ple to a cystoscope used in the medical profession.

When Dr. Clair completed his studies and examinations, the Thompson and Litchner Company submitted *a 5-volume report* to the Architect of the Capitol, *containing his findings and remedial measures recommended.*

Volume 1 contains a detailed account of the survey, studies, and examinations made of the west front structure, together with drawings and other detailed illustrations. In addition, *it contains* a letter from Dr. Clair, summarizing his findings, and recommending the Extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol and its reconstruction in marble. In this letter, Dr. Clair recommended against repair, refacing, or restoration, as a remedial measure to correct the conditions he found to exist.

Volume 2 contains drawings showing general plans of work, location of borings, test pits, cores, and similar detail, soil profiles, test pit detail drawings, wall sections, deviation of wall facing stones, and a view of the East-West section through the Capitol.

Volumes 3, 4, and 5 contain photographs of various conditions found, including, in general, views of the building, major cracks and displaced stones, exposed surface of walls in test pits and hand holes made in walls above grade, both inside and outside of the building, and detail pictures of all cores as removed from the walls.

Contrary to allegations made by others, the *Thompson and Lichtner Company's studies and report were not directed to or aimed at the extension* of the West Central Front of the Capitol, *but were directed to a determination of the condition of* the West Central Front *and what measures*—repair, refacing, restoration, or extension—should be taken to remedy conditions in a permanent manner.

The report did not devote any more time or space to the extension of the west front, than it did to the repair, refacing, or restoration of the west front! The report was devoted, instead, to the *condition* of the west front *and to the conclusions* reached by the Thompson and Lichtner Company as a result of their studies and examinations.

In addition to the findings and recommendations contained in this report, Dr. Clair, in testifying on the Extension Project before the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol at a public hearing, June 24, 1965, enlarged upon the report and, after discussing various conditions, findings, and considerations, stated (p. 10) "What is needed here is to, in my opinion, protect this whole wall, *enclose it just as you did on the east side by another structure.*"

In evaluating opinions, it should be emphasized that Dr. Clair has a first-hand knowledge of deficient structural conditions, acquired through a boroscopic examination of the interior construction, made through the holes from the corings removed from the walls and later replaced, whereas other engineers or architects are limited to a visual examination of the structure and a study of Dr. Clair's report.

Restoration, if done, would have to be done on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, at an indeterminate cost. Dr. Clair has stated, in his opinion, such cost could range anywhere from Ten to Fifty Million Dollars, depending upon the extent of work found necessary in the course of the restoration, following the removal of stonework and exposure of the interior structure. Extension of the west central front and its reconstruction in marble, under competitive bid contracts, is, on the other hand, estimated to cost Thirty-Four Million Dollars.

Restoration, if done, would require the entire west central section of the Capitol, between the two rings, to be vacated, from the basement to attic, for a period ranging anywhere from 5 to 10 years. Extension of the west central front would, on the other hand, not require vacation of any part of the Capitol, except the section of the terrace between the Senate and House wings.

Beyond a doubt, in the entire history of the Capitol Building, no one has ever heretofore made as extensive or meticulous examination or observation of the construction and condition of the wall structure of the Capitol on the west side, as was made by Dr. Clair.

If the west central front of the Capitol is restored, and not extended, then space occupied by the following activities would have to be vacated for all or part of the 5 to 10 years period:

BASEMENT FLOOR

Office of the Architect of the Capitol.
Office of the Coordinator of Information.

FIRST FLOOR

House Branch Post Office.
An office of the Clerk of the House.
Office of the Doorkeeper of the House.
House Enrolling Clerk.
Several offices occupied by Doctor Pearson.
Subcommittee Hearing Rooms, House Committee on Appropriations.
Joint Committee on Printing.
Office of Secretary of Majority—Senate
Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.
Senate Barber Shop.
3 Senators' offices.

SECOND FLOOR

Statuary Hall.
House Document Room.
House Foreign Affairs Committee.
1 Congressman's office.
Office of the Minority Leader of the House.
6 Senators' offices.
Senate Disbursing Office.
Senate Minority Leader.

THIRD FLOOR

House Document Room.
House Administration Committee.
8 Senators' offices.
Secretary to the Minority—Senate.
Senate Library.
Part of Senate Document Room.

ATTIC FLOOR

House Document Room.
Law Library.
Senate Library.

A Not-So-Benevolent Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unaminous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal, dated June 13, 1967, entitled "A Not-So-Benevolent Uncle."

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

A NOT-SO-BENEVOLENT UNCLE

In the past decade Federal aid to cities has been rising so rapidly and recklessly that no one knows just how much has been spent, let alone what has been accomplished. Some guesses put the 10-year outlay at $100 billion.

Now, however, the Federal budget deficit is growing to fantastic proportions; at last it frightens Congress and, now and then, even the Administration. One result, as Mr. Karmin reported in this newspaper recently is that the cities aren't getting quite all the money they want, or all that Washington's politicians had led them to look for.

With somewhat less cash to hand out than expected, Federal urban-aid men are developing a new interest in efficiency. "You've got to do something besides just sitting back and letting the programs run themselves," says one official.

Some cities, of course, are not taking kindly to the idea, having grown accustomed to seeing Federal dollars poured down the drain. Yet Washington's interest in better management, if it somehow survives, could actually benefit everybody.

Consider Cleveland, an early target of the Federal crackdown. The Ohio metropolis has started 6,000 acres of urban renewal projects in the last decade, nearly twice as much as any other city in the nation. Only one of a dozen projects has ever been finished.

Along the way large amounts of land were taken off tax rolls and many families were pushed out of their homes, with the city often having no idea at all where they went. Under its be-kind-to-all policy, the Federal Government went right ahead helping to finance the fiasco.

But change came to Cleveland in January, when Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver withdrew $10.4 million that had been earmarked for the city's Erieview II renewal project. That particular project had been in the planning stage for almost six years, and no plan had been produced.

Other cities have felt a Federal nudge. When San Francisco refused to get moving on a $20 million urban renewal project, the Government retrieved the money. "We're trying to get in a position where our management record is improved," is the way one Federal official puts it.

It isn't especially surprising that many cities have simply taken on more projects than they could handle. With overlapping aid programs scattered around Washington, Government units for years have been falling over one another in their efforts to be first in handing out the cash.

In that sort of atmosphere, a lot of cities came to see "free" Federal funds as the solution to all their problems, or at least as something nice to have around. They often grabbed for the money before they had even figured out very clearly just what the problems were. One indication of the slapdash nature of much of the spending is the sad fact that the cities have continued to deteriorate.

With the Government turning somewhat less openhanded, local governments may try harder to mobilize their own resources. It's conceivable, too, that at least some of them will evidence more interest in revision of antiquated tax structures and management methods, in intelligent control of welfare and other spending.

It's also possible, to be be sure, that this is little more than wishful thinking; the change in Washington can hardly be called an economy wave. At best it affects only a relatively small portion of the Government's huge and growing domestic outlays. A number of cities, moreover, have become so used to loose living that they might not follow even a larger Federal switch toward efficiency.

Nonetheless the new urban-aid attitude is welcome. If it spreads, it could show that an uncle not quite so eager to be benevolent is in fact being kind.

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief observations on the

situation in the Middle East. First, I hope that the administration will make up its mind where it stands. I believe that administration indecision helped to bring on the recent conflict, and I feel that the administration should state the U.S. position clearly.

I believe that the recent hostilities must be terminated by a peace treaty in which the Arab States recognize at least the existing territorial boundaries of Israel. Provision should be made for the internationalization of Jerusalem, which is sacred to all faiths. Israel should be given the right of ship passage through the Suez Canal, and right of passage through the Straits of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba. In return, I believe Israel has an obligation to the Arabs uprooted from their former Palestinian homes. Israel's compliance with these obligations, also a prerequisite of Middle East peace, should likewise be written into any peace treaty.

Last year, I urged the President to stop the Middle East arms buildup and bring U.S. influence to bear on behalf of the creation of a Middle East Development Bank. The President did not do so. In the last week, others have echoed my request—the New York Times, for one. Now more than ever; the Middle East needs a development bank to sow peace and not war—to help beat swords into plowshares. I hope the President will listen.

High-Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor Goes to Full Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within recent weeks the United States has quietly, but with technical competence, added a new type reactor to its shelf of proven nuclear hardware. It is the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor. This new entry into the nuclear electricity generating field proved itself when Philadelphia Electric Co.'s 40,000-kilowatt plant at Peach Bottom, Pa., went to full power. It is notable that this particular station was the only one not shut down by the surge of power demand which blacked out electricity generation recently throughout Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. Details of the Peach Bottom plant, a joint technical development by the AEC and General Atomics, as well as information and prospects for high-temperature gas-cooled reactors are found in the following item published June 4 in the New York Times:

A HIGH-TEMPERATURE REACTOR GOES TO WORK FOR PHILADELPHIA

(By Gene Smith)

Frederic de Hoffmann has been smiling the big smile of satisfaction for the last 10 days. And he has every right to be proud.

Dr. de Hoffmann, a vice president of the General Dynamics Corporation and president of its General Atomic division, has been the champion of the high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor (H.T.G.R.), a concept that provides the highest efficiency nuclear reactor to date. The initial H.T.G.R. Peach Bottom power plant on the lines of the Philadelphia Electric Company system began full power production of electricity on May 25. It ran two days at the 40,000-kilowatt level and was shut down to make adjustments on the non-nuclear portion of the plant. Full power operation will be resumed as soon as these adjustments are completed.

The importance of Peach Bottom lies in the fact that it utilizes high-efficiency steam conditions of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit and pressure of 1,450 pounds a square inch. Up to now, most of the nuclear stations operating in this country have been limited to 500 to 600 degrees Fahrenheit.

Dr. de Hoffmann explained that Peach Bottom operated at a net efficiency of about 35 per cent, which is higher than that of any of the 13 other nuclear plants that have gone into regular operation in this country.

"The H.T.G.R.'s higher operating temperatures give more energy to each pound of steam, thereby enabling the plant to make better use of modern turbine-generator technology," Dr. de Hoffmann added. "This high-temperature operation, combined with improved nuclear performance, opens the way to significant reductions in generating costs and to the assurance of low-cost power from the atom for many years to come."

Dr. de Hoffmann, who almost single-handedly has championed the H.T.G.R. in competition with the breeder reactor concept, expects to see 1-million- or even 2-million-kilowatt H.T.G.R. power plants operating in the early 1970's. He pointed out that an H.T.G.R. plant of 1-million-kilowatt capacity would require the mining of about 500 tons of natural uranium to produce the enriched uranium for its start-up. A conventional nuclear power plant of the same size would require about 1,000 tons for its start-up and would consume about 100 tons of uranium a year compared with the H.T.G.R.'s consumption of about 50 tons.

He predicted that if, after 1975, half of all the additional nuclear generating capacity installed each year in the United States were to be H.T.G.R. plants instead of low-temperature reactors, power cost savings for the nation in the first 10 years could amount to as much as $1-billion.

"First, we must understand that there is no such thing as a uranium shortage," Dr. de Hoffmann said in a recent interview. "There are at present about 200,000 tons of known United States reserves of uranium ore in a region below about $5 to $10 a pound of ore. The quantity of ore known even now between $10 and $15 or so a pound would double or triple this number. This illustrates that the uranium supply situation, as with all other commodities, is innately tied to the price of the commodity.

"One cannot simply talk of a shortage of ore—one can only talk of a possible shortage of ore below a given price. However, the H.T.G.R. can use far more expensive ores than the existing water reactors without increasing power costs beyond the ceiling set by coal. Thus, from the resource point of view, it is true that water reactors could lead to a 'shortage' of uranium ores but the use of H.T.G.R. reactors can alleviate this picture and make the 'shortage' disappear."

COMPARISON OF COSTS

Dr. de Hoffmann has argued for a long time that his H.T.G.R. has been put in the wrong position in the continuing battle over the type of reactor that will be tested for the next generation as an operating power maker. He insists that capital costs for the H.T.G.R. would be "equal to lower" than costs for water reactors of the type now being built.

"Furthermore, the fast breeder reactor should be forced to meet the tests and records of the H.T.G.R. and not of the water reactors," he said. "Fast breeder reactors, just like slow thermal reactors, will have to compete in terms of power costs or they simply will not be built in any free economy.

"If fast reactors can be built with cheap enough capital costs and good enough fuel-cycle costs to be able to utilize plutonium and give cheaper power costs than water reactors and, more importantly, than the lower cost H.T.G.R.'s, then and only then would there be justification for building fast breeders for plutonium use. This does not mean that the building of low gain breeders can be justified through the fallacious argument that a 'home for plutonium' must be found."

In this argument, Dr. de Hoffmann sought to dispute those backers of breeder reactors who claim that breeders would be required to use up the plutonium that would result from the thermal reactors and would have the plus of providing additional fissionable material that would then be in short supply. Dr. de Hoffmann contends that if H.T.G.R.'s were given the go-ahead now, the nation could assure itself that by 1985 it would have no need for more than 250,000 tons of uranium.

General Atomic is building a 330,000-kilowatt H.T.G.R. for the Public Service Company of Colorado under the A.E.C.'s power reactor demonstration program. The plant, known as the Fort St. Vrain nuclear generating station, is scheduled for operation in 1970 and is expected to have an efficiency of about 40 per cent.

This is in line with Dr. de Hoffmann's planning. He has called for a consistent national program that would have these three elements:

Recognition that the H.T.G.R. actually exists and should be given heavy weight in planning the over-all atomic energy effort.

Immediate emergence of gas-cooled technology as a real cost savings, to be encouraged by the Government for rapid introduction of thermal gas-cooled systems.

The chance for developing "truly useful breeders" by means of gas cooling, combined with the emergence of the gas-cooled technology capitalized by both the utilities and the Government.

Historic Whitewater Waterway: Canal Memorial Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in Franklin County, Ind., we have an example of historic and modern-day technology existing practically side by side.

I speak of the Whitewater Canal State Memorial, a restoration of a century-old transportation system, and the new Brookville Reservoir, now under construction.

On the one hand is the attraction of a tranquil canal and lock system which was for a short time, an important artery of trade in the early 1800's. Fourteen miles of the ancient 76-mile-long waterway have been restored and today carry tourists on a replica of the old canal boats.

Less than 8 miles away, huge earth-moving machines are creating a 7,790-acre multipurpose reservoir on which modern high-powered pleasure craft will be carrying visitors in the future.

lems existing in his purported home town of Charlotte, N.C., in Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York. That is, if he is sincere and really looking for the truth rather than some more political hogwash to smear Mississippi.

What an obvious misrepresentation for a medical doctor to say "In every child we saw evidence of etc." One knows he did not see or examine every child in Mississippi. How many did he see and who arranged for him to see the few he possibly did examine? We could go to any city, U.S.A., or world, and get a doctor to examine several children, hand selected because of their physical ailments and utter forth a like emotional statement.

The reported medical diagnosis may not be completely false to the point of outright lies, but they obviously do not give all the facts to arrive at the truth.

I would hope that the American Medical Association would take notice of the grave injustice being provoked by these professional agitators hiding behind a time-respected title of respect such as medical doctor. If the Ford Foundation sinks so low as to spend its tax-free fortune to perpetrate these falsehoods, all America will know there is a conspiracy—and not in Mississippi.

I ask that the AP release of June 17, as it appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star follow my remarks:

NEGRO STUDY SAYS MANY ARE STARVING

Many Negroes literally are starving in Southern states, with the crisis worst in Mississippi, says a panel of six physicians in a study for the Ford Foundation.

"I was told before I went there that there was a conspiracy to eliminate the Negro. I didn't believe it before but I do now," Dr. Raymond Wheeler told a news conference yesterday.

Wheeler, a Charlotte, N.C., internist said, "It is still difficult for me to believe that this could exist in this nation of ours."

The news conference came after the physicians talked with Department of Agriculture officials and members of a Senate poverty subcommittee.

In their report to the Ford Foundation, the doctors wrote:

"In every child we saw evidence of vitamin and general deficiencies; serious untreated skin infections and ulcerations; eye and ear disease; also unattended bone disease secondary to poor food intake."

Other physician members of the survey team were Joseph Brenner on the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Medical Department; Robert Coles, Harvard University Health Service; Alan Mermann, assistant clinical professor, Yale University Medical School; Milton Senn, professor at the Child Study Center, Yale; and Dr. Cyril Walwyn, medical adviser to Friends of the Children of Mississippi.

A Modern David and Goliath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the crisis in the Middle East, countless articles have been written about the bravery of the small State of Israel. Few articles, however, have contained the heartfelt emotion of the one that follows.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues this moving article written by Yvette Scharfman, which appeared in the June 10, 1967, edition of the Kings Courier.

The article follows:

POLITICAL PATTER

(By Yvette Scharfman)

We wrote our column for this issue, engaging in the usual "political patter." But upon reading it, we suddenly found it to be fatuous and banal amidst the blood and thunder rampant in our planet today! We tore it to shreds. We are outraged at man's inhumanity to man, and we pass on our outcry.

It is inconceivable in our day, with so highly civilized and sophisticated an instrument as the United Nations, that one country dares to speak openly of destroying another country! Let us go back to 1956, when three-quarters of a million Israelis won a miraculous victory over the dictator Nasser (and 40 million arabs) and might have saved the Suez Canal for western civilization, but for pressures exercised against them by the then President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. The latter forced them through threats of sanctions, boycotts and "our displeasure," to surrender the spoils of war. Messrs. Eisenhower & Dulles picked Nasser up off his back and placed him again upon the backs of his subjects. And the monster Nasser, like the creation of Frankenstein, is now venting his spleen against the America who saved him. He and his arab henchmen openly lick the Russian boot! In 1956, however, in exchange for returning the dictator Nasser to his country and his throne, the victorious Israelis were told by the then President Eisenhower that our country was committed to a promise of freedom of the seas for all nations. (Actually, we gave them nothing they had not already won through blood, bravery, sacrifice and suffering matched only by the Irish during their rebellion against England.)

But the Israelis, neither boastful nor bragging, went back to their little country, about the size of Rhode Island, and began to build while other nations were seeking to destroy.

Today we ask who are these 2 million Israelis who would dare to fight back against an aggressor who comprises 80 million in manpower, together with the superior strength of mechanized armaments furnished by communist Russia? We shall try to present a picture. They are (1) a band of idealistic pioneers; (2) a handful of concentration camp graduates and (3) a group of comparatively recent refugees. The first group, the idealistic pioneers, felt that the Jew should have a homeland like any other group of nationals; that this homeland was his from time immemorial; that the old testament, upon which our Judeo-Christian western culture is based, promised him this bit of soil in the beginning. He wanted to implement the promise and the prophecy connected with it, and he endured hardships comparable with our own early pioneers in settling the land.

The concentration camp survivors went to Israel because no other country would accept the blind, the lame, the sick and the halt. They did not go by choice. They had been well integrated (or so they thought) in the social fabric of Germany, until the little house painter from Austria decided to eliminate first the Jew and then all non-nazis. These camp survivors have known a living death. Nothing can frighten them now!

The recently arrived refugees have fled from arabic countries where they have been persecuted, and from countries behind the iron curtain where they have escaped at the peril of their lives, rather than live under the terror of communism. They have worked and slaved to build their tiny country. They have made the desert green. They have given full representation and equal rights and pay to all arabs who remained in Israel (which is far more than arabs are now granted in arabic lands.) Israel wishes only to be left in peace (their word for "hello" and "goodbye" is Shalom, which means peace.) But there is no peace!

What about the sanctimonious great powers who would fight communism in one part of the world but would declare their "neutrality" when the 2 million are faced with the aggression of 80 million supported openly by the communists? Our country gave Jordan millions of dollars in armaments only recently "in order to achieve a a balance of power against Egypt in the middle East." And now Jordan has signed a pact with Nasser to stab little Israel in the guts with these very weapons! But little Israel is fighting her own fight—not only against the arab world, but against the communist world. Her people will fight for democracy unto the death. And the Jews in other parts of the world, ashamed that they stood impotently by while Hitler destroyed six million of their brethren, will now give generously of their material goods; for the Israelis ask not that we fight their battle, but that we help them care for their indigent refugees so that they may purchase arms which all their enemies receive free of charge!

The world will not be treated to a modern David-Goliath confrontation. We are an incurable romantic, to be sure, but we believe God is on the side of the Israelis; for despite insuperable odds, these people have breathed life and hope and faith into the magic words emblazoned upon our own Statue of Liberty, written by the Jewish poetess Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor;
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores;
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me."

Yes, the State of Israel will endure!

Arlington County, Va., Cultural Center Proposed by Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the May 13 meeting of the Arlington County Board, in my congressional district, Mrs. George Green, chairman of the Arlington Cultural Heritage Commission, reported on the findings of her commission with regard to the need for a cultural center in the county with a full complement of facilities for the performing and audiovisual arts.

Mrs. Green's study was most detailed, and represents long hours of devoted effort on her part as well as on the part of the members of her commission. I believe the Members of this House might be interested in knowing of the activities of her commission in a community in which many of my colleagues reside.

factory. No one can say with any certainty that the allies are a quarter or a half or three-quarters down the road, or, indeed, whether units of time have relevance in Vietnam.

Verbs in the Vietnamese language have no tense changes. The verb is the same whether past, present or future, and is modified by a second word. This says something for the Vietnamese sense of time.

But for Americans here it is a tertiary matter. Only a handful understand the language well enough to use it in sophisticated discourse.

No one can understand the shooting war in Vietnam because the correspondents have not devised a calculus for measuring it as a continuum. The military is worse, professing to find significance in the corpse count and mistaking valor for progress. The war is now reported by correspondents as Broadway is reviewed by drama critics. Each operation is a production of its own, unrelated to its predecessors. It is reviewed on its own merits, because there are no other standards of judgment.

Battles erupt, small ones in the delta, larger ones in the highlands, the largest of all in the First Corps area up by the demilitarized zone, and none of them battles for terrain or control of population but for men and supplies.

"If we keep going at it like this," said a young marine lieutenant at the DMZ, "my kids are going to be fighting this war."

He had been in Vietnam for nearly a year, and was asked what progress he saw. "We're sure kicking hell out of Old Charlie," he said, "but Old Charlie sometimes kicks hell out of us. I guess I don't see the progress because I'm too close to it."

Frustrated, angry, bewildered at the inability of American firepower to contain "Old Charlie," ever more incredulous schemes are considered: Invade the DMZ. Bomb Hanoi. Mine Haiphong harbor. And none of them bears on winning the war in South Vietnam except as they marginally impede the ability of the enemy to send men and supplies south. These are sideshows, introduced by authors who sense that the main plot is slipping and incapable of enough velocity, to hold the attention of the electorate.

The insurgency seems incapable of being beaten back, so you invade the DMZ. Half the province chiefs are corrupt, half the Vietnamese army won't fight, so you bomb Hanoi. A former prime minister of South Vietnam sat at lunch at the Caravelle Hotel the other day, sipped an American beer, and pronounced sadly, "The problem isn't the North Vietnamese army, it's the South Vietnamese government."

But tell that to the marines fighting in Quang Tri Province or the 4th Infantry Division 30 miles west of Pleiku. They are fighting North Vietnamese infantry, splendidly equipped with modern Chinese weapons, well-disciplined, fanatically dedicated. They have come down from the north, and somehow the flow must be stopped.

Bombing of the trails from the north was supposed to stanch the flow, but it failed. Now the planners want to dig a ditch from the South China Sea to western Laos. These planners make a plausible case for it—you can make a plausible case for anything in Vietnam—but somehow common sense throws up its hands. Is a ditch really the answer? Perhaps it is.

Intelligent men have been wrong before.

They said that American troops would not fight well in Vietnamese jungles. They have.

They said a jet aircraft was useless against the guerrilla. It isn't.

They said B–52 strikes were inconsequential, no more than junglebusters. They aren't.

The heavy weaponry, the tanks and aircraft, more often than not make the headlines, but it is the long, slow slog that makes the war.

The level of leadership in the Vietnamese government, both in Saigon and the provinces, is low. The problems are corruption and lack of dedication.

The top jobs in the provinces and districts are often for sale. In the opinion of some observers here, the corruption problem will not be solved until all the money is gone. And at the rate Americans are putting money into Vietnam, that millennia is some distance away.

Deeper than corruption, though, is the capacity of the Vietnamese to absorb Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, a concept not exactly rooted in Asian tradition nor especially congenial to it.

In Washington, the President can ask why there aren't more schools. In the provinces, the problem is more complex. Are there books? Teachers? Who will build the school? Does the village need one? How much graft must be taken off the top?

The bewildering variety of American programs, from advisers in tax collection to experts in animal husbandry to projects involving health, auto repair, and journalism, is beyond the capacity of the Vietnamese to absorb. The Americans are trying to stuff 10 pounds of sugar into a 5-pound bag. And the bag, more often than not, is made in America.

What the Vietnamese want is not bigger rice crops or handsomer schools, but social justice and security.

Vietnamese intellectuals, particularly young ones, are not always easy to follow. They appear to want the Americans to dispose of the generals, win the war, liquidate all holdings in Vietnam, and exit as quickly as possible—all with as little dislocation to Vietnamese society as possible.

It comes easy, after a year and a half of watching the money-grabbing cyclo drivers and bartenders, the insistence of the street vendors and the massive indifference of much of the armed forces, to place the blame for the inertia in this war principally on the Vietnamese, or at least the Vietnamese leadership.

But it's not that simple in Vietnam. Nothing is.

The most attractive Vietnamese is in many ways Prime Minister Ky. Since he began to regard himself as presidential material, he has become crafty, which has detracted some from a kind of blitzkreig honesty that once permitted him to say, "In Vietnam, 85 per cent of all rumors are true." The principal rumor at the time was an outrageous story about himself.

Americans, particularly military officials, tend to forget that the Vietnamese are laughing most of the time, that they embarrass easily, and have a highly developed sense of the ridiculous.

The war, or as many of them call it, "The situation in Vietnam," strikes many of them as intrinsically mad, an East Asian theater of the absurd where, almost without realizing it, a full-scale war has erupted, and no one can quite say what is being fought for, or over.

Saigon must demonstrate that the war is worth winning and that life will somehow be better when it is over and the Communists are defeated.

Most educated Vietnamese believe that the war is worth winning, but for the average man it must strain credulity. Not that the Viet Cong are to be preferred.

But the war has gone very far. Anything would be better.

The situation in this country is Washington's responsibility as much as it is anyone's.

The Johnson administration has got its priorities badly out of joint in this war. Pressed by the generals and other traditionalists, it has attempted to win the war on the cheap, by "forcing Hanoi to the bargaining table" by destroying her means of production. This strategy has its corollary in the South with the indiscriminate use of artillery fire at night, and literally hundreds of air strikes a day.

The most severe side effect of the first is that it diverts attention from the essentials to a notion that somehow the war in the south can be won in the north. In the second it argues that machinery is a substitute for hard slogging. Anyone who has watched how hard the slogging is knows the compulsion to substitute machinery.

But it won't work.

If the effort and money spent dropping bombs were put into retraining the South Vietnamese army, reforming the bureaucracy, and forcing the generals to prosecute corrupt colleagues, there is more than a fair chance that the Americans could pull it off.

But in Vietnam, the Americans also have a leadership problem.

There are men of immense ability and dedication here, but there are not nearly enough of them. Many of the best go unappreciated by the American establishment, which is in its way as opaque as the Vietnamese establishment.

The war can only be won by the Vietnamese. It is still the Americans' to lose, by misapplication of power or by impatience or sheer unwillingness to do what needs to be done. The administration ought to decide it is in the war for keeps, and victory is not to be bought by bombing a power plant in Hanoi. What it is going to mean is more dead men, both Americans and Vietnamese.

It means fighting the war on the Communists' terms. It means a definition of war aims, so far not supplied by the administration, and most of all a careful explanation of the kind of casualties that can be expected.

A Medical Conspiracy Against Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. RARICK
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that to let an intellectual talk long enough he will begin to believe his own expert opinions and trap himself.

But for a medical man to unequivocally declare that an entire State is in a conspiracy to eliminate the Negro is preposterous. This blast carries the imprint of a self-designed genocide blueprint. I wonder if the good doctor legally understands the term "conspiracy"?

If refusing to pay or feed people who no longer work or are unproductive is conspiracy, then perhaps this report should include the real cause of the problem, that is, Washington bureaucrats, poverty corps, welfare and political carpetbaggers who encourage nonproductivity and parental shiftlessness.

And what significance does the good doctor attach to the word "eliminate." Can it be "migration" as a result of a breakdown in racial harmony brought about in great part by just such agitation as his? Is he afraid for disenchanted people to move north to his hometown? He's on a Ford grant—why does he not promote the rich Ford Foundation outfit to move his specimens to Detroit and give them a free home and a job? That is, if he is genuinely concerned and not just blowing off more hot air to provoke additional racism and sectionalism.

Certainly if he looked, he could find the same medical symptoms and prob-

What Happens to Detente?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when we look back upon the cold war, we find that in every instance the first step toward detente was made by the West, and in particular, the United States. Recent developments in the Middle East are an indication of how unreceptive the Soviets have been to our continual efforts.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the June 8, 1967 edition of the Wall Street Journal. The editorial analyzes the effect of detente upon the Soviets, and suggests a new policy of detente for the future.

The article follows:

WHAT HAPPENS TO DETENTE?

An unfunny thing happened on the way to detente. Though some apostles of accommodation have been proclaiming an end to the cold war, the world woke up to find the Soviet Union dabbling in if not sparking the crisis that led to the Middle Eastern war.

In the long run, the most important upshot of the war will probably come in its effects on Soviet-American relations. So what attitude should the United States now take toward the Soviet Union? Specifically, should it change its policy of trying to improve East-West relations?

A great deal depends, of course, on what the Russians do next. Perhaps their belated agreement to vote for a UN cease-fire resolution will grow into a tacit willingness to promote a sound settlement. This would be a welcome sign of accommodation.

So far, though, it seems the Soviets dropped their opposition to the resolution merely to cut Nasser's losses. And they continue to press for return not to the status quo ante, but to the situation in which Nasser could enjoy the fruits of belligerence he grabbed prior to Israel's counterstroke. It still seems, in short, the Soviets are interested not in peace but in cold war maneuvering.

If events continue to bear out that conclusion, we do not think the Western drive for detente should be reversed or even necessarily stopped. But it should be slowed down.

The drive should not be stopped because in the long run no other outcome to the cold war seems as hopeful. The hot opponents of detente never suggest what alternative the United States should hope to promote instead; neither Armageddon nor permanent hostility at the brink appeals to us. The best hope is that the Communist powers will gradually evolve into something less threatening, and conceivably careful attempts at mutual accommodation may help promote such evolution.

The drive should be slowed down if the current Soviet attitude persists, though, so that its most ardent supporters will have a little time to absorb the lesson of Soviet policy in the crisis so far. It is still not apparent, at least, from the public reports available, whether Russia deliberately unleashed Nasser or merely reacted to the opportunity he created. Certainly it has given strong diplomatic support to Nasser's provocativeness, and its naval movements were pointed.

The advocates of detente should take note. Too often they reason that since accommodation is a sound eventual goal, the U.S. must rush to take any step proposed in its name. Indeed, we already hear arguments that the U.S. must proceed with such steps as the outer space treaty and liberalization of East-West trade despite the latest "aberration" in Soviet behavior.

We think each of these steps must be weighed on its individual merits; they should be neither rejected nor accepted merely for the sake of detente. In the meantime the lessons of Soviet involvement in the current crisis are relevant in two ways.

Regardless of what happens next, for one thing, Soviet actions so far demonstrate that Russian leaders have few inhibitions about heating up a crisis when they conceive that it suits their purpose. Regardless of how far the movement toward detente proceeds, the Communists are likely to retain a residual enmity that can break out at any time.

That being so, the United States must not allow the urge for some symbolic agreement to outweigh the necessity of protecting its own national interests against an outbreak of Russian hostility. Do we really have adequate protection, for instance, against the Russians' secretly breaking agreements on nuclear weapons in outer space?

Any realistic hopes for detente, for a second thing, rest on Soviet recognition that in a nuclear age their own interests dictate a relaxation of tension. Yet if the United States presses its eagerness to accommodate despite provocation, the Soviets will naturally conclude that being provocative involves nothing to lose and just possibly something to gain.

Not only would that eventuality lead to stormy international politics, but it might have a profound effect on the shape of any detente that eventually might merge. To reach anything like equity in the compromises necessary to a detente, America's attitude must be related fairly closely to the other side's willingness to reciprocate with its own steps to reduce tension.

With regard to Soviet relations, then, the lesson of the Middle East crisis so far is that the United States' posture must be truly flexible. It must be willing to take initiatives at certain times. But when the Soviets precipitate trouble, the U.S. must be equally willing to back off and trim its enthusiasm.

Clean-Air Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of the axioms of democratic government is: Public interest yields public action.

Testimony to this was the International Forum on Air Pollution sponsored by Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N.Y.

This conference evidenced support of measures to control air pollution. It also showed what a high degree of knowledge and expertise small but interested groups possess in grappling with this problem of international importance.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News, commending this forum, in the RECORD:

CLEAN-AIR NEEDS

The first of a series of international air pollution forums to be sponsored by Niagara University and the State Senate was an excellent demonstration of how smaller universities can make significant contributions to public enlightenment and community service.

While the forum reached no final answers to the growing menace of contaminated air, speakers underscored a number of important needs.

For example, though Erie County's current clean-air efforts won merited praise, support was voiced for establishing a single air pollution control agency for Erie and Niagara Counties. This certainly should be studied as a logical extension of metropolitan co-operation in a region over which air pollutants blow without regard for county boundaries.

The forum also heard appeals for support of proposed legislation in Washington to establish federal emission standards in various major industries.

The News believes that as much as possible of anti-pollution control and enforcement should remain in state and local hands; we are increasingly impressed, however, with the argument that a region like the Niagara Frontier is economically handicapped in trying to impose higher emission standards on its industries, present and future, than those prevailing in many other states and localities. Certainly, the danger of runaway industries seeking pollution havens in planning new investment should not be discounted.

"Strong state and local standards—essential to pollution control—cannot be effective if neighboring states and cities do not have strong standards of their own," said President Johnson in a message to Congress last Jan. 30. "Nor can such local standards gain the support of industry and the public, unless they know that plants in adjoining communities must also meet standards at least as strict."

There are signs that some major industries may, in fact, prefer a national approach. Thus Congressional Quarterly recently cited "the reported willingness of many industries to accept uniform federal emission standards as a lesser evil than a bewildering complexity of state and local regulations which could upset the competitive balance, within an industry, by requiring more pollution control equipment in some sections of the country than in others."

At the same time, there should be tax incentives to encourage and speed the installation of air (and for that matter water) pollution control facilities by industry. Administration opposition to proposals granting such induceemnts is unfortunate.

A special problem for the Niagara Frontier is to what extent international controls may be required for air pollution passing between the U.S. and Canada along the Niagara River. This subject would seem a fruitful one for further exploration at coming sessions of the Niagara University forum series now so well begun.

India Speaks From an Almost Fatal Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have great sympathy for the almost insoluble problems confronting the nation of India. Each of us recognizes the heavy burden borne by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. The American people have done more than merely evidenced their understanding and their sympathy; they have given unselfishly of their resources in an effort to aid this unfortunate nation. I am confident we will continue doing so, but one would expect a measure of reciprocity from the Government of India at the very least. That we have not had;

and I commend to my colleagues the following editorial from the Sacramento Bee of June 14, 1967:

INDIA SPEAKS FROM AN ALMOST FATAL MADNESS

India has seemed to suffer from self induced hallucinations ever since it attained its independence in World War II. Its neutrality on the side of communism has been nothing short of a compulsive death wish.

This pathological state of the Indian mind never was more vividly symptomized than in the recent attack by India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her hysterical blast at the United States and her praise of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser as "a force for progress".

She lamented what she depicted to be the niggardly aid of the U.S. Yet this aid has amounted to nearly $10 billion since World War II. America has done more to assist independent India than any other nation in the world in the last 20 years.

Minister Gandhi turns on America, however, in a pur-blind disregard of the record, incensed mainly because the US also has aided Pakistan, which, she says, has used some of the American assistance to kill Indians.

Yet India might have sought peaceable resolution of its troubles with Pakistan. Indira Gandhi disregarded the truth that US aid to Pakistan is in line with well known American policy to support in some measures those nations which resist communism.

Her encomiums for Nasser are even more perverse and hallucinatory. Nasser "a force for progress". This "progressive" man has just led the Arab world to its worst and most humiliating defeat at the hands of Israel.

His economy is a mess and the masses, poor and without real political freedom, face possible famine.

Both abroad and at home Nasser has been the very epitome of undemocratic backwardness. Still this well educated daughter of a great and wise father finds one of the most disastrous and autocratic national leaders to be a "force for progress".

And at the same time she bites the hand of the nation which has given her country enough to rebuild 50 American cities. Is this the rabies of racism?

Premier Ky's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for June 16 carries an editorial which should make our policymakers pause and think. Premier Ky of South Vietnam has decided that U.S. troops should be increased in Vietnam from the present level of 462,000 to 600,000. Who is making the escalation decisions anyway? It is time to deescalate this undeclared war and negotiate a settlement.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1967]

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 imeptus 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 the greater the costs on both sides, the more 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.

Destination Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the American merchant fleet is one of the real tragedies of our time. I do hope the Congress will be motivated to do something about this problem. In the meantime, I should like to insert in the RECORD today an excellent article on the subject written by Mr. Mel Barisic, who is vice president of the National Maritime Union of America.

The article follows:

DESTINATION NOWHERE—ODYSSEY OF A PANAMANIAN RUSTBUCKET

(By Vice President Mel Barisic)

The problems we had a short time ago regarding the SS Good Eddie and the SS Good Willie were bad enough. But that's not all. There is also the problem of American shipowners and American-built ships registered under the runaway flags, foreign-crewed, which are starving their crews, abusing them, stranding them and abandoning them all over the world. And these ships are carrying U.S. government relief cargoes!

Our NMU representative Dave Smith who is stationed in the Philippines had an assignment in Guam and brought to my attention a real atrocity story about a ship named the SS Galveston Navigator.

As a Union official, I have heard many sad stories about runaway shipowners but I think our membership and government officials should be made aware of the story of this present day blood ship.

The SS Galveston Navigator, owner by the Galveston SS Co., left Orange, Texas on November 17, 1966 with 4,700 tons of U.S. Government foreign aid rice destined for Saigon. She was under Panama flag, commanded by a Greek-American captain, Lee Tamerlane. The crew consisted of 32 men from Ecuador, Panama, Mexico, Columbia, England and Honduras.

A short distance out in the Gulf, the freighter developed engine trouble. She limped along and finally arrived at Panama after 9 days at sea. There, five crew members deserted the ship because of miserable conditions and the company's refusal to pay decent wages and overtime. No attempts were made to repair the ship's engines at Panama and the vessel departed again enroute to Honolulu, minus her bosun, oiler, radio operator and 2 messmen.

Engine trouble continued to plague the crew throughout the trip to Honolulu. When the ship docked at Honolulu after 30 days at sea, the chief engineer, first and second mates all deserted the ship. According to crew members who remained on board, the officers decided the freighter was no longer seaworthy, and were disgusted at the company's indifference to their problems.

Captain Tamerlane, evidently believing it was important to deliver the cargo to Saigon, decided to continue on to the Philippines. The ship sailed out of Honolulu and the engines broke down again. They had a broken down ship and were seriously shorthanded. But, working day and night on the machinery, they were able to crawl into Wake Island.

Seven more of the crew deserted there. Now they had only half a crew but the Galveston Navigator set out again for the Philippines. Four days out of Wake, the engines broke down completely. She drifted helpless for 12 days and it was not until she drifted within 300 miles of Guam that the owners called for a tug to go to her aid. She was towed into Guam February 1.

Tied up at the docks at Apra Harbor, two more members of the crew deserted. In a statement to the Pacific Journal, a Guam newspaper, the ship's chief cook said: "We, the crew of the Galveston Navigator are very unhappy here. All of us would like to get back to our home towns. We don't want to continue with this ship because we don't trust the company. We are here without wages and also we are almost out of food, we are here with this rotting cargo and we almost cannot stand the smell of it."

According to the men they ran out of drinking water and the Captain himself, out of his own pocket, had purchased enough water at Guam to last for about 24 hours.

NMU has been busy on the case. We demanded an investigation of the situation with the object of protecting the crew and also the good name of the United States. Curiously, no official inquiry has yet been made as to the condition of the ship's cargo which consists of United States relief cargo—Agriculture Department or AID—for Vietnam. The Attorney General at Guam has wired the Department of Agriculture and Interior about the situation.

The owners of this ship have abandoned it. According to reports, they are three fast

corrupt, and politicians lack opportunity, security and prestige.

Mr. Webster of dictionary fame has his doubts, too. He defines a politician as one versed in the art or science of government. But he adds an optional definition, "One primarily interested in political offices from selfish or other narrow, usually short-run interests."

The belief that politics amounts to little more than the conduct of public affairs for private advantage leads to the oft-heard chant: "Let's take politics out of government."

It seems to me that's like saying we should take oxygen out of the air, or the engine out of the automobile. There are many nonpolitical governments in this world of ours. They are usually called dictatorships.

I once heard a member of the anti-Nazi underground describe the Hitler regime as one under which everything not prohibited was compulsory. The first step in achieving this state of affairs came when the Nazi government outlawed politics, banning all parties except the Nazi party. The Communist governments of Russia and China did likewise, outlawing all opposition parties and politicians.

It is through politics that the people of a democracy exercise their options, and make their decisions.

All sorts of forces play a part in the process. The great religions of our world play a major role. So do concepts of philosophy, ethics and morality. So do uses of education, science and sociology. But after these and countless other forces have made their contributions, the final decisions are reached through the intricately intertwined and inextricably interlocked processes of politics and governments.

The decisions are influenced by those who don't vote, for they delegate responsibility to those who do. The decisions are made by those who vote, and by those for whom they vote. The latter, for fleeting moments, occupy the places of power. But their authority lies always in the hands of the people.

The politicians and the parties present to the people their programs, policies, and personalities. The people are free to pick and choose among them. If they choose unwisely, they can always throw the rascals out at the next election.

And so when the people decry politics and politicians, they decry themselves.

By no means are all politicians seedy and selfish. I know many in both parties of strong convictions and unimpeachable integrity. Many are constructive and creative. Yet, it's obvious that there's room for vast improvement—and it's up to the people themselves to make politics more responsive to their needs and hopes and dreams.

Never in all history has it been more important for the people to know their own power, and to exercise it wisely. For ours is the first generation of man possessed of the power to wipe out ignorance, poverty, hunger, disease—and war. Ours is also the first generation of man possessed of the power to wipe out the human race.

The choice is ours, and it will be made through politics and government.

Middle East Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1967

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD three letters written to the editor of the Washington Evening Star on June 10, 1948, June 19, 1948, and June 5, 1967, by a friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Sidney Koretz, of Arlington, Va.

I commend these letters to the attention of my colleagues, as I feel they are both interesting and thought-provoking, and reflect a full understanding of the Middle East situation in 1948 and at the present time:

ARLINGTON, VA.

SIR: Ambassador Arthur Goldberg points out that the United States has been "even-handed." The U.S. called the Security Council meeting in the Suez crisis of 1956 to deal with an Israeli-British-French attack on Egypt and voted against its traditional friends. Last November the U.S. joined in a Security Council vote to censure Israel for an attack on Jordan.

This may be a good time to recall that on July 15, 1958, the U.S. had to send Marines into Lebanon to defend Arab against Arab. Lebanon had formally accused the United Arab Republic before the Security Council of instigating and aiding a rebellion against the government. On July 14 a seemingly pro-Egyptian coup overthrew the Iraqi Government, assassinating the King and the Prime Minister.

When the Lebanese Government asked for help, the answer from the United States was prompt. Said President Eisenhower: "If it is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then indeed the possibilities of conquest are unlimited."

SIDNEY KORETZ.

JEWISH CLAIM TO PALESTINE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The assumption by "Internationalist" in a letter appearing in The Star of June 5 that American policy with regard to Palestine is based on "blind advice" is highly presumptuous, though his call for more education on the subject is not to be gainsaid. Equally presumptuous is his reference to the British Declaration of November 2, 1917, the so-called Balfour Declaration, "in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people" as nothing more than a "beau geste." In effect, this is mockery of the judgment of the highest international authority, namely the League of Nations, which on July 24, 1922, formally approved the Palestine Mandate embodying this Declaration, with the concurrence of all the enlightened nations of the world.

Are we to understand that President Woodrow Wilson was simply ignorant when he approved of the Balfour Declaration, and added, as reported in the New York Times of March 3, 1919, that he was "persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth"? On September 21, 1922, President Harding signed a joint resolution of Congress expressing support of the Jewish national home in Palestine.

Our "Internationalist" friend thinks that he disposes of Jewish "rights" in Palestine simply by referring to the fact that the Jews lived there over 2,000 years ago, while maintaining "the Arabs were there not only before the period of Jewish control, but for centuries after were in uninterrupted possession." But what are the facts?

THE ROMAN CONQUEST

The Jews were the indubitable sovereigns of the land for more than 1,000 years, until the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans in the year 70. Palestine never has since constituted an independent political entity. The Romans perished without leaving a legal successor. The Arabs, who conquered it in 634, remained in possession for a relatively short time, when it passed successively to the rule of the caliphs of Damascus, the caliphs of Bagdad, the Tulinide governors of Egypt, back to the caliphs of Bagdad, then to the Egyptian Ikshidi princes, and finally to the Caliphs of Cairo. After 1071 Palestine was subjected to non-Arab conquerors, the Kurds, the Crusaders, the Mamelukes, and finally the Turks. In 1923, by the Peace Treaty of Lausanne, the Turks surrendered their rights to the Allied Powers.

According to the principles of international law, the Jews never have lost their rights. Although the Romans conquered the country, international law admits the legality of conquest subject only to certain conditions. One of htese conditions is that the conqueror must have been "in continuous and undisturbed possession" for a considerable time but that "as long as other Powers kept up protests and claims, the actual exercise of sovereignty is not undisturbed." (Oppenheim, International Law, 5th edition, London, 1937, Volume I, Page 456.) Since the Jews were conquered after bitter resistance and continuously, by word and act, have asserted their claim, we must conclude that the Roman conquerors never established a clear title to Palestine. The old Jewish claim, moreover, has received renewed vitality through the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate of the League of Nations, the Preamble of which states: "Recognition has thereby (the Balfour Declaration) been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country."

The well supported Jewish claim could be overcome only if the Arab claim proved to be a stronger one. But this is not the case. The Arab claim by conquest is imperfect for a number of reasons. No Arab state can pretend to be the legal successor of those who conquered Palestine in 634. The Arabs ruled Palestine for a relatively short period (437 years). During the past 877 years, i.e., from the year 1071, there has been no Arab rule in Palestine. Moreover, unlike the Jews, the Palestine Arabs never struggled for their independence; they submitted to every conqueror and thus acquiesced in their domination. Even in 1917, when the Arabs of the desert revolted against Turkish rule, the Palestine Arabs took no action and the majority continued to fight for the Turks.

ARAB RIGHTS DISPUTED

It is a myth that the Arabs were in uninterrupted possession of Palestine for centuries. The present-day non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine are not in the main the descendants of the ancient inhabitants of the land. They are a highly mixed group continuously replenished from the tribes of the Arabian desert; the Greeks, Romans and Crusaders have made their contribution to the racial make-up of the Holy Land; in modern times the Turkish governors and Egyptian conquerors introduced large contingents of foreign soldiers and settlers. An analysis of available statistics has brought an estimate that in 1882 no more than about 106,000 settled Moslems had more than a half-century's connection with the country. Calculations have been made showing that only some 228,000 descendants of the 1882 Moslem settled population were living in Palestine at the outbreak of World War II. It should be noted that waves of immigration of Arabs from neighboring countries were prompted by the fact that a higher standard of living was possible for them as a direct and indirect result of Zionist development. Far from being the settled population of Palestine, according to a prevailing misconception, 75 per cent of the Arab population there have been either immigrants themselves or descendants of persons who immigrated into Palestine during the past 100 years, for the most part after 1882.

It is flying in the face of plain common sense to compair the Jewish claim to Palestine with that of some hypothetical Indians

who might lay claim to America. It was not an arbitrary act when the League of Nations with the concurrence of 52 of the leading nations of the world and with the formal approval of the United States recognized the Jewish claim to establish a national home in Palestine. It is not the single fact that the Jews once occupied Palestine, but a whole complex of facts, that makes the Jewish claim acceptable to the international conscience. The historical connection consists not only in the physical facts of former occupation and in the continued presence of at least a remnant of the Jewish community up to modern times but also in the fact that all Western thought, Christian as well as Jewish, connects the Jews with Palestine.

PALESTINE NEGLECTED

The establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine is not, as alleged by anti-Zionist propaganda, "at the expense of another people's existence." While Palestine has a certain importance for Arab culture and for Islam, the significance that it has for the Arabs is relatively less than it has either for Christians or for Jews. Indeed, the Arabs have not used it too well, so that the world today is presented with the glaring contrast of centuries of stagnation and neglect of the Holy Land and a new burst of constructive achievement towards making a wilderness flower again.

Ways must be found for a satisfactory adjustment with the Arab world, which has a civilization of its own which in the past has shown itself to be of a very high order. It is decidedly a responsibility of Israel to learn to live in peace with the Arbs and to help them to develop their own potentialties and be helped by them. At present, blind forces of violence and aggression amidst the Arabs are the prime hindrance. I am sure that among the Arabs there are more moderate and more civilized elements who today fear to show themselves.

After this necessary adjustment has been made, the final justification of Israel as a nation among nations may well be that it will give an example of that flexible and yet planned society, that balance of liberty and order, which at present we associate with Moses and the prophets and with the people of Israel 3,000 years ago, rather than with their modern successors.

SIDNEY KORETZ.

WANTS "TRUE PICTURE" OF ARABS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In a letter to The Star of June 12 C.L.A. complains that "the American public is being stuffed with propaganda" favorable to Zionism and consequently prevented "from making a realistic appraisal of a situation to which this country's welfare is closely tied." If this is the case, we certainly should welcome more information from the Arabs' side as a possible corrective. Instead, we get from them slander not only of the Zionists but of the American press and of the American penchant for having policies influenced by election returns. The particular American policy attacked, namely, that favorable to Zionism, is made to appear as if it were just developed yesterday. Completely ignored is the fact that this policy is almost old enough to be called traditional. Furthermore, it represents a concurrence with decisions made by both the League of Nations and the United Nations.

But let us hear what the Arabs have to say for themselves. By all means, give us information concerning the workings of Arab democracy, if that, indeed, is what we must rely upon. We should welcome some convincing statements by Arab spokesmen to counteract the widespread reports that not only is there no democracy worth speaking of in any Arab state, but that the prevailing situation is one of grinding poverty for the illiterate masses of the people, with a small moneyed class on top desperately resisting any influence likely to disturb their control.

We are told that "certainly the establishment of an independent Jewish state cannot be regarded as setting up an outpost of American democracy." It is well known that not all Jews are of one mind. There are Jews who are opposed to Zionism, and among the Zionists there is a wide variety of opinion which does receive public airing. It is easy for the malicious to stress extremist views and deeds in an attempt to discredit and defame. But the more fair-minded see in this an example of democracy in action.

Will some spokesman for the Arabs give us an account of the Arab showing in the battle for democracy?

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry found cases of Arabs who secretly expressed views friendly to Zionism. Yet we know of no case in the Arab world where such views were publicly expressed. Will some one please explain this in such a way as to counteract the compelling impression that totalitarian terror rules among the Arabs?

Those who wish us to reappraise our stand on Palestine have the obligation of presenting us, not with propaganda, but with a true picture of Arab life and Arab performance. It is there where the most darkness lies and where the light of knowledge is indeed "devoutly to be wished for."

SIDNEY KORETZ.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1967 No. 96

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.—Galations 6: 2.

Eternal God, our Father, before the work of a new day begins we would be still in Thy presence and receive the benediction of Thy spirit. May the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight O Lord—our strength and our Redeemer. Cleansed by Thy forgiving love, made stronger by Thy spirit, and becoming wise with Thy wisdom we would face the unfinished tasks committed to our care this day.

These are times which call for greater courage, higher wisdom, broader sympathy, and deeper faith. May they increasingly become ours as we wait upon Thee. In all our decisions and in all our doing may we keep our hearts confident, our spirits courageous, our minds clear, and our hands clean.

Together may we move forward to a greater day when men shall live together in good will and each one be ready to bear another's burden. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 16, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to the bill H.R. 5424 entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at page H7065 of the RECORD of June 13, in the center of the center column, I am quoted as saying:

We made a reduction of 1,150 employees from the budget estimates.

There is a typographical error in the figure.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that I said:

We made a reduction of 18,150 employees from the budget estimates.

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

There was no objection.

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON TODAY ON THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us here in this House should applaud the President's statement this morning on the Middle East. While many of us, if speaking for ourselves, would have expressed the same points more bluntly, we must recognize the nature of the task which a President confronts in making such a speech. President Johnson's tone was restrained, and his words were carefully chosen in the highest tradition of diplomacy and statesmanship. Premier Kosygin's speech, by contrast, was straight propaganda and invective, with no balance whatsoever. At the same time, President Johnson made unmistakably clear a series of basic and important points. I hope that his words will be weighed most carefully, as they deserve to be, by the delegates assembled at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly.

In particular, I hope the General Assembly will perceive the logic of the President's statement that the best way to achieve a permanent settlement is through direct negotiations among the parties immediately involved. In article 33 of the United Nations Charter, "negotiation" is the very first method mentioned by which the parties to a dispute endangering international peace and security are obligated to seek a solution. In earlier resolutions dealing with the Arab-Israel dispute, both the Security Council and the General Assembly urged the governments concerned through negotiations to reach a settlement of their differences. I have in mind, for example, resolutions of the Security Council on November 17, 1948, and August 11, 1949, and of the General Assembly on January 26, 1952.

The underlying problem lies in the stubborn refusal of the Arab States to accept Israel's existence and right to exist, a refusal which carries with it the implication of the Arabs' oft-stated determination to destroy Israel by force. For the U.N. to fail to insist on direct negotiations would be tacitly to accept the validity of the Arabs' position, even though that position is contrary to the U.N. Charter itself and more specifically to many prior decisions of the General Assembly itself.

BRITISH MORALITY

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for a demonstration of unadulterated gall it would be hard to equal the party that was given at the British Embassy in Washington on Saturday afternoon, June 17, for wounded American veterans of the war in Vietnam.

Scores of ships, flying the British flag, have delivered thousands of tons of supplies to the Communists of North Vietnam to help keep them in the business of killing and wounding Americans. With one hand in Southeast Asia the British rake in blood-money profits and with the other, in Washington, they dish out tea and crumpets to some of the victims of their betrayal.

Mr. Speaker, is there no morality left in this world?

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

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

FBI UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, some say that crime is not really higher but only seems so because crime reporting is better. Perhaps crime reporting is better today than it was a generation ago. But surely crime reporting is not measurably better today than it was a year ago. Accordingly, a comparison of crime statistics within that time frame is a reasonably reliable indicator of the growth in crime.

The latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports compare crime in the first 3 months of 1966 with that in the first 3 months in 1967. That comparison shows an increase of 20 percent in the seven major crimes. These seven include four crimes of violence against the person and three property crimes. Personal crimes increased more than property crime. The largest increase, 42 percent, was in the crime of robbery as reported in cities with populations ranging between 250,000 and 500,000.

With respect to all seven crimes, cities with a population of 100,000 or more registered a total increase of 20 percent. However, it is a mistake to assume that crime growth is only a city problem. Rural areas reported an increase of only four percentage points less, and the crime growth rate of 22 percent in suburban communities was even higher than that in cities.

Neither is there any remarkable difference in the reports by geographical region. The northeast, north-central, southern, and western regions ranged between 18 and 21 percent. But the District of Columbia sustained its inglorious record. Crime in the Nation's Capital jumped nearly 42 percent, or more than twice the national rate. In the first 3 months of this year 8,957 major crimes were committed here. That amounts to more than 99 crimes per day, four each hour, one every 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, these figures and the facts they dramatize are disgraceful. The good name of America is at stake. Society needs new laws, better laws, stronger laws, laws which make crime unattractive and unprofitable. Congress must act.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MASTERS' LIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 162) to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the opposition of the Department of Commerce, as printed in the committee report, which would thereby make consideration of this measure not within the rules of the House adopted at the beginning of this year, for the Consent Calendar, has been obviated by an amendment of the committee?

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague, chairman of the official objectors on this side.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, the Commerce Department expressed their opposition that any master covered by this bill should be one who had an interest directly or indirectly in a vessel. To meet this objection, the committee included an amendment in the bill to provide that except a person who has a financial interest valued at 5 percent or more of the corporation, they would not be classified as a master of a vessel. In other words, we would not hold it against any master of a vessel if he had a very minor interest as an incentive to operate a vessel. Otherwise he would be an owner.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of my distinguished colleague, who is also a ranking minority member on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I understand this does establish a system of priorities, so to speak, for liens involving, first the seamen's wages, and then tort liens, and then contracts, including preferred mortgages, and then we come down to this area; and if I understand the response of the gentleman from Washington, this is not like something which is exposed to a disease and having a "touch of the infection" may blossom into a full-blown case, if it is under 5 percent it therefore does come within the requirements and the Houses adopted rules.

But can the gentleman tell me that if in this circumstance and with the committee amendment, the Department of Commerce has in fact withdrawn its objection?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the Commerce Department sent over any additional views based upon the amendment which the committee adopted in order to satisfy the objections of the Department. However, I am sure while the amendment does not meet the objection 100 percent, it goes 95 percent in that direction.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the further response. I do understand that it is common practice for the masters of some of the fishing vessels, or our own trawlers, or other coastal freighters, or other types sailing out of ports such as that in the gentleman's district or that of the distinguished chairman of the committee; to own a partial interest in a vessel and receive a percentage, in addition to their salary as supported in this lien for the particular cargo transported, in addition to their percentage of the stock held in the vessel. Is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say traditionally masters of vessels have enjoyed a certain percentage of profits of a voyage, going back through the long years of operating ships on the sea.

I believe now that is probably less and less common, but as an incentive we think probably it would be a very wholesome thing to have masters have an interest in the profits of a voyage or in the profits of a fishing venture of some kind. Therefore, we wanted to encourage that, so we did allow that under-5-percent interest, to allow a master to have a lien for his wages along with the other members of the crew.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, being a great believer in incentive, and after this explanation, and having absolutely no desire to damage partial ownership or participation incentive, I will withdraw my reservation of objection, unless the distinguished chairman wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The bill would merely give to the master of the ship the same rights of the seaman to put a lien against the ship.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the master of a vessel documented, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States shall have the same lien for his wages against such vessel and the same priority as any other seaman serving on such vessel.

(b) Sections 4546 and 4547 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 603 and 604) shall not apply in any proceeding brought by a master for the enforcement of the lien granted by this section.

(c) Section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 600) is amended by striking out "seaman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master or seaman".

(d) Section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), is amended (1) by striking out "seaman or apprentice" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master, seaman, or apprentice", and (2) by striking out in the first proviso thereof "any seaman" and inserting in lieu thereof "any master or seaman".

(e) A master shall have the same lien and the same priority for disbursements or liabilities properly made or incurred by him for or on account of the vessel as he has, under the provisions of this section, for his wages.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, following line 15, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), the term 'master' shall include every person having command of any

private cemetery at 2219 Lincoln rd. ne. He died a bitter and frustrated man, still trying to clear his name and receive an honorable discharge from the Army he seems to have served bravely and brilliantly.

The Army Board's decision will make it possible for his grandnephew and the Legion to remove his remains for reburial in the Custer Battlefield Cemetery in Montana, near monuments to the officers and men who served with him in the disastrous and impetuous attack led by Custer on June 25, 1876.

There's a certain irony seen in the fact that barrooms hastened Reno's downfall and then brought his somewhat belated rehabilitation. Ret. Army Col. George Walton, who formerly served in the Washington area, had long wanted to clear Reno's name but could find no descendant to file the petition.

He dropped into the Skyline Restaurant on Tenth Avenue, Manhattan, one day last fall and met Charles Reno, 52, serving drinks behind the bar. When Reno learned he could file such a request with the Army, he and Walton enlisted the aid of the American Legion. The petition was filed last October.

Corcoran, the Legion official, told reporters he didn't know whether any benefits would accrue to Reno as a result of the Board's decision.

A FULL-SCALE INVESTIGATION IS NEEDED IN AIR SAFETY TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body have heard much in recent weeks of the need to reduce Federal expenditures. I have become aware of yet another sphere where tax dollars are being spent needelessly, in this case because conditions exist that allow claims against our Government in the million of dollars.

Because I have had the feeling for quite some time that problems and developments in the field of air safety warrant the attention of Congress, I have endeavored to explore all possible areas of potential consideration by the House and its committees.

Members may remember that after the terrible airplane crashes at Urbana, Ohio, and at New Orleans, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted two mornings of hearings during which the general scope of air safety was discussed by various representatives of Federal and private organizations. The Federal Aviation Agency, the Air Transport Association, the Air Line Pilots Association, and the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association were among those who testified.

Following that, the Administrator of the FAA, Gen. William F. McKee, called for an additional 600 employees to staff air traffic control stations. These are the men who man the "eye in the sky" aircraft tracking facilities for our Nation's airways. This is certainly a step in the direction of increased safety.

But it is just one step.

I recently requested information regarding the cost to the Federal Government of claims arising out of aviation accidents. I was amazed to learn that, since 1959, the U.S. Government has paid, either through compromise settlements or judgments, nearly $16 million to claimants.

What is more serious, not only under present economic circumstances but under any circumstances, is that over $203 million in claims are still pending.

I have in the past called for comprehensive, searching hearings into the many aspects of air safety. In view of the potential cost in dollars and cents as well as the mounting cost in terms of human life of air accidents, I wish once more to call to the attention of the Congress the pressing need for a full-scale investigation of the entire field of air safety techniques and practices.

I include at this point a copy of the letter, containing the figures I have quoted, in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1967.

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Reference is made to your letter of April 18, 1967, addressed to General William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, concerning negligence claims against the Government arising out of aircraft accidents. As General McKee advised you, your letter was forwarded in this Department for reply.

You have requested information as to the total dollar amount of claims that have been paid by the Government. This, of course, encompasses all Federal Tort Claims Act suits asserted against the United States arising out of aviation accidents. Some of these cases have been litigated to judgment whereas many have been settled out of court by means of compromise with the claimants. Our statistical records, which begin with Fiscal Year 1959, indicate that from July 1, 1959, through April 30, 1967, there was a total exposure or potential liability in such aviation cases of $372,331,621.98 and that the Government actually paid through compromise settlement or judgment a total of $15,694,066.69. A breakdown for each fiscal year is attached for your convenience.

You have also requested information as to the total dollar amount of claims pending against the Government. As of April 30, 1967, there were 433 Federal Tort Claims Act suits pending against the Government arising out of aviation accidents. The total dollar figure of the amount claimed in these suits is $203,004,731.00.

Sincerely,

BAREFOOT SANDERS,
Assistant Attorney General.

Claims arising out of aviation accidents and asserted against the Government pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act

	Amount claimed	Amount paid
Fiscal year 1959	$23,153,960.03	$185,960.57
Fiscal year 1960	15,301,838.42	911,879.65
Fiscal year 1961	7,754,449.53	715,582.47
Fiscal year 1962	66,135,226.00	471,170.00
Fiscal year 1963	66,535,196.00	2,015,789.00
Fiscal year 1964	44,049,923.00	4,234,147.00
Fiscal year 1965	47,612,801.00	2,808,487.00
Fiscal year 1966	70,571,396.00	808,759.00
July 1, 1966, through Apr. 30, 1967	31,216,832.00	3,542,292.00
Total	372,331,621.98	15,694,066.69

TOO FEW HOUSES

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a June 9, 1967, editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Too Few Houses." This editorial expressed regret that the House had seen fit to kill the rent supplement program, but then it went on to urge the administration "to turn the other cheek," seek Republican support, and pass the Percy bill to help families buy homes.

In a letter to the editor dated Sunday, June 18, 1967, Secretary Weaver commented on the Post's charge that the administration was "not a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing" by citing the work done under section 221(d)(3), a program of providing housing by subsidized interest rates.

Like Secretary Weaver and the Washington Post, I regretted that the House recently defeated the rent supplement appropriation. Those who served in the 89th Congress will recall that although I first opposed the rent supplement program on the ground that its regulations permitted its funds to go to persons earning as much as $8,100 and with assets up to $25,000, I changed my position and have supported the program since these regulations were revised and the program directed toward low-income groups.

The present 221(d)(3) program, however, is a poor illustration of how the administration serves as a "willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing." The income limits under the 221(d)(3) program are just as bad, and perhaps worse, as the original rent supplement program in that they permit families in city after city across America to live in subsidized housing, although such families' income frequently exceed $8,000, and even $10,000, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the National Home Ownership Foundation Act, introduced by Senator PERCY is not a cureall for our housing problems. Senator PERCY admits it does not "reach down to the bottom of the barrel" and, therefore, is no substitute for the rent supplement program. However, it is a means of giving incentive to families in low-income groups to own their own homes, and it will, as the Washington Post suggests, "channel construction funds and purchase subsidies into the slums." It is far superior, in my judgment, to the present program under section 221(d)(3) cited by Secretary Weaver. More important, the Percy bill has widespread support in Congress. The administration would do well to follow the Post's advice and "turn the other cheek," rather than continuing to oppose new housing ideas such as this one.

I include below the Post editorial and Secretary Weaver's letter to the editor for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1967]

TOO FEW HOUSES

While the country's population has been growing, its housing production has been declining. The number of new houses reached 1.6 million in 1963 and even at that rate, as President Johnson said, the improvement in the housing market failed to reach a great many among the poor, the elderly and the minorities. "By 1970," the President observed three years ago, "we shall have to build at least two million new homes a year to keep up with the growth of our population."

But instead of rising, housing production has fallen each succeeding year until, in

1966, it sank to 1.2 million. With this general tightening of the real estate market, and the general failure of the housing industry to keep up with demand, the Administration's attempts to rehabilitate the city slums become increasingly difficult. The Federal Government's traditional program for providing homes to the poor is public housing, but most American cities now believe that they cannot absorb many more large public housing projects.

Congress has only compounded the confusion. Last month the Republicans in the House voted in very large numbers to defeat the appropriation for rent supplements. It is sad when one thinks of the people who need the supplements; but it is comic when one thinks that most of the Republicans were simultaneously supporting Senator Percy's home ownership bill. Rent supplements mean Federal funds to help families pay rent. The Percy plan means Federal funds to help families buy homes. Both require Federal subsidies, and both encourage private construction. The Republicans insist on damning one as the prelude to socialism and praising the other as an historic vindication of the free enterprise system.

If the Administration is wise, it will turn the other cheek, leave this doctrinaire rhetoric undisturbed, and help Senator Percy pass his bill. Its defects are not small; most serious of all, it follows the Administration's own error of relying on nonprofit corporations. And the Percy plan can never reach the really poor families who most desperately need help.

But the Percy bill has notable advantages of its own. It would set up a new, specialized Federal mortgage bank (judiciously termed a "home ownership foundation") to channel construction funds and purchase subsidies into the slums. The Federal Housing Administration has not proved a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing, and the Percy bill offers an alternative method of financing. It cannot take the place of rent supplements in the structure of Federal aid to housing. But it can bring building money into neighborhoods that commercial banks and the FHA are equally reluctant to enter.

Perhaps the most important fact for Congress to keep in mind is the narrow scale of these endeavors. Both the Percy plan and rent supplements can be very useful, but both are highly specialized. Neither can begin to counterbalance the unwholesome social effects of the low rates of housing construction in recent years throughout the Nation.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1967]

ACTIVE PARTNER

I read with interest your June 9 editorial entitled, "Too Few Houses." Its analysis of the parallels between the rent supplement program and the Percy plan was both accurate and timely. I also was gratified that you recognize that the Percy plan has limitations and defects.

I must, however, take exception to the statement that the Federal Housing Administration is not "a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing" and is reluctant to function in blighted and slum areas. Historically there is a valid basis for such assertions. But today, as a part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the FHA is an active partner in subsidized housing and is helping to bring money into blighted slum neighborhoods.

In 1961 Section 221(d)(3) was added to the National Housing Act. This new section provided FHA mortgage insurance for a new moderate-income housing program, and authorized special assistance funds from the Federal National Mortgage Association for its financing. This is a subsidized housing program, providing both new and rehabilitated housing.

All of the funds available for this program will be allocated by the close of this fiscal year. As of April 30, 1967, allocations for 143,000 units had been made. Commitments were issued for 72,400 of these units, and in excess of 40,000 units were occupied.

The rent supplement program, funded initially only a year ago, has moved more rapidly, thanks in large part to our experience with the 221(d)(3) program. By mid-May of this year, the FHA had allocated all of the available appropriation for rent supplements, aside from a contingency fund that must be preserved. These allocations will provide some 35,000 units of housing for low-income families.

These two programs are the most active of all FHA multifamily housing programs and make up most of its multifamily activity. Thus today FHA is not only willingly but successfully playing a prominent role in supplying low- and moderate-income housing.

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
WASHINGTON.

FOREIGN AID IN OUR NATIONAL POSTURE

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail, I received a letter from a constituent who seems to sum up quite clearly the attitude of many thoughtful people of the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State regarding the Middle East situation as it exists today.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the writer, Mr. Frank D. Weeks, Jr., displays a rare understanding of the place of foreign aid in our national posture. He realizes that it plays an important part in our foreign policy, useful as a stabilizing influence in the world.

It is not a complete answer, surely, as both Mr. Weeks and we in this body are well aware; but remains part of the answer, a workable and flexible tool of our foreign policy—infinitely more humanitarian and economically cheaper than bombs. I only wish that more Americans had as firm and intelligent a grasp of the uses of foreign aid as Mr. Weeks, and hope that as time goes on this may be the case.

I commend Mr. Weeks' letter to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH.,
June 14, 1967.

Hon. FLOYD V. HICKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HICKS: I am deeply concerned with impending events in the Near East and U.S. policy in that area.

It appears that Soviet Russia will attempt to salvage whatever prestige she might, by obtaining a censure from the United Nations against Israel and a return to the status quo through collective UN action. Such a course could result in legions of "Volunteers" pouring into Palestine under communist military leadership which would require our forceful opposition or complete withdrawal from the area. Russia must not be permitted to achieve the objectives so violently and conclusively denied the United Arab Republic in the recent war. The Israelis and the Arabs must work out the solution among themselves, which can be done despite seemingly implacable hatred on the part of the Arabs. (A review of history indicates that the two people lived side by side in peace for almost a thousand years.)

As far as the United Arab Republic is concerned, I feel as most Americans do. Reacting to falsehood and insults slammed against us, my first emotion is defensive hostility. In analysis, however, I can see that it is not to our best interest to retaliate in anger against the UAR but it is also not to our best interest to give them aid and comfort at this time. Denial of aid will force the burden of support on the Russians or Chinese, or both—at a time when neither can adequately do the job. Should they attempt to raise economic conditions above starvation level in the Arab countries, it would require far greater expenditures of risk capital than they can afford—or would be willing to gamble, if they could afford it. By our refusal to participate—we have sufficient justification in the eyes of the world to refuse—we would certainly support conditions which would strengthen Israel's position and force a change in leadership and national philosophy in the Arab nations.

As I see it, should we supply massive aid ot the Arabs before September, we may stay a revolution which will certainly occur as starvation conditions approach. It is to our best interest to cooperate with Great Britain in achieving a new Government among the Arabs which will agree to co-existence with the Israelis and accept the fact that a better life for their people will begin with education and hard work, not with the false dream that conquest of Palestine will fulfill Mohammed's promise.

I am aware that foreign policy is the domain of the President, but Congress can be very influential—especially in deciding who gets foreign aid and in what amounts. We must not be trapped into supporting conditions which will permit a shooting war to erupt at any time—as has been the case during the past twenty years.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK D. WEEKS, JR.

FOREIGN IMPORTS STILL PLAGUE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the mainstay of the economy of North Carolina—the textile industry—continues to be sorely plagued and damaged by a flood of imported products from low-wage countries.

A recent survey of 310 North Carolina textile plants which employ over half of the State's total of 250,000 textile workers revealed that only 15 plants—employing 7,200—are now working full time, with the remainder continuing on a curtailed workweek running as low as 2 days per week.

This is a serious situation, one that grows worse almost daily. Not only does this condition have an impact that bodes ill for the industry and its workers, but also adversely affects the many industries and businesses which depend upon a flourishing textile industry.

When labor turnover exceeds 50 percent and prices drop 15 percent as they have in the textile industry, its future is dim indeed.

I wanted to bring this situation to the attention of the Congress for the economic outlook in my home State of North Carolina is dark unless some action is taken in the immediate future to alleviate the conditions now existing. I might point out that one in every two manufacturing employees in North Carolina is employed in a textile plant and many of the workers depend to a large

degree upon the circumstances of the textile industry.

Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a friend and one of North Carolina's leading bankers. Mr. Addison H. Reese, of Charlotte, chairman of the board of North Carolina National Bank, is well known and respected throughout the Nation's banking industry. His recent letter to me is an excellent summary of the problems and the progress of the American textile industry.

Mr. Reese has cogently pointed to some of the continuing problems facing the textile industry, problems which are beyond the control of this vital segment of our economy.

So that all may benefit from Mr. Reese's presentation of the current problems, I include his letter in the RECORD at this point:

NORTH CAROLINA NATIONAL BANK,
Charlotte, N.C., June 9, 1967.

Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: Speaking as a banker and a citizen, I am gravely concerned at the apathy that allows an increasing flood of imports to endanger our vital textile industry.

The general public does not realize that other industries are involved. Anything that hurts the textile industry hurts trucking, chemicals, paper, oil, metalworking, and corn growers in the Midwest, to name a few other interests.

For years textile spokesmen have called attention to cheap foreign imports, and justly so. Even in strong textile areas such as the Carolinas, people have grown deaf to their complaints.

Some people in government seem to have the erroneous idea that the textile industry is antiquated. They think that to the extent textile mills can't compete with cheap foreign imports they should be abandoned, their people trained for other jobs, and their plants converted to more productive use. This is certainly not sound thinking.

Textile technology has forged ahead rapidly in the past few years. The industry has spent $5.5 billion on new plants, equipment and modernization since 1960. For example, H. W. Close, president of Springs Mills, Inc., reports that his company's newest plant will cost $63,000 per employee. This compares to about $30,000 per employee for plants built since 1963, and $10,000 for older plants.

Other industries depend on textiles for significant portions of their business. Just three of the nation's better-known textile companies, all operating in the Carolinas, spent approximately $242.7 million for supplies, repair parts, power, fuel and water in 1966. One firm alone—and it is not the largest—stocks 90,000 different items in inventory and deals with 7,000 suppliers. America's textile machinery manufacturers lead the world. In 1967 their output is expected to be about $796 million, 80% of it in domestic sales.

The trucking industry transports 87.6% of the textiles moved in this country (1963 figures), and derives over $100 million in revenue from the industry.

Textiles are a substantial customer of the $17-billion paper industry, buying paper, cartons and countless packaging materials. Petroleum and chemical industries are deeply involved, the latter at about $2.5 billion a year. DuPont gets about a third of its annual volume from sale of man-made fibers. Textiles are the nation's second largest industrial user of cornstarch, buying 315 million pounds annually.

Investors have a huge stake in textiles. In North Carolina alone, textile plants (excluding hosiery and garments) are capitalized at $1.18 billion. Textile properties in this state have an assessed valuation of $983 million, and pay more than $36 million in state taxes. More than 250,000 Tar Heels work in textiles, earning over $1 billion of the state's total manufacturing payroll of $2.5 billion a year. Nationally, some 950,000 people earn $4.6 billion in textile wages.

The suggestion has been made that we increase textile imports from developing nations, and compensate American textiles for their loss. It would be easy to go into developing nations, install subsidized textile machinery, and train their abundance of cheap labor to produce cloth for export to this country. This would make the American textile industry a sacrificial goat. It may help build up other countries, but it would be a heavy blow to the American economy.

Futhermore, the theorists who made that suggestion haven't said what would happen if these countries were to renounce their economic ties with the United States. If we had become dependent in years past on Viet Nam, Cuba or China for our textiles, we'd be spending millions to expand the industry in America right now.

Thank you for your past efforts on behalf of our textile industry. I hope you can convince your colleagues from other states that they, too, have a stake in textiles.

Cordially yours,

ADDISON H. REESE,
Chairman of the Board.

LT. GEN. LEW WALT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine, on June 9, 1967, contained a very fine comment on Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, U.S. Marine Corps. This article gave some evaluation of the splendid record of service which General Walt has established as he has led our Marine Corps men in Vietnam.

I have had the privilege of witnessing the performance of General Walt on two visits to his area of operations. This has given me a privilege which I shall always value. I have never been more impressed with any military leader than I have been with General Walt. America can be proud of him and the men who have so courageously served under his command.

The Time magazine article is appended hereto as a part of my remarks:

LEADER FOR ALL REASONS

Soon after landing in South Viet Nam with a new second star on his shoulders, Marine General Lewis Walt recognized that the U.S. role there called for qualities of heart and mind that are not defined in military manuals. "In this war," he said, "a soldier has to be much more than a man with a rifle or a man whose only objective is to kill. He has to be part diplomat, part technician, part politician—and 100% a human being." As the top Marine in Viet Nam, facing an array of challenges matched by no other corps commander in the war, Old Pro Lew Walt, 54, proved himself a leader for all reasons. Last week, after two years of unremitting war, Walt headed home to a hero's welcome and a new job as the Marines' deputy chief of staff for manpower.

With a command that embraces 10,440 sq. mi.—all five of the northernmost provinces that comprise I Corps—Walter had the task of stabilizing South Viet Nam's queasiest territory. The region was plagued by the country's most aggressive guerrillas, threatened with the massive cutting edge of well-armed North Vietnamese divisions and abroil with political dissidence. From the outset, Walt gave priority to winning over the civilians and holding the villages.

Hamlet by Hamlet. His humanitarianism made good military sense. "When we realized that 180,000 people lived within 82-mm. mortar range of the Danang Airbase, and when we realized that there would be no way to police every house," said Walt, "we decided that the only way to solve it was to make sure that we had friendlies living around the airfield." The number of Vietnamese now living in secure areas has doubled, to 1,000,000, during Walt's tour.

The husky Kansan, winner of two World War II Navy crosses, was so committed to pacification that the Marines became known as "Walt's Peace Corps." While assault units like the 1st Airmobile) Cavalry rode their helicopters to major set-piece battles against big Communist forces in unpopulated areas, Walt's outnumbered Marines, for the most part, had to fight mile by mile, hamlet by hamlet.

The switch in tactics from the gung-ho role in World War II and Korea made Walt a frequent target of criticism. The controversy also pointed up a split between Marine and Army commanders. Army men, pointing to such bloody engagements as Ia Drang, argued that the way to win was to kill the V.C. first and pacify the population later. The Marines replied that search-and-destroy tactics suitable for the wastes of the Central Highlands could not be employed in the populous seacoast of "Eye" corps. Moreover, they pointed out, wherever Army troops pulled out, the Viet Cong flowed back in.

Unfailingly Considerate but . . . Burdened with defense of the major jet bases at Danang and Chu Lao, committed to winning over a skeptical population and handicapped by having only 230 helicopters (v. 430 in one Army airmobile division), Walt fought the kind of war that the terrain demanded and his experience dictated. As popular with his troops as with the Vietnamese urchins he daily fed candy, Walt was known to enlisted men as "our squad leader in the sky" because of his tireless helicopter visits to combat areas. His blue eyes often misted over the sight of wounded Marines; yet they could freeze like an arctic night at the sight of an officer derelict in duty. A general and more than one full colonel were booted out of Viet Nam under the assault of Walt's sharp temper. Yet to those who did their job, he was unfailingly considerate.

General William Westmoreland, who was quick to appreciate Walt's achievements—as was the Pentagon, which awarded him his third star after just nine months in Viet Nam—asked the Marine in the spring of 1966 to extend his one-year tour for six months. Then, after Walt's smashing defeat of a North Vietnamese division last summer, Westy asked him to stay another six months.

Soldier's Soldier. Six weeks ago, with 76,000 Marines and 19,000 soldiers under his command, Walt finally closed with major elements of 71,000 guerrillas and regulars threatening I Corps. Though the Marines pulverized the Communist forces, they took high casualties. Walt's critics cited the U.S. losses as the reason for his surrendering command to Lieut. General Robert E. Cushman Jr. Actually, it was known long before the DMZ battles that Walt, bone-weary from endless rounds of 15-hour days, was leaving Viet Nam at the end of his second year.

Westmoreland, in an unusually warm tribute at change-of-command ceremonies last week in Danang, pinned the Distinguished Service Medal on Walt's barrel chest and said: "My admiration for this man is without bounds. General Walt is a Marine's Marine and a soldier's soldier. He's not only big physically but big morally, a man of almost unique professional abilities, an officer of great courage and outstanding leadership attributes."

Characteristically, Walt's thoughts were not with himself but with his Marines and fallen comrades. "I have a deep feeling of sadness as I recall those young men who have given their lives," he said, "but there is no higher cause than that of freedom."

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the Middle East have left most of the participants doubtful and startled about recent past actions and uncertain over the future course of events. Indeed in this crisis the only ones who appear confident of themselves, their institutions, and their actions are the Israelis. The people of that small but incredibly brave nation have taught the world a lesson with its skill and determination to survive. Unfortunately, it is not at all certain that the opposing parties concerned have learned this lesson. The Soviet Union, the Arabs, the United Nations and our own leaders seem to believe in the same old myths that created and fed the bitterness of the Middle East that lead to the virtual annihilation of three armies at the hands of an amazing Israel.

Some hard thinking is now in order. I was pleased yesterday to find that some is being done in this country. In the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of June 18, 1967, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., published an editorial entitled "War of Words." I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Hearst's sentiments and I believe it should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent I place this fine editorial in the RECORD:

WAR OF WORDS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

With almost startling abruptness, the central spotlight of world attention swept during the week from the west bank of the Jordan River in the Mideast to the west bank of the East River in New York. For—thanks to the Soviet Union—the sensational battle of bullets between Israel and the Arab world was followed instantly with the opening of an all-out war of words in the United Nations.

You can bet the war of words will be relatively as long and indecisive as the battle of bullets was short and decisive. The Russians, true to form, have deliberately set out to foul up any chances of achieving early solutions to the many pressing problems left by the recent military showdown.

Despite a lifetime of watching the communists and their dirty work, I find myself literally astonished on occasion by their incredible gall and utter cynicism. There is no moral limit whatever to the Machiavellian maneuvering of which they are capable. What is now going on in the glass and marble home of the Great East River Debating Society is another classic example of their diabolic mischief-making.

As always, the Russians claim they are working for peace and security in the world. Yet, as always, their actions are coldly calculated to disrupt such aims wherever and whenever they think the resultant mess will benefit them. This is precisely what they have been doing in their present drive to have the U.N. brand Israel as an aggressor and to pass a resolution calling on Israel to give back all the Arab territory seized in the war.

What the Soviets are trying to do in the U.N., primarily, is to score a recoup through words the prestige they lost when they failed to come to the rescue of their Arab stooges with military intervention in the war. And in so doing they are encouraging the hate-filled Arabs to hope their war wasn't lost after all—that they can somehow return to the original provocative positions they held before the Israeli blitzkrieg.

I submit it is self-evident that any nation that would do what Russia is doing in the U.N. is a nation whose primary concern is not peace at all. Moscow knows full well that Israel was not the aggressor and that Israel was simply compelled to strike out to save herself from imminent total national destruction. Moscow knows equally well that the U.N. will never be able to force Israel to give up any of the territory she claims as essential to her future self-defense, which indeed much of it is.

The last fact is a good yardstick for showing the utter cynicism of the Russians. They failed to get the 15-member U.N. Security Council to pass the censure resolution they seek against Israel. So now they are trying to get them passed by the 122-member General Assembly, although they have repeatedly in the past insisted that such an action would be illegal. And they have a good chance of success, too, since the Afro-Asian bloc of nations has a controlling balance in the General Assembly—where the vote cast by the representative of 336,000 Gambians is as important as that of the United States.

But—and this is the payoff—the Russians know that the adoption of their resolution by the Assembly will mean just exactly nothing in itself. It would be merely an expression of opinion. Any implementation of such an opinion would have to be made by the Security Council, whose position already has been made clear.

Israel has said that peace terms must be hammered out in face-to-face talks with the Arabs. The Arabs, for their part, have vowed never to participate in such talks with the Israelis although eventually this position will be untenable. The point here is that it will continue to be tenable so long as the Russians encourage the Arabs.

All this once again underscores the limited usefulness of the U.N. in a real crisis. Its fundamental flaw springs from the fact that the great powers never have been willing to arm the so-called peacekeeping organization with the authority of a superstate whose sovereignty would top their own. In the present situation it was further weakened by the incredibly weak secretary general, U Thant, who pulled U.N. forces out of Egypt at the first real sign of trouble. The U.N., in fact, was not even useful in helping our nationals get out of the Arab world when they were ordered to vamoose.

Incidentally, this last point reminds me to give well-earned credit here to Pan American Airways for the superlative but little-known emergency airlift they operated on June 6 and 7—the second and third days of the war. At the request of the State Department, Pan Am evacuated 2,208 Americans, mostly wives and children of diplomatic personnel, in 18 flights out of Beirut. Other emergency airlifts were successfully undertaken by Pan Am from Lagos, in Nigeria, and from fields in Southern Spain. It was a tough job done in superlative fashion. All Americans can be proud of this great American flag airline.

The positive and speedy action taken by the State Department in this matter, unfortunately, is in sorry contrast to the ineffectiveness of our diplomacy throughout the whole Mideast showdown—and since. Before the war broke out, we proclaimed ourselves officially neutral although our national interests would have been vitally and tragically affected by an Arab victory. In effect we were neutral on the side of Israel but even so—thanks to our chicken allies—we were unable to do anything to help Israel break Nasser's illegal blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Now that Israel won the war single-handed, thus relieving us of a tremendous potential responsibility, what have we done? Merely mumbled something about continuing our Mideast policy which calls for honoring the original territorial integrity of ALL the states involved in the conflict.

To me this is all wrong, and even worse than that. In a world of naked power politics, the policies of any nation in its right mind have got to reflect its own selfish interests. When situations are drastically changed, policies must be revised accordingly. This is understood by all of the really hardheaded nations of the world. Unfortunately we too often play politics as if it were a game and expect everybody to play fair and abide by their word and some imaginary rules. The only rule that anybody pays any attention to in diplomacy is the law of self-interest.

Israel has proven herself in sensational and heroic action to be our strong good bastion of Democracy in the Middle East. The Arab land she captured with her blood is all territory whose only use to her will be to prevent easy new attacks on her people—legitimate spoils of war by any definition. On the other hand, and with no cause whatever, seven Arab states have spit in our eye by severing diplomatic relations and encouraging outrages on American property in their midst.

Under these circumstances there is no moral or practical reason whatever for our clinging to a pre-war policy which held that Mideast boundaries should be sacrosanct. It is all well and good to have a policy of neutrality where our interests are not directly threatened. But in the present situation—where the issues of right and wrong are so clear, where our friends and enemies have emerged so unmistakably—it is foolish and meaningless to pretend neutrality any longer.

Now is as good a time as any for the United States to reassert the leadership she has failed to exert in the Mideast crisis.

We can do it by making it crystal clear in a declaration to the world that we believe justice lies with the Israeli cause.

If we don't, we will be helping along the confusion and delay being created deliberately by the communist-inspired war of words on the East River.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

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

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, and as an American I am honored to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent speech by the Vice President of the United States.

Addressing the 1967 commencement at the Naval Academy on June 7, 1967, the Vice President offered a bill of rights and responsibilities for the 21st century to the graduating midshipmen, who will soon be among the leaders of our country. This is a bill of rights and responsibilities that has more far-reaching application than to a single graduating class: It is a set of goals and ideals that every American, looking to the future, should memorize and take to heart.

Mr. Speaker, we all know and respect the Vice President as a man of vision and integrity. It is national leaders such as he who keep us looking ahead, toward the longer needs and goals of our country, and who help us put in the proper perspective the temporary national objectives in order that they may build on one another toward a better way of life. At this point I insert in the RECORD Vice President HUMPHREY'S excellent and challenging speech to the Naval Academy graduating class:

ber of remarks and insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the last 2 weeks by various Members of the House have called attention to the case of Otto Otepka, the chief of the Division of Evaluations of the State Department's Office of Security, whose case is now being tried behind closed doors at the State Department. Described were such underhanded and undiplomatic practices as wiretapping, ransacking of files, mutilation of documents, and testifying falsely before a congressional subcommittee on the part of employees of State in an effort to discredit Otepka. Recently, 10 of the 13 charges against Otepka were dropped, some of which charged him with the mutilation of documents, thereby violating a Federal statute. The mutilation charges were dropped, according to the Government Employees' Exchange, for fear that Otepka knew the names of the actual mutilators, would divulge their names at the hearing, and these persons, in turn, have indicated that they would give the names of "top" persons who had ordered the mutilation and planting of documents in Otepka's burn bag.

To complicate matters, the historic battle between the executive branch and Congress over "executive privilege" militates against Otepka. At times it has been like pulling teeth for Congress to get pertinent information from the various agencies of the executive branch, especially on matters which might prove embarrassing to the agency involved. Considering the above list of malpractices, one would hardly nominate the State Department for the Department-of-the-Year Award for honest and fair treatment of its employees.

The National Observer of June 12, 1967, carried an article by Gary G. Gerlach on the Otepka case. I insert this article, entitled "Man in the Middle," in the RECORD at this point.

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON: MAN IN THE MIDDLE

(By Gary G. Gerlach)

Any schoolboy can tell you that the Federal Government consists of three independent branches, namely the judicial, the legislative, and the executive. Any of Uncle Sam's employes—and especially bureaucrat Otto F. Otepka—can tell you that the three branches harbor intense institutional jealousies. Mr. Otepka is a husky, 52-year-old career civil servant in the State Department, and he knows about the intense jealousy, because for the past 3½ years he has been a near-helpless pawn in a seemingly endless bureaucratic battle between Congress and the Administration.

Last week a little daylight finally appeared at the end of the long tunnel of the Otepka case. The State Department hearing on why Mr. Otepka was fired in 1963 finally began, behind closed doors. The only public development so far: State quietly dropped 10 charges, minor ones, of the 13 pending against Mr. Otepka.

For a decade prior to September 1963, Mr. Otepka was State's chief security evaluator. His job was to sift the backgrounds of hundreds of employes in search of breaches of loyalty. Then he was fired. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is charging him with conduct "unbecoming an officer" of State for having made classified documents available to the Senate's Internal Security subcommittee without his superior's authorization. Mr. Otepka was formally dismissed from his post Nov. 5, 1963.

Behind the firing is the historic squabble between Congress and the executive branch of Government over the doctrine of "executive privilege." From George Washington's day until now, the issue has never been resolved. The doctrine includes the concept that no Administration official shall give information about his department to any other agency or branch of Government—even Congress—without his superior's permission. And that, in a nutshell, is precisely what Mr. Otepka did.

Congress, on the other hand, jealously guards what it calls the basic right of the people's representatives to know what's going on in a democracy. And when the Senate subcommittee began to investigate communism in the Administration, Mr. Otepka readily supplied the committee with information on some highly placed Americans.

Some contend, in fact, that this is the real heart of the dispute: That Communists influences in Government marked Mr. Otepka for removal because he was a zealous patriot trying to do his duty by exposing Reds.

Anyway, the battle was on. Secretary Rusk, fired Mr. Otepka specifically for violating a 1948 executive-privilege directive by President Truman ordering that the files of the Government's loyalty programs be kept confidential. A howl went through Congress over the Otepka dismissal—a howl so loud that Foggy Bottom backed down a bit. Mr. Otepka was allowed to stay on at State pending a hearing. Still, he was stripped of all important duties. Today he remains in bureaucratic limbo at a make-work job in which he earns $20,400 a year clipping the Congressional Record in his State cubbyhole.

is a "higher loyalty" in Government service to the "highest moral principles, which rise above "loyalty to persons, party, or Government departments."

Secretary Rusk counters that no one can run State effectively without sole control of security. Actions like those of Mr. Otepka, he says, cause "an erosion of confidence among people who work at adjoining desks." He paints a vivid word picture of frightened hordes of nameless bureaucrats going about even the most insignificant tasks in a cold sweat plotting to protect themselves and incriminate their associates.

Since 1963 hundreds of headlines, 20 volumes of congressional testimony, and thousands of taxpayers' dollars have failed to resolve the case. Even the current hearing isn't likely to resolve it; Secretary Rusk will make the final decision arising out of the hearing, but Mr. Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, says he may try to take the case into a Federal court on grounds he has yet to disclose.

All along, the quietly firm Mr. Otepka has continued to live at his Wheaton, Md., home in suburban Washington, holding his tedious make-work job and bowling in the State employees' league, where occasionally he meets Secretary Rusk on the alleys. For all his determination Mr. Otepka remains a mostly helpless victim of one of the republic's basic principles—the strict, jealously guarded division of powers among the Government's three branches.

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

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

PROUD OF TEENAGE SERVICEMEN

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have received two letter from teenage servicemen which make me proud to be an American.

These men, one from Wyoming and the other a Texan, already are serving overseas, but they want combat duty. They both wrote that they would extend their tours of duty if they could have combat assignments.

This is positive proof, Mr. Speaker, that not all young Americans condone the actions of the draft card burners and others who would have this country abandon our commitments.

The 19-year-old Wyoming man now is working as a mechanic. He wrote to me that he feels "that if I get into the infantry I might save a married man with children" from combat duty. The Texan indicated a similar sentiment. The Wyoming man said he does not want to "go home feeling that what I did on my tour over here did not help the United States to win the war."

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether these young men will be granted their requests, but I do know that their genuine desire to serve our country in a more significant way makes me very proud of both of them.

ANTIRIOT BILL

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would make it a Federal offense to travel in or use a facility of interstate commerce with the intent of inciting a riot or other violent civil disturbance.

This bill would make the instigation of riots a Federal crime punishable by a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment for a period up to 5 years, or both.

The recent violent civil disturbances in numerous locations throughout the Nation attest to the urgent need for this legislation.

Our law enforcement officials need a legal weapon such as this to more effectively cope with and deter those who would incite riots such as these. A government under law cannot afford to tolerate violence of this kind.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SOUND BLUEPRINT FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has provided a sound blueprint for peace in the Middle East in his speech this morning. I believe that if the nations of the Middle East would focus their attention on the five fundamental points outlined by the President, peace in the region would be assured.

The President rightly noted that peace rests on the recognized right of national life; on justice for Palestinian refugees; on the right of free maritime passage; on limiting the arms race; and on political independence and territorial integrity for all.

I commend the President for both his statesmanship and his deft analysis for easing the tensions and dangers of this troubled area of the world.

I hope that all of the member nations of the United Nations will endorse President Johnson's call for U.N. reports on all shipments of military arms to the Middle East area. This is a vitally important proposal—one that can help to provide necessary safeguards until political solutions can be found to reduce the hostile, explosive atmosphere in the area.

I believe that all Americans will stand firmly with the President on the policies he outlined this morning. For our people know that there must be a settlement of differences in the Middle East that is based on equity, humanitarianism, and mutual respect, if the world is to avoid future and even more dangerous confrontations in the region.

I insert into the RECORD President Johnson's remarks to the Foreign Policy Conference for Educators, at the State Department, today:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE FOR EDUCATORS—STATE DEPARTMENT

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

During this 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. I thought of the future—both in the Middle East, and in other areas of American interest and world concern.

This morning I want to give you my estimate of the prospects for peace, and the hopes for progress, in several 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 leaders of Latin America. For they made the historic decision to move toward the economic integration of Latin America.

In my judgment their decision is as important as any 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 two hundred and twenty 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—the Alliance for Progress.

One meeting of chiefs of state 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 only be hope for the future.

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

I have met with a number of statesmen—Prime Minister Lester Pearson in Canada only a few days ago, and the leaders of Europe shortly before that. We discussed many of the great 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 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 hunger and overpopulation.

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.

You know of my personal interest in improving relations between 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 country.

Through cultural exchanges and civil air 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 to secure peace in the world for future generations. It will be a long slow task, with many setbacks and discouragements. But it is 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 each of them faces: economic stagnation, poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance. Under Secretary Katzenbach reported to me last week on his recent trip through Africa. He described the many problems and opportunities 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 creating institutions for political and economic cooperation. They have set great tasks for themselves—whose accomplishment will require years of struggle and sacrifice.

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

I can give personal testimony to the new spirit that is abroad throughout Asia. It is a spirit of confidence, born of growing security. Everywhere I travelled last Autumn—from the conference in Manila to five 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 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 on a promising track, and Japan is taking a welcome role in helping her fellow Asians toward more rapid development.

A free Indonesia—the world's fifth largest nation, a land of more than one hundred million people—is struggling to rebuild, to reconstruct and reform its national life. This will require the understanding and support of the 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 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. 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 future in peace.

We would like to see the day come—and 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 for too long. When the aggression ends, 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 other nation. Such threats have become a burden to the peace not only of the region, but of the world.

In the same way, no nation would be true to the U.N. 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 interests of their own. Each nation must accept the right of others to life.

Second, this last month 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 primarily by those 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, it was the arbitrary and dangerous announced decision that the Straits 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 twelve years. Here the responsibility must rest not only on those in the area—but upon the larger states outside it. We believe that scarce resources are better used for technical and economic development. We have always opposed this arms race, and our own military shipments to the area have been severely limited.

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

As a beginning, we propose that the United Nations should call upon its members

to report all shipments of military arms to the area.

Fifth, the crisis underlines the critical importance of respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states in the area. We reaffirmed that principle at the height of the crisis. We reaffirm it 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 twenty years. What they now need are recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will give security against terror, destruction, and war. Further, there 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 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 Ambassador 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 have failed for twenty years?

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 U.N., and some call for the use of other parties. We have been first in our support of effective peacekeeping in the U.N., and we also recognize the values of mediation.

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

I appeal to all to adopt no rigid view on these matters. I offer assurance to all that the Government of the United States will do its part for peace in every forum, and at every level, and 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 leaders. What will be truly decisive in the Middle East will be what is said and done by those who live there.

They can seek another arms race if they want. But they will seek it at a terrible cost to their own people—and to their 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 is watching, for the peace of the world is at stake. It will look for patience and justice—humility—and moral courage. It will look for signs of movement from prejudice and the emotional chaos of conflict—to the gradual shaping of peace.

The Middle East is rich in history, in people, and in 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.

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

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

Our country is committeed—and we reiterate that commitment today—to a peace 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 for all mankind, can flourish once again in our time. We shall do all in our power to help make it so.

THE PRESIDENT'S WISE WORDS FOR A MIDDLE EAST SOLUTION

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has strongly urged the nations of the Middle East to come together and work out a settlement of differences that is based on justice and mutual regard for political rights.

I think the American people will strongly support the President. And I fervently hope that the nations involved will realize the wisdom of the President's words.

The President made clear that the policy of the United States is based on the recognition of the rights of all Middle Eastern nations. He also made it clear that there should be no immediate return to the boundary lines that existed in the area on June 4. But he urged a return to reason and reality that can produce a political settlement that is fair to all.

I warmly support the President's call for limiting the arms race in the area. I congratulate him for his recognition of the plight of the refugees. The nations of the world must cooperate in both of these vital matters.

In articulating a five-point plan for peace, President Johnson came to grips with the difficult, stubborn, and complex problems that beset the nations of the Middle East.

We must hope that ways can be found to act on all of these five points—each of which is indispensable to a real and lasting peace.

I hope also that those participating in the United Nations General Assembly debate on the Middle East will heed the President's words that—

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

If these words are heeded, then a real beginning to a Middle East settlement will be underway.

WISE WORDS FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has injected a healthy dose of wisdom and reason into the emotional, hate-filled atmosphere surrounding the problems of the Middle East.

The President's speech, in direct contrast to Premier Kosygin's, proposes just and honorable principles upon which a lasting peace can be achieved in this troubled area of the world.

I strongly support the President's plea for an end to an arms race in the Middle East. I hope that the members of the United Nations will quickly endorse the President's proposal for U.N. reports on all arms shipments into the area.

Most important, I believe that the American people stand solidly with the President's five points necessary to achieve a just settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

But, as the President rightly noted, any progress in the search for peace in the Middle East must come about through direct negotiations between the nations involved. This point is at the heart of any true and meaningful settlement of differences.

I endorse the President's enunciation of American policy in the Middle East. It is a policy that would lead to a new era of understanding and progress for all nations concerned.

We can only hope that the nations involved will heed the wisdom of the President's words.

CRISIS IN OUR MERCHANT MARINE FLEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the United States begin to immediately assert itself in the commercial development of the international waters of the world on a scale that will restore this country to its traditional first-rank maritime importance. It is time we dramatize the declining position of the U.S. maritime industry and the U.S. fishing industry in relation to that of other nations, that we call attention to our embarrassing lack of an aggressive, comprehensive national policy on the oceans, and emphasize the neglect of the ocean potential in general and the fisheries and living resources of the oceans and our merchant marine in particular at the highest levels of Government. The Nation's oldest industries concerning the merchant marine and fisheries are in their hour of crisis.

Last Tuesday, this House passed a measure designed to give a small boost to our sorely depressed shipbuilding industry. An amendment to the Department of Defense appropriation bill which provides that seven of our 16 new minesweepers will be built in this country serves to accentuate a grave problem that this Nation is long overdue in solving. I speak, of the Nation's decline to disaster levels in its fishery and merchant marine areas.

As you are all aware, there has recently been proposed a new maritime program by the new Secretary of Trans-

portation. While the Secretary insists that this is in reality not an official administration program, it nevertheless is represented as the thinking of the Secretary and his staff on the maritime problems which now face the Nation. There are many facets of this program which need to be explained more fully before they can hope to obtain industrywide support.

There is one portion of the program that seems to me to be particularly shortsighted. This is the recommendation to upgrade and to pour huge sums of money into the reconstruction of hundreds of national defense reserve vessels. As you know we have broken out 172 of these ships for the present Vietnam conflict at astronomical costs. Each one of these vessels has cost the Government an average of $550,000 to be fitted back into service. After they have been placed into service many of them have been plagued with mechanical failures which have resulted in the loss of valuable sailing days.

The average age of our reserve fleet vessels is around 23 years. How much longer can these obsolete rust buckets be used for defense purposes without damaging our military efforts? Vessels from the reserve fleet have been used on several occasions. They were used during the Korean conflict and in the Suez incident. However, at the beginning of the Korean conflict in 1950 the average age of the vessels was only 7 years and during the Suez crisis only 10 years. In 1950 only 5 to 7 days were required to reactivate a vessel and the cost was approximately $156,000. Today, reactivation of one national defense reserve fleet vessels costs about three times as much and requires 40 days, or eight times longer to reactivate. Thus, the use of vessels in the reserve fleet for future military and commercial emergencies is becoming less and less feasible from a cost and time standpoint.

It seems the need for new construction was made painfully clear by the recent testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Paul Ignatius, before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee in April. While not pleading the case for new construction, Mr. Ignatius presented testimony which can only bear evidence to the precarious position we would find ourselves in should another conflict develop at the same time as we are fighting in Vietnam. The very recent Near East war would have made our inadequacy painfully clear had the United States been compelled to provide any substantial maritime shipping capacity. Secretary Ignatius indicated that around 35 percent of our total potential carrying capacity was being utilized in the Vietnam conflict. This 35 percent includes 100 percent of the MSTS nucleus fleet and 40 percent of our privately owned fleet. How then can we hope to have enough shipping capacity to meet another crisis without completely abdicating our commercial trades posture or placing ourselves in the precarious position of depending upon foreign-flag vessels to meet our military needs. Indeed, it would appear to me that we have reached the breaking point, and if more new vessels are not constructed we will be faced with the dilemma of giving up our valuable commercial carriage or relying on foreign-flag interests. I might add that these interests have on several occasions declined to carry our military cargoes to Vietnam.

We have been told that the desire to pour millions of dollars into the upgrading of the reserve fleet is a Defense Department decision—the same Defense Department that seeks to build fast deployment Logistic ships as a panacea to our shipbuilding problems. I do not believe that the vast appropriation of money should be made toward supporting an obsolete and antiquated reserve fleet without careful examination of our defense needs, and a full discussion of the merits of reserve fleet conversion as opposed to new construction. If the Defense Department is convinced that their proposal is in the best interests of the country, then they should not hesitate in making avaliable to us the cost-effectiveness studies which have gone into the making of this decision.

A low-level domestic ship construction program, coupled with building abroad, is loaded with danger. It poses the threat of an ever-increasing flight of American capital abroad, adversely affecting our balance of payments. It could leave our own shipbuilding industry with a limited number of vessels to build and hold forth no hope whatsoever of reducing unit cost through multiple production. Yet, this same opportunity denied to our own industry would be offered to foreign yards so as to possibly widen—not close—the price gap between domestic and foreign construction. The ultimate effect could be further pressure to increase our ship construction-differential subsidy rate. We already are encountering congressional opposition to further extension of the present temporary ceiling of 55 percent. An increase above 55 percent might be wholly unacceptable and could jeopardize the entire subsidy program.

A very basic issue is being swept under the rug by improvising such a program—whether or not it is essential for us to maintain in a state of readiness the facilities and the skilled labor to build merchant ships in this country. If it is essential, as I believe it to be, then to propose the construction of only fifteen ships a year, or even thirty, coupled with the modernization of some old "crocks," is to mock and to insult the intelligence of both the industry and the Congress.

Before we embark upon any decisions involving our national defense reserve fleet, I hope that we will take a long hard look at the total effect this will have on our merchant marine and upon our defense capabilities. The prime area of concentration today must be upon the redevelopment of a strong, privately-owned merchant marine. Only when this is accomplished will we be able to have a vital nucleus upon which to base our future commercial and defense needs.

And the problems do not only lie with our merchant marine program but also with our commercial fishing fleet.

While the exploitation of the world's ocean resources is being aggressively pursued by other nations, the Johnson administration either does not understand what is happening or ignores the situation as unimportant.

It is my belief that it will be necessary for the United States to make a heavy Government commitment if this country is to attain a standing of first-rank importance in international ocean development, and this commitment should be in the form of a partnership with industry, as is done in Japan. Japanese fishing operations are not Government owned, but the Government works very closely with the fishing industry, backing it up with education, research, and diplomatic efforts on a far greater scale than ours. As a result, the Japanese take almost a fifth of all the marine food landed in the world. The United States must encourage private investment in the utilization of the food resources of the sea.

The United States emerged from World War II with a large and relatively efficient fishing fleet, but now it has fallen into obsolescence, and nothing has been done to keep the American fishing fleet modern, efficient, and competitive. The average age of the documented fleet exceeds 20 years, and many of the vessels in the commercial fishing fleet exceed 50 years of age. We must candidly admit that there exists an overall obsolescence of the U.S. commercial fishing fleet, then decide immediately what must be done about it, and, thereafter implement a workable plan for modernization.

The 1965 world catch of seafoods of all kinds was 115 billion pounds. If per capita consumption remains the same as in 1965, more than 215 billion pounds will be required by the turn of the century. The current rate of increase in consumption, however, is almost double the rate of world population growth. With better preservation of flavor and more attractive processing, it is likely that the per capita consumption of fish products will increase so that by the year 2000, the total could approach 350 billion pounds—three times what it is today. It should be our stated national objective to achieve a greater percentage of this increasing world catch. To do so we obviously must reverse our present trend; that is, we must increase our production and increase the U.S. share of the world fishery catch.

The United States—by far the world's largest market for fish and seafood products—has slipped in the last 10 years from second to fifth place among world fishing nations in production, falling behind Red China, the U.S.S.R., and Peru. The United States also remains behind Japan, whose production is up 40 percent during the past 10 years, while that of the United States is down about 10 percent. The U.S. share of the world fishery catch had dropped from 12.4 percent in 1948 to 5.2 in 1965. While U.S. demand increased from 6 billion pounds in 1949 to 12 billion pounds in 1965. The fact is that this country's relative position has worsened as other nations have continued to accelerate their drive for exploitation of the world's ocean resources.

These nations, Russia, Japan, Red China, Peru, and many others have mounted a massive ocean offensive since World War II, while the fishing industry in the United States continues to de-

with a plate bearing the words "John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award" and the signature of the President of the United States, is given annually to a personnel official in a Federal, State, or municipal public agency who makes an outstanding contribution to employment of the handicapped in the agency in which he is employed. The selection was made by a group of judges under the direction of Patrick Healy, Executive Director, National League of Cities, and Chairman of the Public Service Committee of the President's Committee.

Mr. Leonhard has set a personal example in his agency by promulgation of policies concerning handicapped employees. Not only have these policies provided for hiring the qualified handicapped persons, they have also provided for continuing employment of personnel who became handicapped during their tenure of employment. He has retained and reassigned employees disabled by injury or disease to other jobs commensurate with their ability, and has re-evaluated or re-designed jobs to compensate for disabilities so that the employee's abilities could be fully utilized without loss of self-respect.

At the time of his nomination, 65.6 percent, or 417 of the total agency staff of 635 have some type of disability and perform their jobs satisfactorily.

In addition, Mr. Leonhard has initiated special agency programs to assist the handicapped in becoming employed, such as assigning special representatives for the handicapped in each of the 31 offices located in 24 cities. The success of Mr. Leonhard's efforts in behalf of the handicapped worker is evidenced by the fact that Oklahoma, in 1965, although 27th in population, ranked fifth in the Nation in total number of handicapped applicants placed in jobs.

Mr. Leonhard began his public service career in the employment field with the National Re-employment Service Office at Anadarko, Oklahoma. In January 1937, when the Oklahoma State Employment Service was created, he became a member of the administrative staff and served as Assistant to the State Director. In 1946 he was named Director of the Agency, which is now known as the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission.

Mr. Leonhard earlier received the Public Personnel Award from the Oklahoma City Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the 1966 State Public Personnel Award from the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. He was nominated for the President's Committee Award by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee.

Although the Public Personnel Award has been presented annually by the President's Committee since 1954, this year it was renamed the John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award as a tribute to the late Congressman Fogarty of Rhode Island. As Chairman of the United States House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of health, education, welfare and labor appropriations bills, Congressman Fogarty was one of the strongest champions of handicapped people, giving them hope and encouragement and inspiring others to do more in easing their load.

EXTEND AND IMPROVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the social security medicare program has now been in operation for nearly a year. It is, without doubt, an unqualified success. But, as with any new program, medicare can be strengthened and improved. It is in this spirit, therefore, that I am today introducing five bills to extend and improve medicare coverage for the Nation's older citizens.

One of these bills would go far to remedy what I consider to be one of the most inexcusable situations confronting the ill: their inability to meet the excessively high costs of drugs. Millions of our older citizens, living on fixed incomes, cannot afford the fruits of our scientific progress. This is inexcusable. The recent disclosures of vast price spreads between brand name drugs and drugs sold by generic name attests to the crying need for remedial legislation.

The bill I am introducing will enable persons enrolled in part B of medicare to receive, beginning January 1969, benefit allowances toward the cost of drugs requiring a prescription, after they have first paid an initial $25 toward their cost. The schedule of allowances will be so drawn up as to encourage doctors to prescribe by generic name rather than by brand name. This, I feel, will be to the advantage of all.

My second bill, more modest in scope, also addresses itself to the financial difficulties of medicare beneficiaries. Under existing law, patients of doctors who refuse to accept medicare assignments must pay their doctor's bills in their entirety before they can claim reimbursement from medicare. This places an intolerable financial burden on many patients and, in some cases, forces them to seek care from doctors not of their first choice. To correct that situation, the bill would allow a patient to file for his claim with an unpaid bill, thus allowing him to defer payment to the doctor until he can pay the entire amount.

The third bill provides for the reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital or rehabilitation center to receive the care of a physical therapist. Quite simply, the bill would strike out language in the Medicare Act—title XVIII, section 1861, m. 7—which states that expenses can be paid "but not including transportation of the individual in connection with any such item or service."

Because of the statute's present wording, therapists must travel to patients' homes or to distant extended care facilities, thus dissipating their time and reducing their availability to other patients. We should eliminate this difficulty by providing reimbursement for travel to the patients themselves.

My fourth bill is designed to remedy some of the inadequacies which have become apparent in the Nation's nursing home program. Sixty percent of all patients in nursing homes across the country are recipients of Federal assistance—some $280 million a year. Yet, we have little assurance that this money is efficiently and well spent.

Federal medical assistance programs have clearly overemphasized institutional medical services. The bill calls on the States to provide home health services where these will fit the patient's needs. Not only will this free much-needed space in the nursing homes, but it will be more economical and more responsive to the individual needs of our citizens.

In those cases where patients do require nursing home care, the bill assures them the kind of professional care they need. At this moment, almost half of the nursing homes in the United States have no registered nurse associated with the institution, and only a few have rehabilitative or restorative services for their patients. The bill would correct these deficiencies.

This legislation also requires that the States conduct periodic reviews of nursing home care to assure that facilities are used to the optimum and that patients are provided with the most appropriate services. Also, it requires them to keep accurate and easily verifiable records of medical services rendered to assure that patients receiving Federal assistance get what they pay for. Finally, the bill provides that payments to nursing homes and home health agencies fully reflect the reasonable cost of services rendered.

The fifth bill would extend medicare coverage to the 2.6 million State and local employees who are not eligible under existing law. Many of them would like to be covered, but cannot be as long as the law also requires them to be under the social security retirement system, of which most State and local governments are not a part.

Quite simply, this bill would permit State and local government employees to obtain medical insurance without also having to participate in the retirement system. Since these two insurance programs are administered separately anyway, this should not be difficult to accomplish. State and local governments and their employees would pay for their medicare coverage according to the schedule now set out in the law—that is, 0.5 percent of salary up to $6,600 per employee and employer, rising to 0.85 percent in 1987. In short, these new participants would fully pay their share of insurance coverage. I see every reason that they should be included.

Each of the five bills I introduce here today sets out to fill gaps in existing medicare legislation. The original law was, indeed, precedent breaking and effectively responsive to a desperate social need. But the work of Congress is never done. We have a continuing responsibility to insure that medicare meets the needs of all our elderly citizens, that it is well administered, and that it remains open to essential improvements. In fulfilling that responsibility, let us give these bills the favorable attention they deserve.

LOUIS AZRAEL TELLS HOW TO TALK ABOUT MARYLAND

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are justly proud of our beautiful city of Washington, the Capital of our great Nation. Yet many people do not know that the District of Columbia was a gift of my State of Maryland to the United States as a seat of the Federal Government.

Therefore, it would appear to be obvious that more people should know something about the Free State, which is the first State south of the Mason-Dixon line. Maryland has been a political entity for over three centuries and its capitol—the State House—which is still in use, was built in 1772, and is where Gen. George Washington resigned his commission.

From the days when it was first a British colony in 1634, to the present, the State of Maryland has always played an important role in American history, in science, culture, education, commerce, and industry. How then shall we talk of this place that has produced many truly great men? What shall we say of its amazing growth and its vitality? I call my colleagues' attention to an excellently written article by Louis Azrael entitled "How To Talk About Maryland," which appeared in the News American of Baltimore on Sunday, June 18, 1967.

Mr. Azrael, a regular columnist for that important newspaper, is not only a gifted writer with a fluent pen, but he also possesses a keen intellect and incisive mind as evidenced in his daily column. What he says is always of interest. Under unanimous consent I include his article about Maryland—America in miniature—at this point in the RECORD:

HOW TO TALK ABOUT MARYLAND

(By Louis Azrael)

Before summer ends you'll probably go somewhere outside Maryland, or you'll talk with people who visit Maryland, and you'll be asked questions.

What's your state like, they will ask. Tell me about it.

The usual response to such questions is to talk about Maryland's variety, ("America in Miniature") and the Chesapeake Bay, about fish and crabs, and sailboats, about Fort McHenry, and Johns Hopkins, about Western Maryland's mountains and the Eastern Shore's traditions—whatever they may be.

But maybe, at this point, you'll need some help.

What you tell about your state should depend, of course, on whom you're talking to; on what interests your hearer.

Is he interested in vital statistics? You can tell him that Maryland has about 3,700,000 inhabitants and gets 228 more each average day. And that the state has 6.3 million acres of land, one-half of which is used for 20,670 farms.

You can say that over 800 islands, not counting the hundreds which are less than ten acres large, lie within Maryland waters. (Some have amusing names: Pone, Tizzard, Shelldrake, Tippity-Witchy, etc.)

And you can sadly add that over 300 acres of Maryland soil disappear every year, washed into the waters by erosion which proper management could greatly reduce.

Is your hearer interested in business? You can boast that 38 corporations, chartered in Maryland, are listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Only eight states have more (Delaware leads with 443) though Maryland ranks twenty-first in population. And add that there are 172 banks, which have 516 branches, in the state.

Do you like to use big figures? Tell the folks that Maryland's state roads cover land which, at book values, is worth almost two billion dollars. Or say the state's 5,000 dairy farms produce 178 million gallons of milk per year.

You might be able to surprise some persons by dropping the remark that one-fourth of all Marylanders are involved in the school system, either as pupils, faculty members or service employees . . . And that the biggest transportation system in the state is the school bus system, which operates almost 5,000 buses and two boats.

Is your hearer impressed by "firsts" and "onlys"? Tell him the oldest railroad station in the world, which still serves trains, is on the B. and O. main line at Ellicott City . . . And that the biggest water wheel in the world is near Chesapeake City at the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Unused now, it was equipped with huge buckets that scooped water out of Back Creek and dumped it into the canal to retain its water level.

You can tell him about the oldest grist mill in operation in the United States. It is the Linchester Mill near Preston in Caroline County . . . and about the oldest Protestant Church in the United States, which is Trinity Church near Cambridge . . . and about the first National Cathedral Shrine, a replica of the shrine at the Grotto of Lourdes, which is on a mountain side near Emmitsburg in Frederick County.

And speaking of "only," you can tell him that Maryland is the only state in the country which still has a Motion Picture Censor Board. (Though it has been shorn of almost all its power.)

You can talk about strange places. For instance, the Craneville Swamp in Garrett County. It is freakish because much of its vegetation and some of its animals are the kind that should be several hundred miles north, even as far as Canada.

Somehow, as the Ice Age passed, this swamp's elevation and drainage facilities created a "frost pocket." In that pocket, such far-north plants as the tamarack, such animals as the Snowshoe Hare, such birds as the slate-colored Snowbird, remain and reproduce.

You can talk of the wildlife refuge at Blackwater Park in Dorchester County which teems, in season, with thousands of ducks and geese and rare song birds.

SECURE EXISTENCE

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused today on the United Nations General Assembly as it starts its emergency session to discuss recent events in the Middle East, at the request of Soviet Russia.

It is strange indeed for Communist Russia to charge the small State of Israel with "aggression" against its Arab neighbors when it is a well known fact that Russia has backed Nasser for years in her ambition to destroy Israel. One need only to review the lineup of forces on both sides to realize that in numbers, geography and resources, the Arabs have a huge advantage over Israel. It is unrealistic to believe that Israel, with her population of 2.7 million, would commit aggression against the Arab countries with a population of 54 million.

It is also a fact that the Arabs have been belligerent for decades and that the attitude of Russia has been one of hostility toward Israel; that the entire history of Russia has been one of terror and aggression.

In the treaty that will eventually be signed to bring peace to the Middle East, I submit that Israel must be permitted to use the Suez Canal, which the United Nations and the great powers promised as a condition of the 1957 armistice, but which the Arabs never allowed.

Israel must also be able to use the Gulf of Aqaba—an international waterway, without hinderance. And, in all justice and fairness, that ancient land which was reborn 19 years ago should not be required to withdraw from the territory which is rightly hers.

Because of the timeliness and importance to the peace of the world in solving the Middle East situation, I invite my colleagues' attention to an editorial in the influential Baltimore Sun entitled "Secure Existence," which appeared on Sunday, June 18, 1967. It is as follows:

"SECURE EXISTENCE"

President Johnson's statement at Austin—"The first and greatest requirement is that each nation must accept the right of its neighbors to stable and secure existence"—starts the United States in the right direction in the discussion of the Middle East which now has moved to the United Nations General Assembly. This is the relevant point. If it were accepted by Egypt and the other Arab states, plus the Soviet Union, progress could be made towards solutions of such matters as passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal, the possible internationalizing of Jerusalem and the resettlement of the Arab refugees.

Israel cannot be expected to pull back its troops from their present positions—and least of all to return to the conditions which prevailed as of June 4—without solid assurances that it will not henceforth be compelled to fight almost continuously for its existence against states pledged to its destruction. Assurances of this kind must come from its Arab state neighbors, but the two big powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, can do much to help guide developments in that direction.

President Johnson's point should be followed up, and amplified, in the General Assembly on Monday. A restrained, forward-looking position by the United States would put us on the right side in the United Nations debate. Moreover, it would help to expose the weakness of the Soviet Union's position if, as thus far indicated, the big Russian delegation came to this country primarily to put on a propaganda show against Israel and the United States.

ELEMENTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SEC PROPOSALS AND THE GOVERNMENT'S SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Philip F. Hack, of New Orleans, La., I am calling to your attention the following article by one of his associates, Mr. Robert B. Lacoste:

ELEMENTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SEC PROPOSALS AND THE GOVERNMENT'S SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

Analysis of the NASD Study undertaken by Booz-Allen Applied Research, Inc., covering the probable effect of implementing proposals of the SEC in its report to the Congress, entitled *Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth,* calling for legislative and other action, reveals that the proposals would bring about effects directly opposed to the main thrust of the Government's intervention in American Business and industry over the past several decades.

A juxtaposition of the elements in this pattern of cross-currents will serve to bring out this contradiction:

1. Bigness, tending toward monopoly, has been fought by the Government under anti-