Hopkins Glass Co., 1506 Callowhill Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Atwell Tractor Co., P.O. Box 114, Concordville, Pa.
 Gerard Gilbert Construction, Inc., 69 Highland Street, Laconia, N.H.
 White Top Taxi, Inc., 390 Central Avenue, Dover, N.H.
 Kal Gas Co., Inc., Church Street, Opping, N.H.
 Metropolitan Trash, Inc., 5790 W. 56th Avenue, Arvada, Colo.
 Trasier Farmers, Wodrow, Colo.
 Armored Motor Service, 970 Yuma Street, Denver, Colo.
 Building Materials Center, 2700 E. 4th, Pueblo, Colo.
 Chattanooga Goodwill Industries, 3500 Dodds Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Ligon & Bobo Funeral Home, 241 W. Main, Lebanon, Tenn.
 Harris Realty Co., P.O. Box 2337, Clarksville, Tenn.
 George Peabody College For Teachers, 21st Avenue, South, Nashville, Tenn.

I should like to submit for the record three very interesting clippings from newspapers serving two of our large metropolitan areas.

According to the Globe-Democrat of St. Louis, Missouri, the Bi-State Transit System of that city installed two-way radios in many of their buses in response to a request for better safety measures by the

Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 788 after one bus driver was slain by a robber while driving his bus. It proved to be one of the major safety measures to protect both drivers and passengers from holdup men. The newspaper reports that the new measures reduced the number of armed robberies on buses in the second half of 1966 by 58 per cent.

In Detroit, Michigan, according to an article in the Detroit News, the president of Division 26 of the Amalgamated Transit Union, is considering asking the transit authority of that city for permission for his members to carry guns if the city declines to install additional two-way radios for the driver's protection. The union was prompted to take such a position after one of the drivers was shot twice in a holdup.

The Union president cited two-way radio as a major factor in apprehending the suspect and according to the account in the Detroit News, the president of the Union was quoted as saying:

"After he (the driver) was shot he called on his two-way radio to report that he was wounded. It may have been a major factor in saving his life."

Dallas, Texas is another city that has installed two-way radio on its buses in hope that the radios will help reduce robberies. A report of the Dallas Texas News is submitted for the record.

Two-way radios have also been used in other ways to help combat crime. I submit a report in the New York Daily News on the use of walkie-talkies by the Housing Authority police of that city. This report shows how radio is able to aid in the quick apprehension of suspects before the trail grows cold.

Still another example of businessmen adopting self-help procedures through the use of two-way radio communications is the antitruck theft alert system now in effect in Chicago and the New York-New Jersey metropolitan areas. I would like to submit for the record an article and an editorial from Transport Topics, the National Newspaper of the Motor Freight Carriers, describing this theft alert plan.

As the plan is described in the article, a trucking company whose truck is stolen notifies other companies who, in turn, call still others, and so on. Drivers are given a description of the vehicle by their two-way radio dispatchers and then keep a look out. According to the newspaper, "In minutes, thousands of eyes are alert for a glimpse of the stolen truck."

The results of this theft alert plan have been very encouraging. Transport Topics reports that in "... the New York-New Jersey area truck hijacking is said to have declined from about 3 a day to 3 a month since the system was introduced." The report further states that "(r)ings with valuable cargoes have been recovered within 45 minutes of a reported loss".

These few examples show that two-way radio used by responsible citizens can be of substantial assistance to law enforcement and civic safety.

Recognizing this fact, members of NABER as well as members of other organizations of two-way radio users such as the Special Industrial Radio Service Association (SIRSA), are doing their part to assist in the efforts of law enforcement by participating in a program called Community Radio Watch.

I should like to describe this program to the Committee.

Since the principal purpose of the "Community Radio Watch Program" is to encourage citizens—especially those who use two-way radio—to support the police in their efforts to maintain law and order, participants in the program are asked to report to their offices, via their two-way radio, any suspicious acts or unusual occurrences that they observe. Their offices will then relay the re-

ports to the proper authorities for further action.

The program is usually instituted in a community by the Mayor or City Manager. He asks all the businesses in his city which use two-way radio to enlist in the program. The businessmen willing to participate in the program are given the necessary information to give to their drivers who are the key men in the operation of the program.

In order to encourage, recognize, and pay tribute to the individuals who use their two-way radio to report a situation which results in the protecting of life or property, a recognition and distinguished service award, contributed by Motorola, a member of the land mobile communications industry, is an integral part of the program and the awards have been established at the national, state and industry levels. An Award Committee made up of representatives of governmental law enforcement agencies or civic groups controls the selection of the participants deserving of special recognition or an award. Thus, not only are the participants given well-deserved recognition for their efforts in behalf of their communities, but also the public is made more aware of what they as individual citizens can do to aid their law enforcement officials. Furthermore, the reporting of particular cases in which the program has aided the enforcement of the law, provides a convenient check on the success of the program as well as making data available for future use to improve or revise the program as particular needs of individual communities become known.

Thus, the Community Radio Watch program is the implementation of the principal that law enforcement is the job of every citizen not only to the extent of helping to protect oneself as in the truck theft alert plan, but also in helping to protect the community as well. Indeed, as President Johnson has stated on December 31, 1966, on the issuance of the Report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia:

"Crime cannot be conquered, in this or any other city unless citizens are willing to help. An understanding of the nature of the problems and the directions of effective citizen action will permit a mobilization of action by citizens and the private groups and agencies which they direct, to work together to meet the challenge, and the opportunity, which the report presents."

As of March 27, 1967, over 200 cities and towns around the country had implemented or made plans to implement the Community Radio Watch program. An estimated 12,000 business organizations with over one hundred thirty thousand (130,000) personnel driving vehicles equipped with two-way radios will soon be actively supporting their local police in their efforts to protect life and property.

A list of cities and firms participating in Community Radio Watch is attached.

To give further information on the operation of the program, I should like to submit for the record the reports of various newspaper accounts on the inception of the Community Radio Watch program in various communities. The clippings indicate the enthusiastic response of both the citizens and officials to the Community Radio Watch program. I also offer for the record, letters from public officials stating their enthusiasm for the program.

As with the use of two-way radio on buses and in the anti-truck theft alert plan, the Community Radio Watch Program has quickly produced highly encouraging and beneficial results. A recent example of Community Radio Watch in action may be of interest to the Committee.

Most of the members of this Committee (as well as most of the residents of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area) remember the escape of three prisoners from Lorton Re-

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8527

But if France is an ally at all, it a worse-than-useless ally. Consider the recent record.

This country did everything possible, short of going to war, to help France in its grubby colonial war in Indochina. In return, in our great trouble in Vietnam, the French have happily sabotaged us at every opportunity. France was one of the two greatest beneficiaries of Marshall Plan aid. In return, the French are now doing everything they can to undermine the dollar.

The U.S. has committed hundreds of thousands of men and tens of billions of dollars to the defense of Western Europe. In return, the French have kicked NATO out of France, and made no contribution worth mentioning to Europe's defense. Europe needs no defense, according to de Gaulle, because "there will be no war, I can assure you that." Why will there be no war? Because, as de Gaulle has also said, the American nuclear deterrent is "the essential guarantee of world peace."

Thus, if France is ever threatened, France's oldest ally will instantly come to the rescue, risking the lives of a hundred million or so Americans in the process. This Gaullist reasoning is a fine example of the famous "logique Française." French logic can be summed up in the phrase, "What's yours is mine and what's mine's my own." The French are totally blind to any national interest except their own.

The British, to be sure, have never been blind to the British national interest, but they have always been aware that an alliance is a two-way street. In our trouble in Vietnam, the British have stood by us, however reluctantly, even when the Labor majority in Parliament was virtually non-existent. In recent months especially, the pressure on Harold Wilson's government to break with the United States over Vietnam has risen steadily. Much of the pressure comes from the British intellectuals, who, like their American opposite numbers, have eagerly swallowed the myth that only American intransigence stands in the way of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

Recently, Foreign Secretary George Brown went out of his way to explode the myth. "The only barrier" to negotiation, he said, "is that at no stage have we had a response from Hanoi. . . . We have made all possible efforts [but] they have all come to nothing because at the end of the day North Vietnam would never come to the table." This is, of course, the simple truth. But to tell the simple truth about Vietnam, in England even more than in this country, is to invite a relentless barrage of abuse from every intellectual organ. Brown is a brave man, and Britain is a useful ally.

In the postwar years, the British and the Americans have had their differences, of course, notably during the Suez crisis in 1956. But by and large Great Britain and the United States have been allies in fact as well as name, while the French behaved like allies only so long as it suited their financial convenience.

All this is, of course, a matter of opinion—and no doubt of outrageously biased opinion. The bias derives at least in part from the plain facts as recited above. But it also derives in part from personal experience, notably the experience of spending two and a half years in the British Army, and several months in the French Resistance, in the last war.

I enjoyed the *maquis* much more than the British Army, partly because the French are more fun to be with than the British. The French are wonderfully likable and entertaining people, and they can also be amazingly brave and altogether admirable in many ways. But the truth is not in them—not, at least, where *la belle France* is concerned.

In the *maquis* everybody lied happily to everybody else all the time. One *maquisard* would boast of how he had strangled 10 Boches with his bare hands, and another would raise the ante to 20 Boches. It was a game. But there was a point at which it ceased to be a game.

When our area was liberated, de Gaulle himself appeared and made a speech to the assembled *maquisards*. "C'est vous, les Français, qui ont libéré la France," he said—"You, the French have liberated France." It was a bald-faced lie, of course, but every Frenchman present believed it devoutly. All Frenchmen are capable of devoutly believing anything good about France, and anything bad about any other nation, which is one reason why the French are useless as allies.

The British are perfectly god-awful in all sorts of ways. But they respect the truth, and are capable of facing it, one reason why they won the last war and the French lost it. They really do care about political freedom, and not only their own. And they have an inner toughness which makes them useful people to have around in a tight spot.

The spot we are in is getting tighter all the time. This is why it seems so odd that we should be actively encouraging the only really useful ally we have to cease to be an ally, and to become instead part of a French-dominated, profoundly anti-American "European" community.

The truth is that, because we are obsessed with Vietnam, we have been following a knee-jerk policy in Europe. In the days of the "Grand Design" for a united Europe closely allied with the United States, the policy made sense. It has now been utterly outdated by events, but our knee goes on jerking—we go on urging the British to join the Common Market, no matter how outrageous the terms laid down by de Gaulle.

This country and Britain ought to be examining with utmost seriousness some kind of "Atlantic arrangement" as an alternative to British submission to de Gaulle's demands—and without being put off by clichés about Britain becoming the "fifty-first state."

Winston Churchill was fond of pointing out that the United States and Britain together made an unchallengeable combination. This is still true, empire or no empire, gold drain or no gold drain. And it is, of course why de Gaulle, with his bitter jealousy and paranoiac distrust of "les Anglo-Saxons," is so eager to break up the Anglo-American alliance for good, before he dies. There is no sane reason why we should help him do it.

File
THE PRESIDENT'S STATESMANSHIP SHOWS THE WAY TO REAL MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday, in a major speech on the Middle East, President Johnson presented a realistic course for peace in that troubled area of the world. Clearly, the President was looking ahead to the possibilities of the future. Clearly, he was seeking to avoid the recriminations and hostilities of the past.

At the heart of the President's remarks was his determination to recognize the social, political and economic rights of all sides in the long-smoldering dispute. The five points he outlined as being indispensable to true peace in the Middle East—the right to political sovereignty; the rights of the refugees; the right of free maritime passage; the end to the arms race; and the need for direct

negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors—demonstrate the President's firm grasp of the most basic issues involved in creating a new era of peace and progress in the Holy Land.

I commend the President for his excellent policy statement. My hope is that the members of the United Nations will take prompt action on the President's proposal that all arms shipments into the Middle East area be reported by U.N. forces on the scene. Ending the arms race is vital if peace is to be truly restored to the Middle East. And direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations are equally important if future hostilities are to be avoided.

It is instructive, I think, to compare the President's speech with the one delivered at the General Assembly yesterday by Premier Kosygin. For while the President spoke the reasonable language that denotes hope for future peace, Mr. Kosygin chose to speak the language of the past—with all of the hatred and violence of the sad history of the Middle East.

President Johnson's statesmanlike address should be the real keynote address of the General Assembly meeting. My hope is that his reasoned, enlightened response to the crisis will be emulated by other world statesmen, who will show equal determination to find the way to avoid the kind of danger and tragedy that threaten the security of the entire world.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, June 21, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of June 12), 1967:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

William D. Dale, of Maryland, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years (reappointment).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Felix P. Ballenger

SUPPLY CORPS

Paul F. Cosgrove, Jr. Roland Rieve
Grover C. Haffner Stuart H. Smith
Elliott Bloxom

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Spencer R. Smith
James V. Bartlett