

June 16, 1967

A 3074

Administration's exceptional accomplishments in these programs.

Miss Parsons is a member of the executive committee of the President's Study Group on Careers for Women, which was established by President Johnson on February 28, 1966.

It gives me great pleasure to commend this outstanding American woman for her achievements, and to congratulate her on receiving the doctor of laws degree of which she is so deserving from the University of North Carolina.

File
History Must Not Repeat

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
 HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week Israel stood alone in her battle for survival and won a stunning victory over the Russian-backed Arab forces. This week the United States must stand with her in the diplomatic struggle to guarantee her borders and her safety. To win the war and lose the peace is an old familiar refrain, and we cannot let this occur again. In reference to this, I commend to my colleagues this excellent editorial from the June 8, 1967, issue of the Long Island Press:

ISRAEL'S NEXT CAMPAIGN

Israel has scored one of the most astonishing victories in military history. This tiny land, with less than half the number of people who live on Long Island, took on the entire Arab world of more than 100 million and in three days destroyed their air forces, ran through their armies and stands triumphant at Suez, Sharm el Sheikh and Jerusalem. What makes this so utterly remarkable is that the Arabs were backed by the Soviet Union with billions in military and economic aid.

But now Israel faces the even more crucial struggle to secure her military victories. Russia, smarting from her humiliation, has already begun to salvage what she can of her hypocritical investment in the world's last major feudal leaders, the repressive and reactionary regimes of Arab colonels and kings.

Israel did the militarily impossible by herself. In the emerging diplomatic campaign she must have the full support of the United States and the other major Western powers.

Her military victories, as she said, were not for conquest, but for survival. She must show now that the land and installations she captured are not booty, but simply the means she did not previously possess to drive effective bargains.

Israel must use those gains until she has unequivocal guarantees that her real aim—peaceful coexistence with the Arabs—will be honored. She doesn't want acreage or canals. She wants to remain alive with fear-free borders and the same rights as other nations to sail international waters. The United Nations has failed to provide such guarantees. That is why Israel had to go to war. As Foreign Minister Abba Eban asked the other night, "What is the effect of the UN presence if it is an umbrella that is taken away as soon as it begins to rain?" Russia and the UN do not have the right to ask Israel to move back unless they guarantee an umbrella will remain until it stops raining insane Arabs.

**The Blue Ridge: Nature and the
 Human Spirit**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, it was my privilege to attend the dedication of the Harry F. Byrd, Sr., Visitors' Center in Shenandoah National Park, on the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia.

This center represents the addition of another major interpretive facility in the National Park System, in a park which has a phenomenal public visitation rate, primarily because the Skyline Drive runs through it, giving the motorists a magnificent view of the Valley of Virginia and the Virginia Piedmont.

Among those present for the dedication was our colleague, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Representative from the State of Colorado. Our distinguished colleague, as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, enjoys a nationwide reputation for his active interest in our national parks and public lands. He has been the author of much hallmark legislation enacted into law.

The principal speaker of the dedication ceremonies for the Harry F. Byrd, Sr., Visitor Center was Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Jr., of Virginia, and I was impressed by his recollection of the consistent manner in which the late Senator Byrd found inspiration, and restoration of his resolve in public service, through his communions with nature in the Shenandoah National Park, in the creation of which he played such a prominent and effective part.

Harry F. Byrd, Sr., loved the Blue Ridge, but the visitation record in Shenandoah National Park makes plain that his affection for these mountains has been shared by millions of his fellow citizens from all parts of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the address of Governor Godwin, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.,
 MEMORIAL DEDICATION OF THE HARRY F.
 BYRD, SR., VISITOR CENTER, SHENANDOAH
 NATIONAL PARK, JUNE 10, 1967

Today, Harry Flood Byrd, Sr. would have reached four-score years, and without doubt he would have been with us in the flesh as he surely is in the spirit.

But had that been so, the crowd would have been somewhat thinner, for his way would have been to lead us on foot up the mountainside. At the top, his ruddy face slightly flushed as the only sign of exertion, he would have smiled benignly at the stragglers stumbling up after him.

The greatest of biographers could hardly have captured Harry Byrd on paper, and the most silver-tongued of orators could not have paid him proper tribute, although he would have acknowledged their efforts with a gracious smile and an occasional nod.

And yet, when that honor today fell on me, there was no hesitancy, there was no discussion of the pros and cons. I simply had to come and to try.

The Harry Byrd the world knew was first a man with virtues respected in him for

their scarcity in an urbane and sophisticated world, a man of his word always, a gentleman even in the white heat of political conflict, a public figure whose sincerity was never suspect, even by the smallest minds.

Never in serious contention for national office, he was nonetheless a national figure, around whose example men rallied in many states far removed from his own.

Among his own constituents, he could, and not infrequently did, refuse requests for his influence from powerful quarters, and yet he rarely made an enemy by these actions. Even though they might be unsuccessful, those who went to him came away knowing he had taken his position out of conviction, and their respect for him multiplied.

There were few wiser judges of Virginia's public temper than Harry Byrd, but in all his years of campaigning, he had no need for pretensions, and little sympathy for those who felt that need.

But when trials of his long and often lonely battle in Washington threatened to engulf him, he had a sure remedy. He would go climb a mountain.

As he reminisced in his later years, Senator Byrd liked to recall that he had climbed Old Rag on his fifteenth birthday, a year in which he took command of the family newspaper at Winchester, already wise far beyond his years.

It was typical of him that instinctively he devised for himself in climbing mountains a health program that might have been prescribed by physical fitness professionals, the exercise of his heart, lungs, and body, even as he freed his mind from the cares forever carried with him.

But it was hardly to maintain a super human energy that he returned so often to the mountain trails. It was purely and simply that he loved these hills. Here he found a strength akin to that which the Old Testament prophets drew from their desert slopes.

But for him it was not enough to make the climb alone, above the troubles that beset lesser men, and which so often surrounded the man himself.

He was content only if others could share what he found here, if a great sweep of nature's handiwork could be preserved for all time, and for all people.

And again, history has proved his judgment. Consistently in recent years, Shenandoah National Park has been second only to a sister region to the south in the number of visitors from all over this nation who have found peace upon its craggy heights.

Officially and privately, this was the province of his concern. As Virginia's governor, he argued its location and persuaded the Congress and the Park Service that this spot in Virginia was ideal for their purpose.

As U.S. Senator, his budgetary vigilance was relaxed only where the Park Service, and Shenandoah National Park in particular, were concerned.

And as a citizen, still concerned for the comforts and enjoyment of others, he provided, in sequence, four shelters which bear his name.

His feeling for the mountains came not purely in a search for a refuge. From his earliest days, they were one of the many traditions held secure and deep within him.

As a boy, he walked the narrow mountain trails with his father. Having all the world to choose from, he spent his honeymoon on one of these hilltops.

Countless times he climbed these mountains, joining his companions from the valley below and the mountain men themselves, in the enjoyment of its rough and open spaces.

We will never know how many of Virginia's, and the nation's, courses of action were determined on these slopes, or in what were then the isolated cabins nestled among the trees.

We do know that here was to be found a Senator Byrd at rest, one who appeared to

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3073

cently of a young South Carolina paratrooper at Fort Bragg. Lt. Ronald Greer Reeves of Charleston, a 23-year-old Clemson graduate and a non-drinker, died in his own vomit after taking part in a drinking ritual which passes as the initiation ceremony for certain paratroop elements at Fort Bragg.

Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson and Army Secretary Stanley Resor have expressed regret over the incident, but their professions of sorrow took on a hollow ring when they added that such rituals "serve a useful role in developing esprit and a sense of unity within military units."

Hogwash!

Any outfit—be it military, collegiate, fraternal or otherwise—which finds it necessary to build morale by boozing it up is sadly lacking in integrity and in self-sufficiency. The swilling of liquor is no sign of strength, of character, of fortitude, of intellect, or of any of the attributes which go toward the making of a man.

The individual who can look his tempters in the face, spit in their eyes, and declare: "I need none of your lousy liquor to prove my manhood," is the stronger, not the weaker, for it.

The United States Army has had the unqualified support of this newspaper and of this editor for as many years as either can remember. But if the military establishment continues to tolerate drinking sprees of the sort which cost the life of Lt. Reeves, then it will forfeit much of the esteem which it has enjoyed, not only from this source, but from the public.

Frustration at United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations is off course, has apparently abandoned its peaceful purpose and now looms more as a threat to free men than refuge against tyranny.

Out of control of reasonable men, it has demonstrated its unreliability in the Arab-Israel matter by withdrawing a peacekeeping force and conversely in the South-West Africa matter, it reaffirms its frustration by trying to invade and take over a peaceful country.

Its respect has disappeared and beneath the wearing shimmer of its gold-plated promises, most people are awakening to the U.N. being used as greatest threat to world peace and free men.

Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks a Washington Post editorial of June 16:

How To HURT THE U.N.

By electing a council and commissioner to run South-West Africa, the United Nations ends one of its most foolish and least necessary chapters. South Africa, which administers South-West Africa under a League of Nations mandate, simply refuses to let the United Nations have it. The General Assembly lacks the power and procedure to implement its will, as it knew before undertaking this exercise in diplomatic surrealism. Since the great powers have no heart for tackling South Africa on the issue, there was and is no chance for Security Council implementation.

The responsible course for the third-world countries interested in South-West Africa would have been to launch an amendment of the United Nations Charter in order to compel all old League mandates to come under the United Nations. Currently the holder of a League mandate has a choice whether to relinquish it; South Africa has chosen not to. That is the legal basis of the United Nations' frustration.

The small states in the world body also have a choice. They must decide whether to use it to unlimber their vanities and vocal cords, and thereby condemn it to damaging displays of impotence and irrelevance. Or they can use it for the serious and effective pursuit of their various national goals, thereby dignifying the United Nations and strengthening it for its many difficult tasks. The performance of the small states in the Middle East crisis can comfort no true friend of the United Nations. Nor can their performance on South-West Africa.

Irene Parsons Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are very familiar with the phrase that "actions speak louder than words," and, regardless of how many words are issued on the equality of the sexes in employment, it takes firm action to see that these are implemented. Under the present administration these words have been transformed into actions, and we now have many high-ranking positions in the executive branch being administered successfully by women.

One of the most outstanding examples of women in Government is Miss Irene Parsons, the Assistant Administrator for Personnel of the Veterans' Administration. She has become a living example that efficiency and achievement are not limited to men.

Much recognition has been given to Miss Parsons for her outstanding Government work, but the old adage that a "prophet is not without honor save in his own country" went by the wayside on June 4 when Miss Parsons' alma mater extended outstanding recognition of her contributions by presenting her with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

In presenting the doctorate, Chancellor James S. Ferguson, of the university, had this to say:

Irene Parsons, the recognition of your administrative abilities, your superior achievements, and your outstanding service to the government of the United States has brought honor to North Carolina, your native state, and to the University of Greensboro, your Alma Mater. Your appointment by President Johnson in 1965 to the position of Assistant Administrator of the Veterans Administration—the highest personnel post in federal government held by a woman—acknowledged a unique record of accomplishment during an eighteen-year-long association with the federal government's third largest agency. Your consciousness of the equal rights of women and minority groups in matters of employment opportunity has been

influential and has brought honor to you and to your agency. For distinction in government service, for a career accomplishment which is unique among women, and for an influential belief in equality of job opportunity, Miss Parsons, by vote of the Faculty and that of the Trustees of the University of North Carolina, I confer upon you the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws with all its rights and privileges.

Miss Parsons' contributions to Government serve as an incentive to all women throughout this country, proving that devotion to duty and preparation for service through study and experience are the prime prerequisites for accomplishment and success.

Miss Parsons has achieved many "firsts" in her career. She was the first woman to receive such a high personnel appointment directly from the President. On August 5, 1965, in a White House ceremony, President Johnson appointed Miss Parsons to her present position. It was the highest position ever held by a woman in the Veterans' Administration and the highest personnel position held by a woman in Government. The Veterans' Administration is the third largest Government agency, having 170,000 employes, 60,000 of which are women.

This appointment became a challenge to Miss Parsons. She attacked the problems of this high office with vigor and determination. The results of her administrative abilities, recognized prior to her appointment, verified the confidence exhibited by the President in her appointment. She has implemented procedures and has made the VA personnel operation one of the most successful in Government.

Her subsequent successes have served as the basis for proof that accomplishment is not restricted to any one sex. Her list of activities and accomplishments are numerous, proving that for those who aspire to success the door is open in America.

Miss Parsons' appointment came about when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs William J. Driver submitted her name to the President following a request for the names of outstanding career employees for consideration in the staffing of Presidential appointments.

Miss Parsons is a native of North Wilkesboro, N.C., and graduated from the University of North Carolina. She received a master of science degree in public administration from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. During World War II, she served with the Coast Guard, attaining the rank of lieutenant. She was employed by the Veterans' Administration in 1946, and progressively was given increasingly responsible positions. She has received many awards and commendations for the outstanding quality and effectiveness of her work, including the Federal Woman's Award as one of the outstanding women in Government in 1966. She is recognized as a strong influence for efficiency and economy in Government. Her personal efforts to advance equal employment opportunity have been cited as contributing greatly to the Veterans'

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3069

goods, with American flags and decorations, drove mad the Pekinists."

Only two years ago, our FBI seized international Communist conspirators planning to dynamite several of our national monuments and the Statue of Liberty where there always are crowds of tourists.

In criticizing extreme predictions of summer violence made by Dr. Martin Luther King, the prudent FBI director was protecting all Americans.

No people can afford the denigration of their outstanding public servants through intellectual snobbery. Its few practitioners reveal themselves as both undemocratic and ungrateful.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a June 1967 newsletter which is being mailed to constituents in Michigan.

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

U.S. SENATOR BOB GRIFFIN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

OUR FIGHT FOR CLEAN AIR

There is "overwhelming evidence" that air pollution is linked to lung cancer, emphysema and other respiratory infections, according to a report by the Surgeon General's office.

Some startling statistics gathered by the U.S. Public Health Service indicate the scope of this growing peril:

135 million tons of airborne "garbage" scattered into the nation's atmosphere yearly.

\$11 billion in property damage annually as pollutants corrode metals and machinery, deface buildings and spoil crops.

In the next 14 years, the nation is expected to burn as much gas and oil as it has consumed in the previous 107 years.

It's no wonder Congress is searching hard for better answers to the pollution problem. But the battle is so big that vigorous efforts are urgently needed on the part of private citizens as well as public agencies at all levels.

On the Federal level, I believe Congress should give antipollution forces much needed strength and incentive by passing a bill, which I have co-sponsored, to provide a 20-percent tax credit to those industries which install effective pollution control equipment.

Another method for cutting air pollution is receiving widespread attention. I refer to the growing demand for a practical electric car. I believe our recent Senate hearings on this subject have spurred auto and battery manufacturers to new heights in the efforts to make the modern-age electric car a reality.

In addition, there is encouraging news that private industry is now working harder than ever to develop a gasoline-powered engine that will be pollution free.

VIET NAM AND VANDENBERG

Michigan's Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican architect of non-partisan foreign policy, stood behind a Democratic President and declared, "Politics stops at the water's edge."

When I was in Vietnam a year ago, 260,000 U.S. troops were committed to battle.

Now there are 500,000, and the number of Americans killed has passed the 10,000 mark.

The conflict in Viet Nam is a confused, bloody, expensive and unpopular labyrinth. Casualties have continued to mount—and so have criticisms of the Administration and its policies.

Of course, any American can dissent from Administration policy. The right to disagree is what America is all about.

However, I believe that in time of war Republicans have a high responsibility to leave politics at the water's edge. For the most part, the Viet Nam debate in Congress has served the national interest because it has been non-partisan.

When Governor Romney spoke on Viet Nam at Hartford, Connecticut, leaders in both parties hailed his words. In saying—

"Let us pursue with strength the just peace in South Viet Nam that our prayers should so earnestly seek, and that may yet be within our grasp.

"So doing, we can fulfill our role as the last best hope on earth. . . ."

—Romney spoke in the Vandenberg tradition: not as a politician, but as a dedicated American.

IS VICTIM "FORGOTTEN MAN"?—CONGRESS ZEROES IN ON CRIME PROBLEM

At long last Congress is giving the problem of crime the national attention it so sorely demands. A comprehensive Crime Commission report issued in February has documented these shocking statistics:

In 1965, there was 9,850 intentional killings, 22,467 forcible rapes, 118,916 robberies, 206,661 aggravated assaults and 1,173,201 burglaries in the United States.

In addition, 762,352 larcenies and 486,568 motor vehicle thefts were committed.

Michigan has not been spared. Last year, in Detroit alone, 131,777 known offenses were committed—40 percent more than in 1965.

The Commission's report proclaims the great need to combat not only "crime in the streets" but also the intricacies of organized crime and the spreading disease of narcotics.

Following publication of the report, a flurry of anticrime legislation has been introduced in Congress. Included are such bills as:

The President's Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

Measures to modify recent Supreme Court rulings on the use of confessions.

Bills to outlaw wiretapping.

Legislation to provide more assistance for state and local law enforcement agencies, such as for the education of officers and the purchase of modern equipment.

These measures are receiving Congressional study. However, I have also been concerned about the forgotten man in the crime picture. I refer to the crime victim.

I have introduced legislation to permit an income tax deduction for all medical expenses incurred as a result of a criminal act and for theft losses. In addition, my bill would allow a tax deduction of up to \$300 for amounts invested by an individual for certain crime prevention devices, such as locks and burglar alarms.

Incidentally, although the Administration has not yet indicated support for my bill, the President's Commission said in its report that "the general principle of victim compensation . . . is sound."

TAX FAX

The average American taxpayer spends two hours and 25 minutes out of each eight-hour working day just earning enough money to pay his taxes, according to the Tax Foundation.

Or, to put it another way, if he has worked steadily all year, the average taxpayer finally began working for himself about April 21. All the money he earned until then goes to pay his taxes.

Incidentally, if you paid as much as \$4,281 in Federal income tax last year, you may be interested to know that your "contribution"

was just enough to keep the government running for . . . one second.

Government statisticians say it takes \$4,281 to fuel the federal machine every second of every day in the year, based on a \$135 billion budget for fiscal 1968.

HELP FOR HOME OWNERSHIP

I have joined Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois and 35 other Senators in sponsoring revolutionary new legislation designed to ease the housing crisis in our big cities.

The proposed National Home Ownership Foundation Act has been developed as a way to help lower income families who want to help themselves.

Under the plan:

Prospective home owners would be called upon to make a down payment in one of two ways, either by a modest financial outlay or in the form of personal labor.

The Federal Government would set up a foundation, guarantee debentures, provide seed money, make technical assistance available and help carry out training and education programs.

The local community and private enterprise would be working partners on the team.

The concept of home ownership is basic to the American way of life. In my view, realistic policies which encourage home ownership (such as FHA) have done more to combat communism in America than the FBI, the CIA and the Un-American Activities Committee, all rolled together.

SOCIAL SECURITY RED TAPE

"Surely eight months is too long to wait."

Such a comment is all too familiar in the flood of mail I have been receiving about slow processing of Social Security and medicare claims.

A student who applied for dependents' benefits complained that she had received no payments from the time of her filing, in September, 1966, until April, 1967.

One Michigan resident was not only eight months behind in receiving reimbursement under medicare—but in the confusion, his Social Security retirement benefits were cut off and his wife started receiving widow's benefits.

Social Security is the major source of income for about one-half of the beneficiaries over 65. A delay of a month—or even a week—is a serious blow to those who have nowhere else to turn.

I have joined with several other Senators in calling for a Senate investigation to dig out the causes of such delays and to find ways for improving the administration of Social Security and medicare programs.

WHY TAX SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS?

When the Administration submitted its Social Security program to Congress, it included a proposal to tax Social Security and railroad retirement benefits. Such a move would penalize retirees by imposing double taxation on their efforts to build a retirement income. For this reason, I have joined Senator Everett Dirksen and others in sponsoring a resolution to declare that "Social Security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes."

file
Russia and the Mideast: Efforts for Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a very significant column appeared in this morn-

A 3070

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 16, 1967

ing's Washington Post entitled "Russia and Mideast: Efforts for Peace—or War?" by the noted columnist Roscoe Drummond.

Mr. Drummond calls "dangerous and wishful fiction" the theory that the "Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time." He traces the actions and the attitude on the part of the Soviets prior to and during the several days of war and concludes that the Soviet Union "helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop."

Quite right, I think, Mr. Drummond points out that "it is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the very penetrating column by Roscoe Drummond in the RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST—EFFORTS FOR PEACE—OR WAR?

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is being built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1—By every device at its command—massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2—Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it could cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of the Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3—Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President Johnson over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

A Missile Crisis in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Vietnam Missile Crisis?" written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, and published in the Washington Post of June 11, 1967.

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

A VIETNAM MISSILE CRISIS? UNITED NATIONS OFFICIALS WARN U.S. THAT RUSSIA PLANS TO ESCALATE WAR WITH MEDIUM MISSILES
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Worrisome evidence is building up that the Soviet Union has decided to escalate the Vietnam war by introducing medium-range missiles, possibly triggering a Vietnamese missile crisis.

Officials at the highest level in the United Nations are going out of their way to warn the United States informally of Soviet intentions. These officials—obviously talking from knowledge—say North Vietnamese technicians are being trained in Russia to handle and fire medium-range ground-to-ground ballistic missiles.

Furthermore, United States intelligence, using highly sensitive airborne cameras, is all but convinced that recent Soviet cargoes into North Vietnam contained such missiles.

Expert photo-analysts made this judgment by scrutinizing blow-ups of the configuration of the visible part of the cargo—just as they accurately identified missiles on Soviet vessels during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

When fully operable, the intermediate missiles could be fired from north of the 17th parallel, the North-South Vietnam border, into Saigon. No one, however, knows when that time will come. It depends on whether the Soviet Union would permit Russians to handle the monstrous weapons, or insist on waiting until the North Vietnamese became trained.

A footnote: A possible explanation for Poland's anti-Israeli stand may be its increasingly firm alliance with East Germany, which has been currying favor with the Arab states.

U.S. Responsibility in Winning the Mideast Peace

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. HALPERN, Mr. Speaker, the brave and valiant Israelis—men, women and children of all ages—have amazed the world with their determined might. They not only have thrown back their enemies, but have pushed them far into the Arab's own territories.

Israel prowess, her will and her determination have won the admiration of freedom-loving people everywhere. And there is no question but that Israel has even won the respect, begrudging as it may be, of her bitterest enemies.

Unlike the Arabs, whose repeatedly stated objective has been one of destruction, a vow reflected so vividly by the Nasser crisis which brought war to the Middle East, Israel seeks only to live in security and peace, and in cooperation with her neighbors. In this war, as in the hostilities of 1956, Israel sought only to defend her land, protect her people and their freedom.

The fundamental issues remain unchanged.

In obvious desperation, as a cover for the devastating Arab military defeats, Nasser and his stooges claim the United States secretly fought much of Israel's battle. We know only too well this is not so. We have proved it is not so. But Nasser keeps repeating it—typical of his Hitler-like big-lie technique, and typical of his wild and blatant irresponsibility.

Then the Egyptian dictator compounded his belligerence and vindictiveness by cutting off diplomatic relations with the United States.

All this is quite ironic, to say the least, because, to the dismay of many Americans and contrary to our long-standing legal and moral commitments, reiterated repeatedly by four of our Presidents—and no nation could have been more reassured by our pledges than Israel—our State Department had announced a policy of neutrality.

The Department's official position was that the United States would be "neutral in thought, word and deed." How ridiculous was this statement. Oh yes, it was later modified to say they meant "non-belligerence."

Israel did not ask us to be belligerent, but we owed it to her to be steadfast in our allegiance, to be unequivocal in our support, to be true to our commitments.

When the showdown came, there was too much quibbling as to the exact language, the real meaning, of our commitments—as if there should be any question of its application. Then, to top this, came the startling State Department

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3071

statement. Israel was left standing alone. All of us were left frustrated, bewildered.

But Israel stood up to its greatest challenge, met it bravely, and right prevailed. And now, we hear wild acclaim for Israel's armies—how great the victory was. How magnificent those Israelis are on the battlefield. You have got to hand it to those Jews. We even hear how the United States ought to retain Moïshe Dayan to run our Defense Department.

All this is well and good. But where do we go from here? Is this admiration and newly won support just to be superficial, or is it to have real meaning?

Is our Government going to heed our voices, the voices of the vast majority of the American people?

Or are we going to crawl back into the State Department shells and let the striped-pants boys continue to guide U.S. policy?

We should have learned our lesson a long time ago. You cannot appease Nasser or his stooges, nor can you reason with stubborn resistance to reality by assuming a weak position and maintaining a policy lacking in firmness.

The time has come when our Government should forget about currying favor with the Arabs. Instead, we should take the leadership in the community of nations to insist on a settlement on terms that will not leave the way open for further threats to Israel and to world peace; that we must have a settlement that will not bring a new crisis, another war, and another cease-fire.

There must not be just another armistice. Two armistices, those of 1947 and 1956, have failed. A third, leaving the basic disputes unresolved, would stand no better chance. In any league, three strikes are out. The world cannot risk a third strike in the Middle East.

The mistakes and failures of 1946 and 1957 must not be repeated.

In 1957, after the Sinai campaign, Israel's withdrawal of forces was based on her acceptance of four major assumptions, reinforced by recognized principles of international law.

First, the Suez would remain open to Israel's shipping.

Second, the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba would be international waters, guaranteeing to all nations the rights of free passage.

Third, the Gaza strip would not be under the United Arab Republic, but would be protected by United Nations Emergency Forces.

Fourth, efforts would be made to move toward a relaxing of tensions and peace.

We all know only too well the synthetic meaning of those agreements Israel accepted in good faith in 1957.

The simple fact now remains that Israel cannot be expected to go back to the status quo—where there has been no peace and the declared design of her neighbors has continually been to destroy her.

Now the Israelis doubtless are not going to evacuate the Arab areas they hold without firmer assurances than they had before, underwritten by international guarantees to protect Israel's sovereignty as a nation, to secure normalized and realistic borders and free

passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

Israel must also have more satisfaction and cooperation in dealing with other issues, such as the refugee problem, water rights and meaningful restoration of international peacekeeping forces.

No withdrawal can be expected of Israel without these completely new conditions of peace and stability.

The United States is committed to resist aggression and defend freedom. How often have we heard that. I won't even bring up the question of whether Saigon is more sacred than Jerusalem. But I do maintain we can still give meaning to these words. We can yet redeem our pledges to Israel. What we did, or failed to do, is behind us. We now have the opportunity to fulfill our commitment to Israel by standing up for Israel's rights in the peace settlement to come.

Despite her glorious victories, despite her peaceful goals, despite the enthusiastic support of people throughout the world, the fact remains Israel can still lose on the diplomatic front.

She desperately needs the unqualified support of the United States and most of the other big powers to help win a settlement that will bring a lasting peace.

She must have strong allies. She must have the United States at her side in the struggle for diplomatic achievement of her goals for survival and for the future economic and social development of her neighbors.

Israel has the right to expect from the community of nations a new era. But this new era can only be consummated by statesmanship leading to the general peace settlement. That is when the expert skill and power of U.S. diplomacy is needed so badly and must be forthcoming.

We can take immediate leadership in the world community by moving our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This simple change can be a symbol of our support for a future with no false boundaries, no divided cities, no built-in points of crisis and tension.

And there must be a satisfactory resolution of the confused questions of boundaries. The solution should include realistic territorial adjustments in keeping with historic and strategic requirements.

All of Jerusalem must remain within Israel's borders.

There must be inclusion within Israel's boundaries of the Syrian and Jordanian hills overlooking Israel's previous shaky borders.

There must be transit rights for Israel ships and the ships of all nations through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

There must be guarantees for these territorial and shipping rights through meaningful international authority.

There must be direct talks between the nations involved, and especially there should be direct attempts to find agreeable solutions to the refugee problem. And, in this regard, the United Nations could cooperate toward the peaceful resettlement of the Arab refugees in

lands where they can find opportunities. I would like to see a concept of a confederation of Arabs and Israelis to work toward finding solutions of their time-worn problems and toward mutual regional goals.

There must be serious, high-level talks between the United States and the Soviets. Surely, the Soviets must now recognize that their \$3 billion worth of arms to the Arabs has hardly been a good investment and its repetition would not offer the most likely means to stabilize Soviet influence in the Middle East. There must be recognition of the fact that renewal of the Mideast arms race would be inconsistent with the efforts the United States and the Soviets are making toward a nonproliferation agreement.

And of paramount importance to the peace settlement, there must be Arab recognition of Israel's sovereignty. No settlement with the Arabs could be effective unless it embodies acceptance of Israel's statehood and rejects the fiction of its nonexistence.

An important challenge for our country is its promotion of stability through assistance to the Middle East as a region, through encouragement of cooperation among all the nations of that area.

We are thankful for Israel's military might in repelling cruel forces of hatred and aggression. But Israel can achieve its true destiny only through reconciliation with the Arabs and achievement of their mutual destinies in the Middle East. A future in which Israel's development techniques, in making the deserts bloom, in medicine and education are shared with its neighbors.

The Arabs must overcome neurotic resentments. Perhaps the shock treatment of defeat will bring them to accept the performance of Israel and to develop jointly a new relationship for mutual welfare and progress.

Any other course will lead to new bitterness, new tensions and more war—perhaps a less controllable, more destructive war, one involving the entire world.

American diplomacy must arrive at a working arrangement with Russia to prevent a new confrontation. The Soviet Union must be made to understand the consequences of seeking domination of the Middle East by using Israelis as the scapegoats and the Arabs as tools.

And the United States on the other hand must help to bring reform and progress to the Arab world by encouraging democratic elements, rather than working through bigoted, despotic, and feudalistic rulers.

I strongly believe that our Government should announce a broad emergency economic assistance program for Israel to help rebuild the devastation the war has caused within its borders. And, if the Arabs show a willingness to work toward regional cooperation, then in the name of humanity we should consider assisting their countries in the reconstruction that lies ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Arab antagonists have pursued a course at the diplomatic level designed to overcome their losses at the military level. They must not succeed, for the sake of Israel, or the sake of the United

A 3072

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 16, 1967

States, for the sake of freedom, for the sake of humanity. The United States must stand by Israel steadfastly, to win the realistic diplomatic victory that is so vital for a lasting peace. Our Government must be unequivocal toward this objective.

Condemnation of Army Sanction of Unofficial Rituals Involving Use of Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the people of South Carolina and the Nation were shocked and saddened to learn recently of the death of Lt. Ronald Greer Reeves, of Charleston, S.C. This young officer's death was the direct result of an Army initiation event involving the use of alcoholic beverages.

All of us recognize the value of various rituals in building esprit de corps in military units, but I feel that very few of us would feel that the use of alcohol in such rituals would serve any useful purpose at all. There are many tests of manhood, and it appears that Lieutenant Reeves had met them all. The very fact that he had abstained from the use of alcoholic beverages made him the more vulnerable to them.

Mr. President, I feel that the Army as well as other Departments of the armed services should immediately take whatever steps are necessary to remove sanction, official or otherwise, to events of the type which occurred at Fort Bragg, N.C., and resulted in the death of Lieutenant Reeves.

An editorial which goes right to the heart of this matter was published in the June 3, 1967, issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C. Editor William D. Workman entitled his editorial "Measuring Manhood." His succinct treatment of this tragic event should be posted on every troop information board in the U.S. Army. Moreover, such counsel on conduct should be coming from the commanders of our men in uniform. The Army is walking a tightrope in this entire matter, and I think it is past time the responsible officers at the top levels of command go on record in this area without any equivocation in opposing the use of alcohol in events of this nature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Workman and an article entitled "Prop Blast Party Said Cause of Officer's Death," published in the May 4, 1967, issue of the Fayetteville, N.C., Observer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, May 4, 1967]

"PROP BLAST" PARTY SAID CAUSE OF OFFICER'S DEATH

(By Pat Reese)

A six-man coroner's jury Wednesday night held that a 23-year-old Army lieutenant died

in April as the result of drinking too much champagne and vodka at a "prop blasting" party at Ft. Bragg.

The jury also ruled that evidence shows no probable cause for criminal charges against anyone connected with the traditional Airborne party.

The inquest had been ordered by Coroner Alph Clark into the death of Lt. Ronald Reeves who died in his room at a Hay St. apartment house.

HEARING LENGTHY

The hearing lasted five hours as Superior Court Solicitor Doran Berry painstakingly questioned witnesses about that April 14th party at the Castle Hill Annex.

Members of Reeves' family sat behind Berry and Lumberton attorney John W. Campbell, employed as private counsel to aid the solicitor in the hearing.

Lt. Joseph Patrick O'Connor III, executive officer of a battery of the 320th Artillery, 82nd Airborne Division, was first to testify and he said he had been named in an "order" from the 320th headquarters as "sponsor" for Reeves, a fellow artillery officer, at the party.

He explained that a "prop blasting" was a traditional ceremony for membership in an unofficial club for officers who "become Airborne."

TWENTY-THREE TOOK PART

There were 28 officers who were eligible for the "prop blasting" and they were named in the order. Col. Harry Rusham, 320th commander, later testified that only 23 actually participated in the ceremony.

O'Connor, a West Point graduate, said the "blastees" wore fatigue uniforms for the party while the sponsors, the members of a mock board and other persons involved were clad in Class A dress uniforms.

The initiates wore helmets and mock parachutes as they were ushered one by one into the room where the initiation took place. There was a simulated "jump" from a plane and the "blastees" reported to the president of the board (Col. Rusham).

The blastees then picked up the "blasting cup" (a GI bucket) and held it to their lips and drank while the members of the board counted: "One thousand, two thousand, three thousand, four thousand."

The initiates were supposed to begin drinking of the mixture of vodka and champagne and continue without stopping until the count ended.

SPILLED SOME

O'Connor said Reeves spilled a considerable amount of the liquor on his uniform as he drank the first time and the group present voted for him to repeat the procedure. He returned to the end of the line.

When his turn came again, O'Connor testified, he once again drank from the blasting cup and once again spilled some of the liquid on his uniform. But this time, according to the lieutenant, the board decided to pass him and let him sign the prop blasting book which would make him a member of the club.

However, "someone" in the party pointed out that Reeves' chin strap was not proper. O'Connor said that the young officer insisted that he repeat the procedure because he "wanted to be sure he was 100 per cent correct." The board gave him permission.

He drank from the cup once again and then signed the book. Seconds later, according to O'Connor, the initiate was led from the building by several officers, including O'Connor.

O'Connor said Reeves was unconscious when they arrived outside and that those officers helping agreed that he should be taken to Womack Army Hospital.

O'Connor and an artillery captain put Reeves in a car and started to the hospital with him. However, O'Connor said, they stopped on the way and Reeves became sick.

"He appeared to be getting better . . . and we decided the best thing for him was a good night's sleep," O'Connor stated. He and the other officer, a Capt. King, drove on to Reeves apartment where he was undressed and placed in his bed.

O'Connor said he returned to Ft. Bragg and then went back to the apartment where he decided to spend the night to be sure Reeves would be all right.

FOUND HIM DEAD

The next morning, O'Connor said, he discovered that Reeves was not breathing. He ran for help and ambulance attendants said the officer was dead when they arrived.

Maj. Robert E. Jones, pathologist at Womack Army Hospital testified that Reeves died of aspiration resulting from material and water that clogged the air tubes in his lungs.

Maj. Jones said there was an unusually high content of alcohol in the dead man's blood, that the content found in the examination indicated that the lieutenant was in a "stupor" at the time of his death.

He said normally the reflexes of persons in the "stupor stage" failed to function properly. He said he believes that the valves that close the air tubes failed to respond properly as Reeves was regurgitating and that the material from his stomach was sucked into the tubes.

NOT OFFICIAL ORDER

Col. Rusham testified that the "order" announcing the prop blasting party was "not an official order."

The 320th commander said the order was prepared in the division artillery headquarters but it was not "official," that the persons named did not have to participate if they did not wish to.

Col. Rusham said seven bottles of champagne and five bottles of vodka were mixed together in a 10-gallon GI slop bucket for the blasting drink.

The colonel said he did not know Reeves "personally" but that he does remember the young officer because of his "spirit and esprit de corps" during the ceremony.

Rusham said the prop blasting parties have been held in the Airborne since 1940 and that they have become a tradition. He testified that no man was required by the Army or by any individual officer to participate in the ceremony.

Lt. David J. Odom, a Medical Services officer who testified that he was named in the prop blasting order to serve as a mock medic, said he felt the pulse of Lt. Reeves when the officer was first taken from the building.

"It was weak," he said, "and his complexion was pale. I felt that he should go to the hospital."

Members of Reeves' family including a psychiatrist, Dr. J. M. Bennett, testified that the 23-year-old Clemson College graduate had never been known to drink or smoke in his hometown of Charleston, S.C.

"In fact," Dr. Reeves said, he had told me last Christmas that he had "tasted" liquor but that he did not like it.

"The family just would like to know what caused this young man, who only last Christmas said he did not like liquor, that it held nothing for him, could four months later be dead as a result of drinking too much liquor."

The jury deliberated less than 15 minutes before returning its verdict of "no probable cause."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, June 3, 1967]

MEASURING MANHOOD

The Army, more's the pity, still has its quota of individuals who feel that the measure of a man lies in his ability to "hold his liquor."

It was just that sort of attitude which seems responsible for the tragic death re-

committee reports make any reference to the coverage (as a physician's service) of telephone conversations for any purpose between a physician and his patient.

We believe there are sound professional, as well as program reasons for not including telephone conversations between physicians and patients, including those in which the physician provides advice or instruction to or on behalf of a patient, as covered "physicians' services" under the medical insurance program. We have, for example, been advised by our professional medical consultant group that there is no uniform practice among physicians with regard to charging for medical advice furnished in the course of a telephone conversation. While our consultants did indicate that some individual physicians in some localities charge patients for telephone advice, it is clear that the general practice among physicians throughout the country is not to charge for telephone advice. In addition, examination of the practices of some of the major private health insurance companies and the Blue Shield Plans reveals that the practice among private health insurance organizations is to exclude charges for telephone advice from coverage under these private plans. Accordingly, both physicians and patients could generally be expected to understand the distinction between covered physicians' services and the non-coverage of telephone charges.

We regret that there was a misunderstanding about the statement on page 18 of the booklet, *Your Medicare Handbook*, to which Mr. ——— referred. The statement "wherever furnished" is intended to point out that the physical setting in which the physician furnishes his professional services in person would have no effect upon the coverage of his services. It states in pertinent part as follows: "Benefits may be paid for the medical services you receive from a physician wherever they are furnished—in a hospital, in an extended care facility or nursing home, in his office, in your home, or in a clinic." When the Handbook is revised, an appropriate clarification of this statement will be considered.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. BALL,
Commissioner of Social Security.

PATIENTS MAY WISH TO DISCUSS SUCH CHARGES WITH THEIR DOCTORS

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it is somewhat rare, according to this report, for physicians to charge their patients for telephone advice, and in view of the fact that it is the general practice not to make such charges, and in view of the fact that they are disallowed by the major private health insurance companies, by Blue Shield, and now by Social Security under Medicare, it would seem to me that when such a charge is made, the patient might mention these facts to the doctor.

At least I hope there will be some attention paid in the medical press as well as in the general press, to the facts in the report I have received from the Social Security Administration.

An individual who has had thousands of dollars in medical fees and hospital bills following major surgery is not going to find a \$4 fee for a telephone consultation to change a prescription the difference between solvency and bankruptcy, but this \$4 added to other items disallowed for one reason or another in a large bill is exactly the kind of thing which infuriates people. Under the circumstances, physicians making such charges might consider waiving them except in cases of real abuse or, if they feel the charges are justified, they should

certainly work through their professional organizations to have the policy changed on the treatment of such charges by all of the various health insurance programs.

Russia and the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia and the Mideast," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1967.

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

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST: EFFORTS FOR PEACE OR WAR?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1. By every device at its command—massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2. Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it would cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of the Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3. Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President Johnson over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

Baccalaureate Address of Hon. Stanley S. Surrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the baccalaureate address of the Honorable Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, delivered June 8 to the graduating class at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.

Many of us know Stan Surrey for his preeminence in the field of tax law and policy. Secretary Surrey is also a gifted speaker. His remarks on the responsibilities and challenges of the future were well received by the 1,200 graduates at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Secretary Surrey's address had a particular significance for the Ullman family. Our son, Kenneth, was the grand marshal—president—of the class of 1967.

Secretary Surrey's speech follows:

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE STANLEY S. SURREY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, TROY, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1967

This is a day of accomplishment for the class of 1967. The work of college years is over, the goal of membership in the society of educated men and women has been won, the bachelor's degree is yours for life. These accomplishments are laurels earned—but not laurels to rest upon. This is also a day of challenge—of an accomplishment swiftly turned into a question.

The question—and the challenge—is simply put: What will you do with your college education? It is a question neither easily answered, nor only put once. It will recur

again and again as the years go by—What are you doing with your education, with your life? And over the years this challenge becomes even more insistent if one sees ahead that confrontation at the end when challenge turns to a summation—What have you done with your education, with your life?

But today is also a day of challenge for your speaker. What does he say across the years to your class, your generation? Can he communicate with you at all? Or the more painful question—has he anything to communicate about? Can his retrospection in any way have meaning and aid as you face forward? Can a recollection of things past be of any value in telling of the world of your future years?

Nor is my problem aided by the parallel to that refrain from the musical, "The King and I", where Anna watches the young couples dancing and, thinking through the years, sings "Hello young lovers, whoever you are . . . I've been in love like you." For I too once graduated from college and the years have not at all dimmed my memory of how I regarded speakers at my Commencement. I wondered then how can they help me—they have forgotten and do not understand what our problems and concerns are, they speak a different idiom and live in a different world. And so today I have the haunting doubts, fed by such past memories, that I may only be describing my present concerns and attitudes and in no way responding to your concerns.

But haunting doubts are not enough to dissuade me. For at least I feel that my attitudes and concerns—shared by many of my generation—should be a part of that challenge you face. I am selfish enough to want to make you think about the tasks I would like to set for you, and about some of the responses I would like to see made to that challenge. So if I do not directly address your concerns, remember I have set myself a different target.

Let me place my cards—and biases—upon the podium. I am a lawyer by profession. I have practiced that profession mainly in Government Service and teaching in law schools, but with tasks now and then that led me to other countries and to private consultation. My specific field is taxation and tax policy. Some may regard it as a dry, technical specialty—I find it a wonderful vantage point from which to observe the conflicts of interest in our society. It also brings me, in my present occupation, in daily contact with the Congress, which provides me with a vantage point to observe the ways by which our democracy solves its day-to-day problems and deeper issues. I have served more than twenty years in the Federal Government—and all of those years were under Democratic Presidents, in fact under all our last four Democratic Presidents. With these disclosures, I now come back to you.

We can start with material aspects. This is a splendid period for you to begin your professional careers. It is a period of material abundance for our nation unsurpassed in our history or that of any country. We are in our seventh straight year since 1961 of expansion in our economy—certainly one of the longest on record. Jobs are plentiful for persons with skills, and the salaries are inviting. Business profits are high. Unemployment is at a comparatively low level, under four percent. Moreover, our Government is pledged to keeping unemployment low and the rate of economic growth high, and to the affirmative use of all fiscal and monetary tools requisite for achieving these ends. You thus enter your careers with a commitment by society that you will lead a comfortable life as respects material goods. This is, by the way, quite a contrast to the outlook for my law school class which graduated in the depths of the Great Depression of the Thirties.

This is especially a splendid period for your choice of profession. For this is an age

of science and technology. You are the golden boys. It is an age when society is proud of its abilities in these fields, and has limitless faith in the capacity of its scientists and engineers to make ever faster progress. Its confidence in you and your talents is greater, I believe, than in any other group. In keeping with these attitudes it showers abundance upon your activities. Funds for scientific research in universities are generous. Our large business firms are committed to ample research and development budgets that span the spectrum from pure research through technology to the end product. Small enterprises founded by independent spirits with a new idea or a new technology or a new product can flourish and grow.

And so I say you are the golden boys. But—and here one can see the first cutting edge of challenge—the hands that accept all these coins of the realm are entering upon a bargain with society. For society assumes that these same hands are offering a pledge of responsibility in return. It is proud of you, generous to you, confident in you—but it wants, indeed expects, your talents to be used for the national good. You should not underestimate the depth and firmness of that expectation. But you are fortunate that opportunities lie all around you to meet that expectation.

For this is an age of excitement and glorious new opportunities for the role of science and technology in our national life. Many of the problems we used to catalogue under human relationships and to consider as local in concern have almost suddenly become great national issues. The human problems of race and civil rights and poverty and juvenile delinquency merge and join at countless points with the physical problems of urban life. Individual concerns intersect everywhere with urban building, urban housing and urban transportation. These are massive problems that can only be solved by the coordinated and systematic approaches that science and technology can offer. In education we are seeing the curtain opening on a wide expanse of new methods of learning and teaching as we seek to harness our burgeoning technology to this field. Nor can we speak only of the opportunities in this country, for this is also an age of global participation. The fruits of our technological knowledge spread inevitably through the less developed world, sped by the progress in communication and transportation. And then there is all of atmosphere and space and depth being opened to our exploration.

But clearly I need not go on, for to tell you of the glorious opportunities for science and technology is, if one can use a sixteenth century technological phrase in this modern context, surely to bring coals to Newcastle. Of, if you wish we could characterize it in terms of even an earlier technological age, and use the first century B.C. phrase of "carrying timber into a wood". You must have perceived all this and more here at school and are ready to show the world what awaits it.

But again, the cutting edge of challenge—you have the ability to contribute to removing the ills of society in so many ways. However, ability also begets responsibility, and rouses expectation. And yet once more you are fortunate, for that expectation can be met by following paths in the business world that many of you will take.

For this is an age of the involvement of business in our social problems. The involvement is not philanthropic and fortunately so, for if it were it would not be capable of success. It would lack the well-spring of the profit motive, the incentive that harnesses the energies of the private sector and drives it to overcoming tremendous obstacles.

The involvement is profit-seeking. It recognizes that in the search for solutions to our urban problems and our social ills lies major growth opportunities for the business sector. To say there are profits to be made

out of curing poverty, urban slums, inadequate education, pollution, inadequate medical care, undernourishment in so many less fortunate countries—and this list could be still longer—is not in any way to detract from the participation of business. There were profits to be made out of spanning the continent with railroads when that was our national need, or out of clipper ships when they served a national goal. Those profits assured the success of the tasks. Business has generally earned its profits by meeting human needs. Today, with a large part of our material needs amply met for a great number of us, the goals must be in meeting the needs of those that are not so fortunate and in meeting the needs of the social order. That is where action is and that is where business will inevitably become involved.

There is still another offering the world has for you at this time. This is an age of innovation, and innovation belongs most of all to the young in mind and heart and outlook. It is impossible for us to comprehend and absorb the unprecedented pace of invention and change that is all around us, for our daily life goes on with one day not remarkably different from its yesterday. We can look up and realize that an astronaut is whirling through space, yet our daily tasks continue in familiar form. So it must have been for men in Europe when Columbus discovered this continent, but we know how different the world became with the discovery. And so the inability now fully to grasp the effects of momentous events does not take away our feeling that we are living through a period of great change because of the rapidity of innovation.

An age of innovation should be an age of the open mind. For you who work in science this should be an obvious and agreeable precept. Science is necessarily revisionary in spirit and practice—it moves forward by questioning old truths and formulating the transient new truths that in turn inevitably yield their sway. I need not underscore all this for you. But—and once more the cutting edge of challenge intrudes—will these same minds be open to other challenges, to innovation elsewhere.

Your opportunities—and your responsibilities—I have said will lead you to applying science and technology to curing our social ills. You will, I have said, find your business associates in private enterprise engaged in the same endeavors. But you will also find men from other disciplines engaged in these fields—the social scientists, the economists, the journalists, the lawyers, the clergy, the philosophers. Will your minds be open to them? It isn't as easy as it may seem—their learning is not of the same content or structure as yours. Their variables are far different and far less manageable.

Consider for a moment that we can easily pinpoint a target area on the moon, yet economists cannot forecast the state of our economy a few months ahead without the possibility of considerable error. We do not know what really motivates businessmen to invest in a project; what will be the reactions and consequences for work incentives if we provide people with a guaranteed income; what is the best way to achieve the education of the underprivileged; what is the best way to cope with criminal behavior—and on and on. These disciplines are struggling with man and his motivations and his goals. Will you be able to participate with them, see their hypotheses, understand their doubts? Our chances for success in solving our social ills turn on the answer.

You will meet with more than men of other disciplines—you will meet with Government. You will find that Government has a will of its own, the collective will of our society. At its best you will find it more innovative and daring and imaginative than you and your associates in private enterprise. Will you be able to accept its leadership with an open mind, and offer it your talents?

Appendix

file
**Lasting Peace and Economic Progress in
 the Middle East**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, time will surely record these past weeks as among the most fateful and momentous in the long history of the Middle East—that ancient and strategic crossroads of civilization.

The world has watched in surprise and amazement at the brilliant and heroic action—and spectacular accomplishments—of the sons and daughters of Israel in asserting the right to full international acceptance as a sovereign equal among the community of nations, in reclaiming the most holy of its sacred religious shrines, and in showing a ready willingness to work with others to establish a firm basis for true, lasting peace and progress in the Middle East.

Both President Johnson and our distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, have already begun the difficult task of initiating discussions aimed at exploring for agreed terms leading to an enduring and workable peace in this volatile area—based, as it must be, on a policy of reconciliation and mutual responsibility for developing a just, effective, and long-range settlement of all outstanding issues.

As Israel's scholarly Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban, recently stated before the U.N. Security Council, we must now look "not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace."

With the cooperation of the freedom-loving nations of the world, we can begin to look beyond the present conflicts and tension toward a new, more hopeful era of greater stability—which can at last permit all the peoples of this vital region to enjoy the fruits of peace and prosperity.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Special Study Mission which surveyed the Middle East last November, I have maintained a keen personal interest in American efforts to exercise a stabilizing influence and to provide international leadership to help preserve peace and promote economic, social, and political progress in these historic lands.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the following five points may serve to outline some of the essential requirements of achieving these worthy goals—for which the proud men and women of Israel have again, for the third time in 20 years, fought and risked their lives—

First, immediate attention to: Establishing an effective cease-fire respected by all parties in order to stop the tragic killing and destruction of these past days; providing emergency relief for both civilian and military victims of the fighting; and, assuring humanitarian care for and early exchange of all prisoners of war.

Second, full international recognition and acceptance of the State of Israel's right to exist as a politically independent, sovereign nation, and to live, grow, and prosper without any outside interference or harassment from any source.

Third, ironclad guarantees, backed by the great powers, and enforced by a strong United Nations or other international presence if necessary, of Israel's national security and territorial integrity, so that its borders will be protected from further encroachment and terrorist attack, and so it will have an undisputed right of passage through the Suez Canal, as well as full freedom to use the international waterway of the Gulf of Aqaba, including unchallenged access to its entrance through the narrow Strait of Tiran.

Fourth, final resolution of the twin problems—refugee resettlement and military arms limitation—that have frustrated every attempt since the 1940's to find a permanent and equitable solution to the deep-seated conflicts in the Middle East. This will require active participation, and assumption of a share of responsibility, by each of the great powers, as well as by all the parties to the dispute, and by the United Nations organization on behalf of the world community.

Fifth, a bold, new regional development programs, supported by the United States and the other economically advanced nations, in cooperation with all the Middle Eastern countries, to turn the energies of this entire area, once and for all, away from conflict and war, and toward the work of fashioning a more prosperous region—emphasizing the development of precious water and agricultural resources, the widening of their industrial base, the expansion of trade and commerce, an all-out attack on the abject poverty, disease, ignorance, and human misery which have been the fate of so many for so long, and finally, the creation of conditions of long-range stability and genuine progress toward a better way of life for all the peoples who live in this area—the historic cradle of Western civilization.

Mr. Speaker, because of my intense personal interest in the situation in the Middle East, and the position we here in America should take toward events in that part of the world, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of my earlier remarks on this vital subject, which I made on

May 24, 1967—nearly 2 weeks before the armed conflict erupted.

My earlier statement follows:

PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, an extremely dangerous crisis of worldwide proportions has developed in the Middle East—directly threatening the territorial integrity of the State of Israel, as well as its vital and basic right of access through international waters to its only outlet south to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean.

In addition to jeopardizing the peace and security of both Israel and her neighbors in that troubled part of the globe, this grave and highly explosive situation could escalate at any moment into a general military confrontation involving the major world powers—a catastrophe the full consequences of which are difficult to imagine.

As I stated nearly 4 years ago on June 21, 1963, during an earlier period of mounting tension:

"The vital interests of all Middle Eastern countries, as well as the expressed policy of the United States, demand the maintenance of peace.

"It is essential that existing conflicts and unstable conditions not be allowed to disrupt the tranquility of this important region and risk involvement in the current struggle between East and West.

"Such a development would be an utter disaster for all concerned, and play directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.

"As one of the leaders of the free peoples of the world, the United States has a strong and vital stake in keeping peace among all the nations of the Middle East.

"It is imperative that these nations begin to concentrate their energies and the energies of their people on fashioning a more prosperous region, developing their agriculture, widening their industrial base, and expanding trade and commerce.

"In this way, peace will become a reality, and the Middle East will no longer be the fused powder keg of the world, waiting for a spark to ignite it, and threatening to involve us all in a tragic and unnecessary war."

Today, however, Mr. Speaker, we are again faced—in this strategic crossroads of the world—with a perilous situation that could erupt at any time into armed conflict.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President on his firm and forthright statement on the Middle Eastern crisis, and for his strong stand in support of united action by the world community to preserve and protect the peace.

The President also deserves to be commended for his clear and forceful comment regarding the purported closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping in an effort to seal off the vital southern port of Ellat—Elath—as a key commercial exporting and oil importing center:

"The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace.

"The right of free, innocent passage of the international waterway is a vital interest of the international community."

I am particularly gratified that the President pledged America's wholehearted and vigorous support for a continuing United Nations presence—as a matter of fundamental importance to the peace and stability of the entire area.

A 3061

A 3062

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind about the meaning and intent of Mr. Johnson's unequivocal White House restatement of—

"What three Presidents have said before—that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area.

"The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine. This has been the policy of the United States led by four Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and myself—as well as the policy of both of our political parties."

Mr. Speaker, let no one mistake or misjudge this country's firm commitment to oppose aggression and advance the cause of lasting peace in the Middle East.

Handwritten signature
The Reasons for Israel's Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Reasons for Israel's Victory," written by Ira C. Eaker.

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

THE REASONS FOR ISRAEL'S VICTORY
 (By Ira C. Eaker)

The first week of the Israeli-Arab war has revealed astonishing victories for little Israel. There two million people, completely surrounded by 40 million fanatical hostiles, raised the siege and ignominiously routed the boastful enemy.

War colleges the world over will search this campaign with eager interest to catalog the reasons for Israeli success. Some of these reasons already are clearly apparent.

Israel's political leaders took their military leaders into their national councils and made the decision to take the offensive. Thereafter Israel turned the management of military operations over to the military leaders.

The Israelis made a bold plan to raise the siege of the Gulf of Aqaba by threatening the Suez Canal. They reckoned that Nasser would exchange freedom of passage in the Straits of Tiran to save his stolen Canal, Egypt's most profitable enterprise.

Then the Israelis, in the first hours of the conflict, gained air superiority by destroying Egyptian Air Force on the ground, the quickest and cheapest way to destroy a hostile Air Force (The White House Tuesday Luncheon Club now directing our Vietnam operation, please note.) Thereafter Israeli armor could proceed unmolested in its rush to Suez. Somebody in Israel remembered Rommel's desert campaign and what doomed the Afrika Korps.

Having made a bold plan, caught the enemy by surprise, gained air superiority and taken the offensive, the Israelis then went to Suez like the Germans went to Paris in 1940, with armored columns spearheaded and protected by fighter bombers and fueled and fed by air transport.

Despite their numerical inferiority, the Israelis had some things going for them. They were a united people, all determined to defend their country if need be to the death. No peaceniks, beatniks and draft card

burners have demonstrated in Israel. There are no carping critics in their Knesset (Congress). As they demonstrated in 1948 and again in 1956, they are excellent fighting men far superior to the Arab enemy.

The principal adviser on national security to the President and Prime Minister of Israel is General Moshe Dayan, Israel's most experienced and respected soldier (a relation like that between President Roosevelt and Admiral Leahy or President Truman and General Marshall).

The Israelis were not palsied by fear of what Russia or Red China might do or of what world opinion would be. Their objective was quick victory, not prolonged stalemate.

The greatest satisfaction I personally have had from the Middle East war is the realization that little Israel brought might Russia to the Security Council of the United Nations. How? Not by entreaty, not by paying tribute or by building bridges to the East, but by kicking the daylight out of the Kremlin puppet, Nasser. Russia had two options. She could send Russian troops to save Egypt or join the U.N. Security Council in demanding a cease fire. She chose the latter. We shall always owe a great debt to Israel for demonstrating to our leaders that one negotiates successfully with the Reds only with fearless firmness.

There are some other lessons from the Middle East conflict which could be translated to Vietnam with profit:

A short war is preferable for all concerned. Wars, general or limited, large or small, must be won. Wars are won by fearless leaders employing brilliant strategy, bold tactics and adequate forces always on the offensive.

When the shooting starts in a war, it becomes a military operation which can scarcely be concluded successfully without entrusting battlefield operations and the management of the war zone to men with military training, education and experience.

Settlement of the Current Railway Labor-Management Dispute

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1967

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 559) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I know he has given this matter a great deal of thought, and he has spent a great deal of time in research on it before coming to the conclusion as to what he believes should be done. I know the entire House respects him for being willing to take a stand on what he believes to be right.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this, and I told the gentleman that I cannot, and there are practical reasons why I cannot. Both management and labor are opposed to fragmentary settlements. I

believe we can understand that. There are 154 standard railroads in the United States. I am talking about large railroads. This does not take into consideration short lines and others, of which I understand there are 70 or 80.

It would mean, if they were to bargain railroad by railroad, that there could be two or three on a strike, and the others not on strike. Going into a State, other railroads would be operating, with connecting lines into other railroads which were a part of the strike. Delivery might be made to the terminal of a railroad, and that railroad could not deliver the goods because of a strike on that railroad.

Those are the practical problems which are involved in a big industry such as the railroad industry, in which there are some 24 brotherhoods which to bargain.

It presents such practical limitations that both management and labor testified before our committee they did not favor doing so. They were sharply questioned on this point. Two members of the committee, on my side of the aisle, deeply believe that this is perhaps a way to work out something, trying to get a settlement unit by unit.

I thought that both management and labor gave excellent reasons why this, at its very best, even though there might be some merit to it, actually would bring about an impossible situation for them to undertake.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What is it that makes the railroads different from all the rest of the industry of the world? Are they so unique, they can find no way to bargain together, the management of each company and the employees of that company?

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe it is the fact which was referred to a moment ago. These lines are all interdependent and connected with each other.

That is not true of the automobile industry. If the Ford Motor Co. should shut down, I could buy a Chevrolet. If the Chevrolet production should shut down, I could buy another automobile.

In the industry of the railroads, that is not true. They are all connected.

I can send something from Seattle to Miami, and even though it goes over five railroads eventually it will arrive. Suppose that a connecting railroad somewhere in between Washington and Florida were on strike.

I believe we can see that bargaining unit by unit for an entire network, for the entire country, simply would not work.

Mr. BROCK. The point of the amendment is to protect the consumer, the general public of this country. We have to talk about providing an alternative source of supply.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply, if we were talking about the trucking industry I could not give such a positive answer, because in nearly every community there are two or three trucking companies. If one of them is on strike, the others will pick up and deliver what-

part of our people's deepest inner consciousness.

At the dawn of our redemption, as we stood, few against the many who were seeking to throttle Israel's independence in its infancy, Harry Truman announced the United States' recognition of the independent State of Israel—a step which was the climax of his activities in favor of its establishment.

We here in this country count ourselves fortunate in that Israel has been associated by Harry Truman with his aspiration for peace. We welcomed his idea that in Jerusalem, the city of prophecy and peace, an international center for the advancement of peace should be established.

I hope that this great project will fulfill its aims and make a notable contribution to peace in our area and in the world as a whole. In the words of the prophet: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings, that announceth salvation." (Isaiah 52:7)

MR. THURGOOD MARSHALL

This ground-breaking is an occasion so unprecedented, so pregnant with hope for man, so charged with possibilities for the future, that I count this among the inspiring moments of a lifetime. To be a witness and a participant here today is truly to be among the chosen people.

If the Center represents an act of faith in the capacity of the human spirit to quell its ancient foes, I for one take heart and hope from the fact that such acts of faith seem to thrive on this soil.

It was here, after all, on this soil, amidst this people, that men first began to turn their backs on the gods of war and lust and discovered a God of law and love.

It was here, too on this soil, that men first found the abiding principles of a social order worthy of man. It was here that we first perceived the uniqueness and integrity of every human being.

MR. ELIAHU ELATH

It is doubtful whether there is any city in the world more fitting as the home of an institution aimed at advancing the cause of world peace than Jerusalem, the Holy City.

It was here, in Jerusalem, that the Prophet Isaiah conceived his vision of the time when the peoples of the world would beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks, when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

It was in Jerusalem, the Eternal City, that the Hebrew University was established. Situated in this unique site, the Hebrew University regards it as its sacred duty to ensure that the Truman Center, which is an integral part of itself, will justify its existence by measuring up to the tasks and the ideals which brought it into being.

MR. SAMUEL ROTHBERG

It is we who are honored today, for Harry Truman has deemed us worthy to be his partners, to help realize his vision, which is the hope of mankind from time immemorial—the vision of universal peace.

The founders who made this Center a reality, and who had the privilege of participating in the inauguration of the Truman Center in Independence, Missouri, this January in the presence of President Johnson, were deeply moved by President Truman's closing remarks. He said:

"When the day comes—when it is time to close the book of my life—I will be comforted by the hope that this Center for the Advancement of Peace will become a major source of light and reason towards the achievement of eternal peace."

TEXT OF SCROLL—RECORDING THE CORNERSTONE-LAYING OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PEACE

On the twenty-third day of Tammuz, 5725, eleventh of July, 1966, in the nineteenth year of the State of Israel, the cornerstone was laid of the Harry S Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace on the Givat Ram campus of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The building to arise on this site will become a center for studies dedicated to the pursuit of peace, which, it is hoped, will make a significant contribution to the fostering of international harmony and the advancement of cooperation between the peoples of the world.

Situated as it is at the Hebrew University, in the City of Jerusalem, from which the ancient Jewish prophets sent forth their message of universal brotherhood, it will symbolize the lofty ideals towards which mankind has aspired throughout the ages.

The Center is appropriately named for Mr. Harry S Truman, who has been deeply concerned with the cause of peace throughout his life and whose unshakable belief in a world-wide rule of reason has been the inspiration of many nations.

The Center is being built as an expression of the profound gratitude and appreciation which the Jewish people feel for the thirty-second President of the United States, who was responsible for his country's support of Israel before its establishment and for the historic fact that his Government was the first of any to grant the State of Israel recognition after the proclamation of independence.

The funds for the establishment of the Harry S Truman Center have been generously provided by Friends of the Hebrew University in the United States and in other parts of the world.

This cornerstone is laid in a spirit of profound faith that war is not inevitable, that knowledge and understanding are basic prerequisites for the attainment of peace, and that the Harry S Truman Center will make a measurable contribution towards the realization of an aim of vital concern to humanity as a whole.

[From News From Israel, July 29, 1966]

TRUMAN PEACE CENTER IN JERUSALEM

A message from ex-President Harry S. Truman was read at the cornerstone-laying ceremony of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace on July 11. The ceremony was held on the campus of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, of which the Center will be a part, under the chairmanship of University President Eliahu Elath and in the presence of the Acting President of Israel, Mr. Kaddish Luz, and other dignitaries.

Addresses were delivered by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, Mr. Thurgood Marshall, Solicitor General of the United States, Prof. Nathan Rotenstreich, Rector of the University, Mr. Samuel Rothberg, Chairman of the Board of the American Friends of the University, and Mr. Teddy Koilek, Mayor of Jerusalem. Mr. Truman's message was read by Mr. David Noyes, his personal representative.

The following are extracts from President Truman's message and from Prime Minister Eshkol's address:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

"We come here to rededicate our means, our skills, our moral and intellectual resources, to a cause that has priority on the minds and hearts of the leaders of all nations. "It is unthinkable that, with the huge stockpiles of nuclear arsenals, and with missiles with nuclear warheads poised on

their pads for instant assault, there could be a valid reason why any Government would refuse to come to terms with its neighbors.

"We meet here to try to make a fresh start. Here at the Center for the Advancement of Peace we will give serious consideration to any new practical approach that could help to advance the cause of peace.

"All will be welcome here who desire to join in our common search for the ways of peace. There are no restrictions as to national origin, ideological commitment or religious differences.

"I continue to have a deep faith in man's nobler side and his rightful destiny; all he needs is to be given a fair chance. This I believe to be the essence of the great American dream: a dream of a world without war, without want, without misery.

"The Center for the Advancement of Peace is now part of that dream."

PRIME MINISTER ESHKOL

"It is difficult for our people to express the depth of its feelings for Harry Truman. Harry Truman, like Cyrus in his day, has not only earned honorable mention in the history of Jewry; he has become an inseparable part of our people's deepest inner consciousness.

"At the dawn of our redemption, as we stood, few against the many who were seeking to throttle Israel's independence in its infancy, Harry Truman announced the United States' recognition of the independent State of Israel—a step which was the climax of his activities in favor of its establishment.

"We here in this country count ourselves fortunate in that Israel has been associated by Harry Truman with his aspiration for peace. We welcomed his idea that in Jerusalem, the city of prophecy and peace, an international center for the advancement of peace should be established.

"I hope that this great project will fulfill its aims and make a notable contribution to peace in our area and in the world as a whole. In the words of the prophet (Isaiah 52:7): 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings, that announceth salvation.'"

The founders of the Truman Center have thus defined its basic mission: "to supply scientific methods to seek out for the world's troubled citizenry the means to achieve peace for which all men hunger."

The educational structure of the Truman Center will have, as its base, teaching and research units which deal with varying aspects of international relations. These will include, among others, African and Asian studies, Comparative Religion, International Law, International Relations and Sociology.

An international committee of trustees is being organized for the Center. This group of distinguished personalities from various countries will include statesmen, scholars, clergy, United Nations officials, writers and men of the people who have made significant contributions in international peace efforts.

The ultimate symbol of the Truman Center, its founders say, will be young people from contending nations, seated side by side, learning how to replace mutual distrust with understanding based on knowledge.

DEDICATION OF J. F. K. MEMORIAL

An impressive memorial to the late President John F. Kennedy was dedicated on July 4 in the Jerusalem hills, not far from Israel's capital, in the presence of Mr. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Acting President of Israel, Mr. Kaddish Luz, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, and other public figures, as well as many hundreds of Israelis and Americans now in Israel.

June 16, 1967

H 7394

The circular, 65-foot-high edifice, constructed by the Jewish National Fund with the support of the American Jewish community, takes the form of a giant tree-trunk, severed like the tragically ended life of the young President, while the 51 concrete pylons that make up the walls represent the States of the Union and the District of Columbia. A single shaft of light from an opening in the saw-tooth roof falls upon a bust of Kennedy by the Israeli sculptor Dov Freidin.

ON A CLEAR DAY

Standing on a hilltop more than 2,700 feet above sea-level, the memorial affords a majestic view, through the glass windows between the pylons, of Biblical Judea for many miles all around. On a clear day there is an unobstructed view, to the west, right down to the Mediterranean coast.

A huge forest is being planted by the J.N.F. on these barren hills, called the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest and bordering on the America-Israel Freedom Forest.

Dedicated to the concept of world peace and to the bonds of friendship between the people of Israel and the U.S.A., the millions of trees of the forest will be contributed by Jews and non-Jews.

WARREN BRINGS L. B. J. GREETINGS

In his address to the gathering, Justice Warren described the combination of the Memorial Monument and the Peace Forest as "the impressive living memorial to our late President," and recalled that President Kennedy "had a very special feeling for the nation (of Israel) and an unwavering confidence in its future."

Justice Warren brought "cordial good wishes" from President Johnson "to the people of Israel and to all those Americans who have made this Memorial possible."

[From Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Jan. 24, 1966]

THE HARRY S. TRUMAN CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PEACE

(The President's remarks in Independence, Mo., at the ceremony announcing the establishment of the center, January 20, 1966)

President Truman, Mrs. Truman, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator Symington, Senator Long, Members of the Missouri delegation in the Congress of the United States, Senator Anderson, Congressman Boggs, ladies and gentlemen: I come back to Independence to be with one of the world's most persistent searchers for peace in the world. It is quite fitting that this day is set aside for the announcement of the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace in the world.

I first want to congratulate the men here today whose generous public spirit is making this Center possible.

I take my text from the words which President Truman spoke just 17 years ago in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949.

"We must embark," he said, "on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and the growth of underdeveloped areas in the world."

This was, as we know now, point 4. It was a bold and vital idea then, and it is just as bold and just as much alive as we meet here this afternoon.

The initial point 4 program of technical assistance was enacted in 1949 and has continued from that day to this. Congress after Congress has continued to appropriate to that program—with growing confidence—sums which now, I believe, add up to more than \$3 billion. American experts have traveled the globe to every continent, bringing their skills to the worldwide war against ignorance and against hunger and against disease.

And to measure the success of this effort we have only to ask: What would the world be like today if President Truman had not launched this program?

In this year 1966, I am proposing, on behalf of our Nation, a major new effort in this same field that he began so long ago, and I am proud to add to the point 4 of President Truman, the fourth principle of this year's State of the Union speech: "to help improve the life of man."

How will we help improve the life of man?

First, we propose a radical increase in our response to the needs of international education. There can be no decent life for any man or any people without education.

The International Education Act of 1966 will help build partnerships between American and foreign schools.

It will recruit teachers for overseas work. It will make possible long-term commitments by American universities toward solving the problems of international education.

It will launch a series of projects to attack illiteracy and to find new ways to teach basic skills. It will begin to provide for an Exchange Peace Corps to bring able young people from other countries to live and work here with us.

Second, we are going to enlarge our work for world health. And the twin of the International Education Act will be the International Health Act of 1966.

And with that act we will strike at disease by establishing an international medical mission in our Public Health Service.

We plan to triple our effort to train medical manpower in the developing countries.

We plan to double the size of our nutrition program for mothers and for children. We plan to increase by 80 million those who will receive adequate diets.

We plan to set targets and to develop programs so in the next decade we can completely wipe out smallpox in the entire world. We can eliminate malaria in this hemisphere and large parts of Africa and Asia. We can end yellow fever in this hemisphere, and we can find new controls for cholera, rades, and other epidemic diseases.

Third, we will launch a major new attack on worldwide hunger. We will present this year a new food aid program, designed around the principle of intense cooperation with those in all hungry countries who are ready to help themselves. We will direct our assistance program toward a cooperative effort to increase agricultural production. We will ask the countries which we help to make the necessary land reforms—to modernize marketing and distribution—to invest greater energy and resources in their own food production.

And in return, we will triple our assistance to investments in the powerful weapons of modern agriculture—from fertilizer to machinery we will direct the efforts of our agricultural scientists to the special problems of the developing countries—to the development of new foods and concentrates. We will call for an international effort, including institutions like the World Bank, to expand the world supply of fertilizer.

Fourth, we will increase our efforts in the great field of human population. The hungry world cannot be fed until and unless the growth in its resources and the growth in its population come into balance. Each man and woman—and each nation—must make decisions of conscience and policy in the face of this great problem. But the position of the United States of America is clear. We will give our help and our support to nations which make their own decision to insure an effective balance between the numbers of their people and the food they have to eat. And we will push forward the frontiers of research in this important field.

Fifth, the underlying principle of all of our work with other nations will always be the principle of cooperation. We will work

with those who are willing to work with us for their own progress, in the spirit of peace and in the spirit of understanding.

And while we work for peaceful progress, we will maintain our strength against aggression. Nothing is more false than the timid complaint that we cannot defend ourselves against the aggressor and at the same time make progress in the works of peace. A celebration which unites the United States is a fit time to reaffirm that energy in the defense of freedom—and energy and progress in the building of a free society—should be the common objectives of any free people, large or small.

Now this is the central necessity today of the brave people with whom we are associated in South Viet-Nam. Just this week, the Prime Minister of Viet-Nam has pledged his country to this necessity. He has spoken for progress in rural education, in housing, in land reform, and above all, of the need for progress in social revolution and in the building of democracy—by constitutional process and by free elections. All this he has said in the shadow of continuing aggression from the North. In all this he will have the full support of the United States of America.

And so, President Truman, as we dedicate today in your honor the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, we recall the vision that you gave us to follow when you gave your farewell address, and I quote:

"I have a deep and abiding faith in the destiny of free men. With patience and courage we shall some day move on to a new era—a wonderful golden age—an age when we can use the peaceful tools that science has forged for us to do away with poverty and human misery everywhere on earth."

That is still our goal, President Truman. And now we are today redoubling our efforts to achieve it.

Today I informed President Truman of our worldwide efforts to move the violence of Southeast Asia to the table of peaceful discussions. I received a report this morning before I left Washington from Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Harriman on their recent travels. I shall be meeting with the Secretary and the Ambassador again later this afternoon. Both the Secretary and the Ambassador told me that in all the capitals they visited—and Ambassador Harriman went to almost a dozen—government leaders recognized the United States' genuine desire for peace in the world.

And of this one thing I am sure, the door of peace must be kept wide open for all who wish to avoid the scourge of war. But the door of aggression must be closed and bolted if man himself is to survive.

It is tragic that in the 1960's there are still those who would engulf their neighbors by force, still those who require that vast resources be used to guard the peace rather than to bring all the people in the world the wonders that are really within their grasp.

The central purpose of the American people is a peace which permits all men to remain free. But we must do more. We must work, and we must build upon the solid foundations, as the Chief Justice said, of law among nations. And this is America's determination, and this is America's commitment.

Now let me leave this one last thought with you. I think every schoolboy knows that peace is not unilateral—it takes more than one to sign an agreement. And it seems clear to all that what is holding up peace in the world today is not the United States of America. What is holding back the peace is the mistaken view on the part of the aggressors that we are going to give up our principles, that we may yield to pressure, or abandon our allies, or finally get tired and get out. On the day that others decide to substitute reason for terror, when they will

use the pen instead of the hand grenade, when they will replace rational logic for inflammatory invective, then on that very day, the journey toward peace can really begin.

If the aggressors are ready for peace, if they are ready for a return to a decent respect for their neighbors, ready to understand where their hopeful future really lies, let them come to the meeting place and we will meet them there.

Here in the presence today of the great man who was the 33d President of the United States, who labored so long and so valiantly to bring serenity to a troubled world, the 36th President of the United States speaks with a voice of 190 million Americans: We want a peace with honor and with justice that will endure!

Now, President Truman, there is one more bit of business that I would like to take care of so long as I have come out here to Independence. I was here not long ago in connection with a little project that you inaugurated 2 decades ago, but when the fellows last night in the Social Security office learned that I was coming out here again to see you and Mrs. Truman today, they asked me to bring along your new medicare card.

And it is now my great pleasure to present here, in the presence of these distinguished friends of yours, and many of the young men of yesteryear who fought these battles with you, to bring you Card No. 1 for you, and Card No. 2 for Mrs. Truman.

They told me, President Truman, that if you wished to get the voluntary medical insurance you will have to sign this application form, and they asked me to sign as your witness. So you are getting special treatment since cards won't go out to the other folks until the end of this month. But we wanted you to know, and we wanted the entire world to know that we haven't forgotten who is the real daddy of medicare. And because of the fight that you started many years ago, 19 million Americans will be eligible to receive new hope and new security when the program begins on July 1, and 19 million Americans have another reason, another cause to bless Harry S. Truman.

Again, I want to thank all of you who made this great day possible.

(NOTE. The President spoke at 11:15 a.m., c.s.t., at the Harry S. Truman Library at Independence, Mo. The Center will be established at Hebrew University in Jerusalem.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) was granted to the following:

Mr. MORTON, beginning June 16 through June 19, 1967, on account of official business for the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, beginning June 16 through June 19, 1967, on account of official business for the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Utah, beginning June 16 through June 19, 1967, on account of official business for the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN), for 60 minutes, on June 21; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

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

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. EVERETT in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances.

Mr. RARICK.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1577. An act to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 834. An act to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of Cecil A. Rhodes;

H.R. 2048. An act for the relief of William John Masterton and Louis Vincent Nanne; and

H.R. 4445. An act for the relief of Aurex Corp.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 19, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

839. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

840. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of policies and procedures for collecting judgments, fines, penalties, and forfeitures, Department of Justice; to the Committee on Government Operations.

841. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to settle the land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

842. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports of visa petitions approved, according to certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10730. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10867. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 10934. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10935. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10936. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10937. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to add 1,726 miles to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to designate such additional mileage as the route for a highway on such Interstate System from Brownsville, Tex., to the North Dakota-Canadian border; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 10938. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 10939. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, establishing the National Capital Planning Commission in order to provide for the preservation of the remaining historic landmarks in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 10940. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10941. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mrs.

GREEN of Oregon, Mr. DENT, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. CAREY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 10942. A bill to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mrs.

GREEN of Oregon, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. AYRES):

H.R. 10943. A bill to amend and extend title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10944. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 10945. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to revise the rates of postage

on third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10943. A bill to reclassify certain key positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10947. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period comprising the first full week in October of each year as Spring Garden Planting Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. Res. 515. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 586. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Res. 587. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H. Res. 588. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 589. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

239. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, relative to taxation of social security benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. REINECKE introduced a bill (H.R. 10948), for the relief of Gerardo B. Barbero, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

107. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the United Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to war and world order, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

June 16, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I want to take advantage of this opportunity, when we have a little more time, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] to state that yesterday, when we had a few seconds per Member on an amendment, which was rejected—and this is really water over the dam—perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] misunderstood my point. I merely wish to elaborate a bit, briefly.

I raised the objection to the then pending amendment, that it was totally impracticable and unworkable to try to work out freight trains consisting of perishable crops like strawberries, lemons, and oranges, and nonperishable commodities like roofing materials and other such products of my congressional district.

I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] misunderstood me. I well understand he is as much concerned about getting perishable crops to market as I.

My point at that time was that this was a very difficult, if not impossible, practical way to handle the makeup of the freight trains.

I just wanted to take a few moments to make that clear.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, so that I may respond?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I say to my good friend and colleague from California, I recognize fully the extremely difficult nature of the problem which has confronted us, the many dilemmas which have confronted us in the past few days. I had no feeling that the gentleman would attribute to me any conviction that he was attempting to obfuscate, or place upon me the onus of not having as much sympathy for agriculture in our State as he has.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman. My point is just to be sure that we understood what I was trying to get across yesterday.

Mr. MOSS. I fully understand.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in connection with the interpretation of this letter, I seem to sense some equivocation today as to the meaning of the letter, in that no one wants to take responsibility. Yesterday in the debate I did not sense that equivocation at all. Everyone was determined there would not be a strike if the amendment was agreed to, so far as this measure is concerned.

I wonder if this is not some devious method where they are going around to try to maneuver the President into having to seize the railroads during this period of time.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a response?

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. First I should like to ask the gentleman if he could give me the authority of the President to seize, absent congressional action.

Second I should like to read with emphasis the language of the letter and, as I have stated previously, give my own interpretation:

I wish to advise you on behalf of the six shop-craft unions involved in this dispute that no strike action would be taken during the period of time required for the conferees to compose the differences between the measures adopted by the two Chambers.

It is my interpretation—an individual interpretation—that that clearly comprehends the time required to effect the appointment of conferees.

Mr. HERLONG. I thank the gentleman. That answers my question.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a further question.

The letter is clear to me. It is inconceivable to me that the unions in question would authorize a strike after having written that letter.

The only other question I will ask is, can the gentleman or someone connected with this legislation tell this body whether or not the author of that letter is a person who speaks with authority?

Mr. MOSS. It is signed by Donald S. Beattie, executive secretary. I would assume, therefore, that in this corporate structure he speaks with full authority for the members, or at least for the board of directors, that is, the directors or the top executives of the crafts involved in the dispute.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

NE files
AID FOR ABANDONED ARABIAN SOLDIERS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. DELLENBACK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our great country has always been dedicated to humanitarian principles. All Americans must have been profoundly

moved, as I was, by recent news accounts and photographs of helpless Arab soldiers abandoned by their governments and wandering in the broiling desert sun. These men, surely, are not responsible for the folly of their leaders nor deserving of slow and horrible death after defeat in battle.

Therefore I applaud and support the step just announced by the White House, offering American aircraft to airdrop water to these unfortunate castaways. Let us hope that the Israel and Egyptian Governments will give their cooperation promptly, before the grim desert sun makes our mission of mercy moot. Personally, I would think emergency food and medical supplies as well as water should be provided.

While I remain adamantly opposed to the use of American aid to prop up such demagogic and discredited governments as Mr. Nasser's, I notified President Johnson by telegram today of my warm endorsement of this humanitarian step which accords with our highest religious teachings. Because it is moral and right, it is also good international politics for the United States at this critical juncture in Middle East and East-West relationships.

The text of my telegram follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I commend and support our government's offer of American aircraft to try and save the stranded Arab soldiers in the Sinai desert. It accords with our country's humanitarian and religious traditions and effectively answers President Nasser's big lie on the role of American planes in the recent war. My stated opposition to the use of American aid to prop up Mr. Nasser's demagogic and discredited regime does not preclude emergency measures to save soldiers it has abandoned in defeat. If they live, they might prove a leaven of realism among the Egyptian population to restrain future follies and threats to world peace.

Respectfully,

GERALD R. FORD,
Minority Leader.

Gerald R. Ford
CHAIN OF EVENTS IN ISRAEL

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following articles from the June 1967 number of Jewish Frontier:

BREATHING SPELL OR NOOSE?

The U.N. calls for a "breathing spell" in the present crisis in the Middle East should not serve to obscure the essentials of the situation. There is no point in a breathing spell which provides air and ease for all except the one aggrieved. If Egypt is to maintain her blockade and the Arab armies continue to encircle Israel while the United Nations debates and negotiations drag on, Israel may find herself choking during the supposed respite. The mobilization of her people's army to meet the Arab threat means the cessation or serious impediment of her economic life. Israel has to marshal every able-bodied citizen from the age of 18 to 45—boy and girl, man and woman. Denial of access to the Gulf of Aqaba further throttles the small country. Unless Arab aggression is halted quickly Israel will find the breathing spell a noose.

June 16, 1967

gress, in spite of the specific language of the letter—is he assuring us that there will be no strike—if conferees are actually not appointed and in being—is he telling us now that we can be assured through his connection with the organized labor movement in this particular fight with the management of the railroads that there will be no strike, although there is no conference, and we do not know whether this matter will ever go to conference?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to answer that statement.

If the gentleman is reading that letter now, let him make his own decision what it says.

I am not going to make any statement as to what labor is going to do for 1 minute—or that I am their representative any more than I am a management representative.

I do not want anyone to read into my words anything except what is in this letter. I will read the letter and then the gentleman can make his own decision.

Mr. LENNON. That is very helpful and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will tell the gentleman where it is.

It is on page H7282 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the gentleman can read this if he wishes to—because I am sorry, I cannot read it without my glasses.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me and I will be pleased to read the letter to the Members of the House.

Mr. LENNON. I yield and I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MOSS. As the gentleman stated, this letter is to be found on page H7282 of the RECORD of Thursday, June 15, 1967, and it is addressed to the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS and is as follows:

RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES'
 ASSOCIATION,
 Washington, D.C., June 15, 1967.

HON. HARLEY STAGGERS,
 Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce
 Committee, U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STAGGERS: A valid question has been raised by a number of the members with respect to the possibility of a railroad strike occurring before conferees could complete their work in the event S.J. Res. 559 should be amended.

I wish to advise you on behalf of the six shop-craft unions involved in this dispute that no strike action would be taken during the period of time required for the conferees to compose the differences between the measures adopted by the two Chambers.

We would be most appreciative if you would advise your colleagues to this effect.

Sincerely yours,
 DONALD S. BEATTIE,
 Executive Secretary.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would certainly say that it is my judgment that the letter would certainly comprehend and include the time that is necessary to effect the appointment of conferees, as long as that is a reasonable period of time.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman, and I ask my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, if his view of this is in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman from California.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will leave that up to the gentleman from North Carolina to make his own deduction. I read the letter and put it in the RECORD to let the Congress make its own judgment.

I did not interpret anything, and I am not trying to interpret anything. I said I had the letter, and I read it, and the gentleman can read it.

Mr. LENNON. Then the gentleman is not willing to give us his personal judgment on this just as the gentleman from California has?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California, if you want my personal opinion.

Mr. LENNON. That is what I asked for, and I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California yield for the purpose of an inquiry in this respect?

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman will be pleased to respond. The gentleman from Oregon has the time.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, do we interpret the position—that is, the position of the leadership of the majority party, not just the individual interpretation of the esteemed gentleman from California—to be that under the assurances which have been given to this Congress, if we now go into recess with the intention of meeting again Monday next, there will be no strike on the railroads prior to the time we come next into session?

Mr. MOSS. That would be a most inappropriate interpretation. I have not consulted with the leadership in an effort to arrive at their interpretation.

I have given the gentleman my interpretation. I think that the letter will fully support the interpretation I have placed, but I would not presume to give the assurances the gentleman seeks without appropriate opportunity for consulting. I think the letter must be read and construed by each Member as his own wisdom dictates.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is the gentleman or any other representative of the majority party in this House in a position to assure the Members of this House that it is the official position of the majority party that if we now concur in an adjournment at this time, there will be no strike between now and when we next come back into session?

Mr. MOSS. I think the gentleman, if he yields for purposes of response, asks in a more oblique manner what he asked before, and my answer would be the same.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving further the right to object, is there any Member who is in a position to speak on behalf of the majority party for the information of those of us in the minority and for the information of the Members of the House, to give us further assurances or further interpretations of whatever communications have been received by the majority party that our action would be well advised, that is, to go into recess at this time or to adjourn?

Mr. MOSS. Will the gentleman yield for a further response?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the assurance that was given here does not come from the majority party. Rather, it comes from an organization known as the Railway Labor Executives' Association. It is under the signature of the executive secretary of that association.

The situation confronting the House at this moment arises because of the information conveyed to the Speaker of this House by the other body that it does not intend to act today, tomorrow, or on Sunday. In other words, no action will be taken until Monday. Therefore, the assurance we have is not from within this Chamber, but from an organization deeply involved. I think it was given in good faith. I would expect them, if they want me to accept their assurances in good faith, to meet the test of whether or not it is in good faith by having it cover the situation presently existing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Reserving further the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to engage in semantic quibbles on this, but I interpreted the gentleman from California as making it explicit in his remarks a few minutes ago that he was talking merely as one individual Member of this Congress, that it was his interpretation of the letter that it said certain things.

The inquiry that I direct to the majority is this: Is this also the interpretation of the leadership of the majority party that under the circumstances before us, in the light of the language of the letter which is in the RECORD, which has been received by the esteemed chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, it is now in accord with the interpretation of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a response?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman acting now as majority leader is in no more of a position to convey a precise statement on behalf of the entire majority party than the gentleman who is now acting as minority leader is in a position to convey any such commitment binding upon the minority party.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Reserving further the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there any representative of the majority party who is in a position to add to the statement of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MOSS. There is none. I am assuming that the gentleman will yield at this point.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman acting in the role of the majority party spokesman in this House has given to the best of his ability and in good faith answers which he feels are responsive to the question.

They are the only answers that can be given.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, certainly I do not question the good faith of the gentleman from California.

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

The declaration of President Nasser of Egypt that he will not permit Israeli ships to go through the Straits of Tiran is an act of aggression against the rights of Israel and represents a violation of international law as affirmed by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958. The Egyptian dictator's demand for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai, and the massing of Arab forces on every border of the Jewish state are further indications that the Arab rulers may have decided that the hour is ripe for the "war of annihilation"—military and economic—about her, the danger to peace in the Middle East and consequently to world peace is grave. The best hope for curbing the warlike designs of the Arab powers and for preventing a tragic conflagration lies in the implementation of American policy as announced in the Tri-Partite Declaration of 1950 and subsequently re-affirmed by every American president. The American commitment is unequivocal. It applies both to the territorial integrity and independence of Israel and to free access to the Gulf of Aqaba. A review of the chain of events leading to the present situation makes clear the blatant immorality of tactics of delay.

On March 1, 1957, Mrs. Golda Meir, then Foreign Minister of Israel, stated to the General Assembly on what assumptions Israeli forces were withdrawn from the Gaza Strip and the region of the Gulf of Aqaba. These assumptions were: that free and innocent passage for international and Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and through the Strait of Tiran would continue to be fully maintained after Israel's withdrawal; that the take-over of Gaza from the military and civilian control of Israel would be exclusively by the United Nations Emergency Force; and, finally, that the United Nations administration of Gaza would be maintained till there was a peace settlement or a definite agreement on the future of the Gaza Strip.

On the basis of these assurances Israel ordered the evacuation of points vital to her security. The Gaza Strip, occupied by Egypt in 1948, had been transformed into a hostile base from which Nasser unleashed his *fedayeen* terrorists in a mounting campaign of arson and murder. Sharm el Sheikh in the south-eastern corner of the Sinai overlooked the Straits of Tiran; control of this point was essential to lifting the illegal Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. The Sinai Campaign, precipitated by the heavy massing of Egyptian troops and Russian armor in the Sinai desert, as well as by the documented imminence of a "second round" was undertaken to liberate Israel from the *fedayeen* outrages and the strangle hold of the Egyptian blockade. In the interests of international peace Israel surrendered the fruits of its victory. It accepted the assurances of the Great Powers, particularly those of the United States, that incursions from the Gaza Strip would be curbed, and that free passage through the Straits of Tiran would not be impeded.

THE ASSURANCES

In a memorandum of February 11, 1957, the Secretary of State, the late John Foster Dulles, with the approval of President Eisenhower, said:

"The United States believes that the Gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the Gulf and through the Straits giving access thereto. We have in mind not only commercial usage, but the passage of pilgrims on religious missions, which should be fully respected."

On February 20, 1957, President Eisenhower stated:

"With reference to the passage into and through the Gulf of Aqaba, we expressed the conviction that the Gulf constitutes international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the Gulf. We announced that the United States was prepared to exercise this right itself and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right. Egypt, by accepting the six principles adopted by the Security Council last October in relation to the Suez Canal, bound itself to free and open transit through the Canal without discrimination, and to the principle that the operation of the Canal should be insulated from the politics of any country. We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the Armistice Agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations."

The U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, stated on March 1, 1957:

"It is essential that units of the United Nations Emergency Force be stationed at the Straits of Tiran in order to achieve there the separation of Egyptian and Israel land and sea forces. This separation is essential until it is clear that the non-exercise of any claim to belligerent rights has established in practice the peaceful conditions which must govern navigation in waters having such an international interest."

On the basis of these assurances, Israel Foreign Minister Golda Meir on March 1, 1957, declared:

"Israel is now prepared to withdraw its forces from the region of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran in the confidence that there will be continued freedom of navigation for international and Israel shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and through the Straits of Tiran."

As additional re-assurance, President Eisenhower wrote personally to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion on March 2, 1957:

"I know that this decision was not an easy one. I believe, however, that Israel will have no cause to regret having thus conformed to the strong sentiment of the world community as expressed in the various United Nations resolutions relating to withdrawal."

"It has always been the view of this Government that after the withdrawal there should be a united effort by all of the nations to bring about conditions in the area more stable, more tranquil and more conducive to the general welfare than those which existed heretofore. Already the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions which presage such a better future. Hopes and expectations based thereon were voiced by your Foreign Minister and others. I believe that it is reasonable to entertain such hopes and expectations and I want you to know that the United States, as a friend of all the countries of the area and as a loyal member of the United Nations will seek that such hopes prove not to be in vain."

The United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea on April 27, 1958, reaffirmed international law regarding passage through straits in these terms:

"There should be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits which are used for international navigation between one part of the high seas and another part of the high seas or territorial sea of a foreign state."

THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE

The United Nations Emergency Force, established by virtue of a General Assembly resolution of November 5, 1956 had been deployed in the Gaza Strip and the Sinai for over ten years. Its function was to act as a buffer and contribute to the peace of the regions. Its sudden withdrawal by Secretary-

General U Thant upon the unilateral demand of the Egyptian dictator has been viewed by the Secretary-General himself as ill-timed. In his statement to the Security Council (May 19, 1967) U Thant said: "It can be said that the timing of the withdrawal of the U.N.E.F. leaves much to be desired because of the prevailing tensions and dangers throughout the area."

Why in view of this situation did U Thant acquiesce so promptly in carrying out Nasser's demand? The Secretary-General has stated that the U.N.E.F. could not remain against the will of Egypt. The possibility of an Egyptian request for the evacuation of the peace-keeping force had been foreseen at the time of its establishment. The then Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold reached an agreement with President Nasser in regard to the conditions under which the force might be withdrawn. On November 20, 1956 Hammarskjold reported to the General Assembly on this matter, and noted that the General Assembly "understanding this to correspond to the wishes of the Government of Egypt, reaffirms its willingness to maintain U.N.E.F. until its task is completed."

In other words the U.N.E.F. was to stay till its peace-keeping purpose was achieved. In addition, on February 26, 1957, Hammarskjold outlined the procedure to be followed in case a demand for withdrawal of the force was made: the Secretary-General should inform the Advisory Committee of the U.N.E.F. which should then decide whether to bring the matter to the attention of the General Assembly.

Why were the peace-keeping forces not placed in Israeli territory? In the crucial question of the Gulf of Aqaba there is no such geographic possibility. Israel has no border which overlooks the Straits of Tiran, the point at which Egypt seeks to bar access to Israeli shipping through the Gulf. As far as the Gaza Strip is concerned, there is no function for the U.N.E.F. on the Israeli side of the border. It must be borne in mind that the U.N. soldiers may not use force. They are observers who act as checks on proposed violence. Since military infiltrators and terrorists come from Gaza into Israel and not from Israel into Gaza, a United Nations presence is helpful in Gaza; it is meaningless in Israel. Shukairy's fire-eating "Palestine Liberation Army" is now stationed in Gaza and threatening to send guerrillas into Israel. No Israelis are trying to infiltrate Gaza.

THE PRESENT CRISIS

President Nasser has explained his massing of troops in the Sinai and his mining of the Gulf of Aqaba as measures to forestall an Israeli attack on Syria. The Soviet Union has echoed this explanation, suggesting further that Israel is involved in an "imperialist plot" to topple the "progressive" government of Syria. The nonsensical nature of these charges is disproven by the sequence of events as described in Prime Minister's Eshkol's report to the Knesset on May 22, 1967:

"During the night of May 15, 1967, news of the movement of Egyptian military forces into Sinai reached us from various sources. Military forces had been openly and demonstratively transferred, in broad daylight. Cairo explained that this step was taken in response to Israel's alleged preparations to attack Syria, and concentration of military forces on the northern frontier."

"Upon learning of the Egyptian troop movements and the pretext offered to explain them, and before Egyptian forces had crossed the Suez Canal, we informed the U.N. that the allegations of Israeli troop concentrations in northern Israel were baseless. This statement was transmitted by the U.N. to Middle Eastern capitals, including Cairo. In his report to the Security Council on May 19, 1967, the U.N. Secretary-General states that U.N. observers verified the absence of

Israeli troop concentrations and Israeli military movements on the northern frontier.

"Nevertheless, Egyptian troop movements continued in the direction of Sinai, while mendacious propaganda continued to proceed from Cairo and Damascus concerning Israeli concentrations which had never taken place.

"During the first days of Egyptian troop movements towards Sinai, authoritative political circles in the world capitals expressed the view that this was merely a propaganda move, devoid of any particular military significance.

"The movement of Egyptian forces into Sinai gathered strength during the second half of last week, and today they are almost fully deployed in eastern Sinai and various positions throughout the peninsula.

"Before May 14, the Egyptian force in Sinai consisted of less than two divisions, based mainly on infantry and some armour. Today, after reinforcements, Egyptian forces there are of a strength close to four divisions of infantry with armour. Furthermore, numerous artillery units have been brought up, and the Palestinian forces in the Gaza Strip have been strengthened. Moreover, the Egyptian Air Force in the Sinai peninsula has also been reinforced."

While it is true that the Israeli government had warned Syria to stop terrorist attacks on agricultural settlements near the Syrian border, U Thant as late as May 19 confirmed the absence of troop concentrations in Israel, where as the Egyptian massing of troops in Sinai began on May 15, four days earlier. Whatever the reasons, it is apparent that Nasser, whether confident of Russian military support, or piqued by Arab charges that he was insufficiently bellicose and eager to re-establish his pre-eminence in the Arab world, appears to have decided that the moment for the "third round," the war of final "annihilation" of Israel, had come. In this he is, of course, supported by the various Arab states, none of whom can afford to appear less bellicose than the other. Israel may well have to fight once more for the right to live, against enormous odds. Though the plaudits to Israel valor and competence are fully merited, arithmetic should not be ignored. The small democracy, created as an act of historic justice by the United Nations less than twenty years ago, encircled by a hostile ring of Arab states, is vastly outnumbered. It is essential that the "third round," already initiated by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, be stopped by the international community in their interests of world peace.

Israel is eager for peace. Prime Minister Eshkol has offered to draw back Israeli forces from the borders if the Egyptians will do likewise. In his address to the Knesset (May 22) he declared:

"I would like to say again to the Arab countries from this rostrum, particularly to Egypt and Syria, that we harbour no aggressive designs. We have no possible interest in violating either their security, their territory or their legitimate rights. Nor shall we interfere in any way in their internal affairs, their regimes, or their regional or international relations. We expect of them, according to the principles of reciprocity, the application of the same principles toward us."

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT

Declaration by Britain, France and the United States, May 25, 1950:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area.

"The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would,

consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside of the United Nations to prevent such violation."

On June 1, 1953, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, reaffirmed the declaration in a radio address and said:

"The present U.S. Administration stands fully behind that declaration."

President Eisenhower, State of the Union Message, January 5, 1957:

"We have shown, so that none can doubt, our dedication to the principle that force shall not be used internationally for any aggressive purposes and that the integrity and independence of the nations of the Middle East should be inviolate."

President Kennedy, May 8, 1963:

"In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression (in the Middle East), whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression; which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time."

President Johnson, on May 23, 1967, stated: "To the leaders of all the nations of the Near East, I wish to say that three Presidents have said before—that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of the area. The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, overt or clandestine. This has been the policy of the United States led by four Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and myself—as well as the policy of both of our political parties. The record of the actions of the United States over the past twenty years, within and outside the United Nations, is very clear on this point."

THE RIGHT TO SELF-DEFENSE

(NOTE.—This article is part of an address delivered at the United Nations, December 5, 1956, by Mrs. Golda Meir, then Foreign Minister of Israel, in regard to the Sinai Campaign. We reprint it because of its pertinence to the present crisis.)

(By Golda Meir)

For eight years Israel has been subjected to the unrelenting violence of physical assault and to an equally unremitting intent to destroy the country economically through blockade, through boycott and through lawless interference with the development of its natural resources. Since Israel's efforts to repulse the concerted Arab onslaught in 1948, it has had no respite from hostile acts and loudly proclaimed threats of destruction.

It would be idle to pretend that the present situation can be discussed without regard to this background, or that the causes that precipitated Israel's recent security action can be ignored. If this Assembly is genuinely determined to restore peace to the Middle East it must first determine from what source aggressive policies derive. It will serve little purpose to isolate one link in the chain of circumstances, to thrust the weight of resolutions upon one incident without considering the total effects. Unless the United Nations is prepared to use its influence to prevail upon the countries of the Middle East to negotiate a fundamental solution, the Middle Eastern cauldron will continue to seethe and the region will be a powder-keg for others anxious to exploit its inflammable possibilities. Not only the well-being of Israel, but perhaps the peace of mankind, demand that the question of responsibility for unrest in this part of the world be squarely faced and the causes of tension removed.

Israel is ringed by hostile states which invoke the terms of the 1949 Armistice Agree-

ment when they find it convenient, and which flout those agreements when they find them oppressive. They refuse to sign peace treaties, clinging desperately to the discredited theory of a "belligerent status" against Israel, while at the same time piously demanding the protections of peace for themselves. As long ago as June 12, 1951, an official Egyptian representative defended his country's obstruction of Israel shipping through the Suez Canal with the following extraordinary words:

"We are exercising a right of war. We are still legally at war with Israel. An armistice does not put an end to a state of war. It does not prohibit a country from exercising certain rights of war."

We know from agonizing experience what these "certain rights of war" are. They include indiscriminate terror, arson and economic attack. At the same time any Israeli effort to stop murder and pillage, to make existence tolerable for its beleaguered population, is met with an outcry about the violation of peace, a peace which exists only in so far as it accords with the convenience of those who have broken it. A comfortable division has been made: The Arab states unilaterally enjoy the "rights of war"; Israel has the unilateral responsibility of keeping the peace. But belligerency is not a one-way street. Is it surprising if a people laboring under this monstrous distinction should finally become restive and at last seek a way of rescuing its life from the perils of a regulated war conducted against it from all sides?

For the people of Israel this paradox is not merely a question of logic or semantics. Among the "rights of war" exercised against Israel has been the fedayeen campaign unleashed by Colonel Nasser in the summer of 1955. These fedayeen are gunmen, trained by Egyptian army officers and recruited chiefly from among the Arab population in the Gaza strip, which was captured by the Egyptian army when it invaded Israel in 1948. Fedayeen gangs have been planted in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. Very heavy concentrations of these fedayeen units were stationed in the Sinai desert. Israel's narrow borders and long frontiers make it particularly vulnerable to terror squads who cross the border at night with the sole objective of indiscriminately shooting or bombing any Israeli house, or any man, woman or child. The murders committed by the fedayeen were hailed by the Cairo radio on August 31, 1955, with words which left no doubt as to the identity of the organizers of these outrages:

"Weep, O Israel, because Egypt's Arabs have already found their way to Tel-Aviv. The day of extermination draws near. There shall be no more complaints or protests to the United Nations or the Armistice Commission. There will be no peace on the borders because we demand the death of Israel."

The slaughter of six children and their teacher in the agricultural school of Shafrir, the bombing of a wedding in the Negev village of Fatish—these are examples, familiar to the world, of the kind of heroic exploits so lustily applauded by Colonel Nasser when he addressed a fedayeen unit in the Gaza strip in the following terms:

"You have proven by your deeds that you are heroes upon whom our entire country can depend. The spirit with which you entered the land of the enemy must spread."

The list of daily murders, of acts of robbery and sabotage, can be indefinitely extended. But let me only remind this Assembly of the events of September 23rd of this year on another front, when a group of archaeologists was fired upon in Ramat Rachel from the Jordanian border. Five Israelis were killed and 16 wounded. The next day two more Israelis, a man and a woman, working in their fields in different parts of the country, were killed by Jordanian units. When

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7383

in response, on September 25, deterrent action was taken at Husan by an Israeli army unit, this action was officially described as "unprovoked."

May I say that the people of Israel cannot emulate, nor do they understand, this legalistic detachment. When their peaceable fellow-citizens are murdered in cold blood, in the course of their daily occupation, they are provoked and they demand that their government reflect that sense of provocation by affording them the protection which ever state owes its citizens and which international bodies are apparently unable to provide. If moral distinctions are to be made, then let me suggest that controlled military actions—with limited and well defined military or police objectives—are less abhorrent, even to the most sensitive conscience, than wanton and indiscriminate murder which strikes not at military targets, but solely at civilians.

The campaign of terror unleashed against Israel was not stopped by the intervention of the United Nations. The cease-fire secured by the Secretary-General last April was not honored. Instead, despite exemplary restraint practiced by Israel immediately after the cease-fire agreement, violence increased on every border. Every sign pointed to the fact that the Egyptian dictator was about to realize his cherished and fully publicized ambition of a second round aimed at destroying Israel. He had amassed huge stocks of heavy armaments, secured largely from the Soviet Union and affiliated countries. He had concluded treaties with Jordan and Syria according to which the military forces of these countries were placed under the Egyptian High Command. We knew of large concentrations of armor and fedayeen in the Egyptian bases in the Sinai desert and the Gaza strip directly along the borders of Israel. There was a minimum of reticence about the proposed "extermination" of the small neighboring state. We recognized the symptoms. Within the lifetime of nearly every person here present a dictator arose who, like this disciple of his, informed the world in advance of his bloodthirsty plans. The ashes of the crematoria, the carnage of millions, a world in ruin, testified to the fidelity with which he kept his purposes.

Such a lesson should not be forgotten. Certainly the people of Israel are not likely to forget what the threat of total extermination means.

It is not my intention to enter into a description of the acts of hostility of the Egyptian government in many other fields. But the Assembly cannot remain indifferent, above all, to the fact that ever since the Resolution of the Security Council of September 1, 1951, and indeed, before that, the Government of Israel has patiently striven to solve the grave international problem of a double sea-blockade imposed against Israel by Egypt in the Suez Canal and in the Straits of Aqaba. The Security Council confirmed the illegality of this blockade and rejected the Egyptian argument of a "state of war" by which it sought to justify it. The Council ordered Egypt to terminate these practices. In October, 1956, the Security Council repeated its call for free passage without discrimination, "overt or covert."

Their decisions have been flouted. At the same time Egypt and the other Arab countries have sought by every means, direct and indirect, by organized boycott and by indiscriminate threats against Israel and attempted blackmail of countries friendly to Israel, to cripple Israel's commerce and to strangle her economic life. They have extended that boycott of Israel even to the agencies of the United Nations.

We are a small people in a small barren land which we revived with our labor and our love. The odds against us are heavy; the disparity of forces is great, but we have no alternative but to defend our lives and free-

dom and the right to security. We desire nothing more than peace, but we cannot equate peace merely with an apathetic readiness to be destroyed. If hostile forces gather for our proposed destruction they must not demand that we provide them with ideal conditions for the realization of their plans. Nor should the sincere desire for peace, shared by so many, be used as the shelter for such preparations.

The action of the Israel army in the unpopulated Sinai desert served to disrupt well-laid Egyptian plans and to liquidate new bases of active hostility against us. The texts of captured Egyptian military documents which Israel presented to the Security Council on November 15th indicate how imminent was the attack. I shall not repeat the long and detailed directives to the Egyptian commanders. But it would be salutary for all of us not to forget the introduction, which read:

"Every commander is to prepare himself and his subordinates for the inevitable campaign with Israel for the purpose of fulfilling our exalted aim which is the annihilation of Israel and her destruction in the shortest possible time in the most brutal and savage battles."

Is it conceivable that this Assembly should view the situation in Israel preceding October 29, 1956 as one of peace? Why should acts of cowardly murder of unarmed men, women and children, carried out for years, evoke less resentment than open military operation against nests of fedayeen and bases of hostile forces?

The practical problems which, it is claimed, divide the Arabs and Israel are not beyond solution. The world has, for instance, known and still knows refugee problems of far wider scope than those of the Arab refugees. In Korea, in India and Pakistan, in Greece and Turkey, in Europe after World War II, these numerically far larger problems have or are being successfully handled. Who more than the Jewish people has endured the tragic fate of the refugee? If to-day there is no bitter Jewish refugee problem in the world, it is because Israel supported by the solidarity of the Jewish people everywhere and with the aid of friendly governments has largely solved it. There need never have been a Palestine Arab refugee problem at all, had it not been created by the action of the Arab states. Given the cooperation of those same Arab states this distressing human problem could readily have been solved and can be solved to-day. In its solution Israel, as has been previously stated on behalf of my government, is prepared to play its part. But while Israel was absorbing Jewish refugees to a number exceeding that of all the Arab refugees—and hundreds of thousands of those whom we absorbed came from these same Arab lands—the Arab states for their part, with the exception of Jordan, were erecting an iron wall between themselves and these kinsmen of theirs. Since then they have lost no opportunity for exploiting these people as a political weapon in their war against Israel.

The fundamental problem in the whole situation is the systematically organized Arab hostility against Israel. Arab enmity towards Israel is not a natural phenomenon. It is artificially fostered and nurtured. It is not, as has been here alleged, Israel which is an instrument of colonialism. It is the *Israel-Arab conflict* which keeps the area at the mercy of dangerously contending outside forces. Only by the liquidation of that conflict will the people of the region be able to work out their own destinies in independence and hope. Only in that prospect lies hope for a brighter future of equality and progress for all the peoples concerned. If hatred is abandoned as a principle of Arab policies everything becomes possible.

Over and over again the Israel government has held out its hand in peace to its neighbors. But to no avail. At the Ninth

Session of the General Assembly the Israel representative suggested that if the Arab countries were not yet ready for peace, it would at least be useful as a preliminary or transitory stage to conclude agreements committing the parties to policies of non-aggression and pacific settlement. The reply was outright rejection. Our offer to meet the representatives of all or any Arab country still stands. No answer from across our borders has come to our call for peace.

The concept of annihilating Israel is a legacy of Hitler's war against the Jewish people: it is no mere coincidence that the soldiers of Nasser had an Arabic translation of *Mein Kampf* in their knapsacks. We are convinced that these dangerous seeds have not yet succeeded in corrupting the Arab peoples, but this fatal game is one which the Arab political leaders should halt in the interests of the Arab peoples themselves.

I wish at this point to renew an appeal already heard from this rostrum to Egypt to desist from the shameful and disastrous policy recently initiated of wholesale persecution of its Jewish population. I shall not elaborate on the mass of detailed information now reaching us in this connection, some of which has been incorporated in a memorandum which it was my honor to transmit to you last Saturday afternoon—the sordid and disgraceful story of deportations and concentration camps, of indignity and spoliation, the holding of hostages to ensure silence on the part of those expelled, and of callous brutality. I can only hope that the shocked conscience of the world will have its effect on the rulers of Egypt and that they will yet desist, and desist at once, from the measures on which they have embarked.

What ought to be done now? Are we, in our relations with Egypt, to go back to an armistice regime which has brought anything but peace and which Egypt has derisively flouted? Shall the Sinai desert again breed nests of fedayeen and of aggressive armies poised for the assault? Will certain countries rearm Egypt for the renewed pursuit of its announced aims? Must the tragedy be re-enacted in the tinderbox of the Middle East? The peace of our region and perhaps of more than our region hangs on the answers which will be given to these questions.

In a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of October 30, 1956, we put the following questions:

(a) "Does Egypt still adhere to the position declared and maintained by her over years that she is in a state of war with Israel?"

(b) "Is Egypt prepared to enter into immediate negotiations with Israel with a view to the establishment of peace between the two countries as indicated in paragraph 3 of the aide-memoire of the Government of Israel of November 4, 1956 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations?"

(c) "Does Egypt agree to cease the economic boycott against Israel and lift the blockade of Israel shipping in the Suez Canal?"

(d) "Does Egypt undertake to recall the fedayeen gangs under her control in other Arab countries?"

Is it too much to expect clear, simple, binding answers? Are we, and not only we but the fellow members of the United Nations, to take as an answer the announcement on Radio Cairo, on December 2, 1956, repeated again later in the day, that: "The Fedayeen Command has decided to launch a fierce campaign within Israel during the coming winter season"? Can the United Nations make itself responsible for the restoration, once again, on our southern borders of murder and sabotage units pursuing a one-sided belligerency? The blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba is now terminated. The battery of guns installed a few years ago by the Egyptian government on the desolate shore at the southern tip of the Sinai peninsula for

H 7384

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 16, 1967

the sole and illegal purpose of preventing the passage into the Gulf of Israel of shipping no longer exists. Would it not be grotesque for an international body to permit the creation anew of the conditions which made that blockade possible; or to permit Egypt to perpetuate unhindered its parallel blockade in Suez? We cannot believe that that is the case. To do so would constitute a distortion of the very meaning and essence of the Charter.

My Government has undertaken an obligation to withdraw its forces from Egyptian territory and we are implementing it. But we must know what will be the role of the United Nations Force after the Israel forces are withdrawn. We are certain that it is not the intention of the Assembly to recreate the conditions laden with the identical dangers which produced the explosion of October 29th.

May I remind the representative of the Soviet Union that there was a time, not so long ago, when they understood Israel's right to self-defense and appreciated the true disposition of forces in the Middle East?

Ambassador Jacob Malik declared in the Security Council in 1948 in words which are as apt today as the day they were uttered:

"Since its birth the State of Israel has declared that it will live in peace and entertain peaceful relations with all its neighbors. Israel is not to blame for the fact that this appeal did not meet with response from its neighbors."

The truth is that since 1948, when the words of the USSR delegate that I have quoted were uttered, nothing has changed in Israel's desire or intentions. We seek, as before, to fulfill our historic mission of rebuilding our land for our harried people and to live in peace with our neighbors. But I say again again that neither peace nor war can be unilateral. A boundary must be respected by two sides; it cannot be open to feyadeen and closed to Israeli soldiers.

What does Israel want? Its requirements are simple. We wish to be secure against threats to our territorial integrity and national independence. We wish to be left alone to pursue the work of developing our country and building a new society founded on social justice and individual liberty. We wish to cooperate with our neighbors for the common good of all the peoples of the region.

WEST VIRGINIA REGIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there follows a transcript of the June 16 radio-television interview in which Chester G. Bowers, Director of Airport Service of the Federal Aviation Administration, describes the significance of the May 15 FAA decision to support a regional airport for southern West Virginia at the Midway site. This constitutes an official, objective view which sheds light rather than heat on the West Virginia airport problem.

The transcript follows:

ANNOUNCER. Here today is Chester Bowers, Director of Airports Service of the Federal Aviation Administration, who will outline the background and significance for West Virginia of the FAA decision to support a large regional airport serving West Virginia at the Midway site.

Mr. Bowers. Last month the Federal Aviation Administration made a decision to con-

struct a new airport to provide improved air service to that part of the state. The FAA decision and recommendation was based on a long study of the airport needs of West Virginia. The citizens of Kanawha County and the city of Charleston have recognized for several years that they would need improved airport facilities to accommodate the newer and larger aircraft that would be serving that community. Several years ago, Kanawha County undertook a planning study to decide whether it was feasible to improve the existing airport or whether a new replacement facility should be developed. The Federal Aviation Administration assisted with a small grant in that planning study.

GUTHRIE PROPOSAL

Our agency also administers a construction grant program under which we provide funds, frequently as much as 50%, in the construction of airports. In our grant-in-aid program for last year we received a request from Kanawha County for some \$8 million of Federal funds to assist in development of a new airport at the Guthrie site. This request was based on the planning study undertaken which concluded that it was more feasible to provide improved air service for the long term future at a new site rather than improve the Kanawha County Airport.

TRI-STATE AIRPORT EXPANSION

In that same grant-in-aid program last year, our agency also received a request for improvement of the Tri-State Airport to provide a 7000 foot runway and the request asked for some \$3.6 million of Federal funds. Naturally, when an investment decision of the magnitude called for here, it's prudent to examine all the alternatives. The FAA normally would examine the possibility of one airport to serve adjacent communities when it's faced with the magnitude of the requests that were received from Tri-State and from Kanawha County.

FAA LOCATES SITE AT MIDWAY

At the same time, the citizens of Huntington approached the agency about the feasibility of an airport midway between Charleston and Huntington to serve both communities. The FAA located a site that was suitable for airport development and consequently deferred action on the requests for aid from both Kanawha County and Tri-State. At the same time, we urged the state and affected public agencies to study their long-range airport needs and to unify a proposal or proposals to satisfy those needs.

When our unified proposal was evident, the FAA accelerated its studies and after a rather intensive study of some five months, we have concluded that it is in the most public interest to develop a single airport.

In the course of those studies we examined three principal alternatives. We examined first of all and in some depth the possibility of improving the present airports. Tri-State and Huntington can be improved to provide long range needs by extension of the runway. We estimate that Tri-State could be improved to provide a 7000 foot runway for approximately \$4.9 million.

WHY EXPANSION OF KANAWHA AIRPORT IS NOT FEASIBLE

Kanawha County Airport at Charleston is another matter. It has some distinct advantage in being a close in airport. Our studies show that a 7000 foot runway can be constructed on the existing site. This would be a new runway. Such construction, however, would require a relocation of the National Guard area, and we concluded that a new runway would cost approximately \$9.4 million. Even with this cost, we looked very carefully at whether or not the existing airport, improved with a new 7000 foot runway, could meet the future needs of the Charleston area. We thought very definitely that the possibility of improving Kanawha should

either be ruled in or ruled out before we examined a new site. Our studies have led us to conclude after consultation with the airlines, after consideration of many factors, and after making our own forecasts, that a 7000 foot runway at the Kanawha Airport would be a stop-gap measure, that 7000 feet, while meeting today's needs, would not meet needs as far ahead as 1975. Therefore, if we supported the development of a new runway at Kanawha County we would again be in the same situation we are today, come 1975. So, we concluded, as did Kanawha County several years ago, that a new site was needed.

ANALYSIS OF GUTHRIE ALTERNATIVE

The alternative sites were the Guthrie site, located some 12 miles from Charleston and a Midway site, located between Charleston and Huntington, some 27 miles from downtown Charleston and 33 miles from downtown Huntington. The Guthrie site has the advantage of being closer to the majority of the air travelers. At the present time, the Kanawha County Airport boards about three times as many domestic scheduled passengers as does Tri-State. The Guthrie site is suitable for development of a 7300 foot runway that will serve the short-range needs. The site has capability of runway expansion of 10,000 feet. There are no smog or fog problems as there are at Kanawha. But the cost of development of a runway at the Guthrie site we estimate to be slightly over \$22 million. If Guthrie is developed to serve Charleston, Tri-State would need also to be further improved to serve the Huntington-Ironton-Ashland area, and here you have an additional cost of approximately \$4.9 million.

ADVANTAGES OF MIDWAY SITE

We then looked very carefully at the Midway site. This site is also suitable for runway development in the first stage of 7300 feet and ultimately to 10,000 or longer.

The weather conditions at Midway are approximately the same as those at Guthrie. The distance, as I mentioned, is greater. The cost of development of an airport at the Midway site would be approximately \$19 million. The Midway site has an additional advantage in that you would not need improvement of Tri-State at the same time. In other words, development of an airport at Midway would serve the common carrier needs of the entire area.

On total balance, therefore, FAA came to the conclusion that the convenience to passengers in some degree at a Guthrie site was more than offset by lower total cost of airport development at the Midway site, and an opportunity to share that cost among a wider population base. And Midway has the additional advantage of providing the opportunity for improved service by having one airport to serve the entire area. Of course, the more passengers you have at a particular airport the better prospects you have of long-haul, non-stop flights.

COST ESTIMATES FOR MIDWAY

ANNOUNCER. Mr. Bowers, would you please break down for us the Midway figure of \$19 million. Does this include navigation aids, access roads and the terminal building?

Mr. Bowers. Included in our costs for Midway was a terminal building, the access road, the navigation aids that would be provided by FAA, the site preparation, grading, earth moving and paving of facilities. As a matter of fact, the difference in costs between the Midway site and the Guthrie site is almost entirely the earth-moving costs of providing a level platform for the airport. We used the same cost figures in our estimates for both sites. For instance, we used a figure of 80 cents per cubic yard for earth moving, and the cost we used for terminal building and navigational aid, access road were identical at both sites. We also used the same costs of paving the 7300 foot runway at both sites.

May 18, 1967, in which you request the Department of Defense position relative to certain aspects of NASA's space program.

The first point you mention relates to the need for the NERVA engine for military purposes. The Department of Defense has no identifiable requirement currently or in the foreseeable future for such a nuclear rocket engine. We will, of course, continue to examine the technology developed under NASA's nuclear engine program for possible military application.

In regard to your second point, we do of course have a substantial industrial base which currently supports our Defense efforts. Our military space systems are an integral part of our national defense posture. The majority of industrial facilities and government installations which support the Department of Defense space activities also support the NASA space program. I do not believe that any special network of NASA space installations is necessary to assure that industrial input will flow with ease from all portions of the country into such plants in event of large scale military operations. Should the need arise, the flow you suggest can readily occur within our present industrial structure.

I feel that the main contribution of NASA's space program to Defense is in the technology being developed rather than in major items of hardware. I believe that NASA's research and technology programs contribute substantially to the nation's industrial capability. The Department of Defense of course draws on this capability to provide more effective space systems to enhance our military capability. Technology contributions from NASA programs in areas such as spacecraft power supply, life support, and attitude reference and control subsystems, for example, have been utilized in DOD space systems.

Questions of surveillance and weaponry are military in nature. While much of the basic spacecraft technology developed by NASA could contribute to a space surveillance system, the contribution to a ballistic missile capability would be substantially less. In fact, the DOD ballistic systems and technology programs, which have contributed heavily to NASA's space effort in the past, are expected to provide technology advancements of value to NASA in the future, particularly in such areas as guidance and control, upper stage propulsion, and reentry materials.

I sincerely hope that these comments will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. FOSTER, JR.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority whip as to the program for the rest of this week and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention after announcing the program and after 1-minute speeches and the other unanimous-consent requests, to ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be allowed to declare a recess today pending the action of the other body with respect to the joint resolution which we adopted on yesterday. That is the balance of the program for this week. There is nothing else scheduled.

For next week, Monday we will have

the Consent Calendar. Also we will have five suspensions. They are:

H.R. 611, to establish a Federal Judicial Center;

H.R. 10730, Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967;

House Joint Resolution 601, temporary extension of emergency provisions of urban mass transportation program;

H.R. 480, extending the act relating to the acquisition of wet lands for conservation of migratory waterfowl; and

H.R. 482, authorizing an increase in fee for migratory bird hunting stamp.

On Tuesday we will have the Private Calendar, which is to be followed by the conference report on the draft bill, S. 1432, extension of Universal Military Training and Service Act. This will be followed by H.R. 10480, to prohibit desecration of the flag, which will be heard under an open rule with 2 hours of debate. This will be followed by H.R. 2082, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to members of Armed Forces for dependent schooling, with 1 hour of debate and an open rule.

On Wednesday we have the increase in the public debt limit. This is subject to a rule being granted and a report being filed.

On Thursday we have H.R. 10340, the NASA Authorization Act of 1968, which is also subject to a rule being granted.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] tells me that there are several resolutions from the Committee on House Administration of a noncontroversial nature which he hopes to bring up on Monday or Tuesday.

Also, this announcement is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Can the gentleman from Louisiana inform the Members what the situation may be as far as a session tomorrow is concerned?

Mr. BOGGS. I can only speculate. My guess is that there will not be a session tomorrow, but as of now we are unaware as to whether or not the other body will request a conference on the resolution we passed only yesterday. Of course, it is conceivable that they could request a conference and conferees could be appointed and the conferees could meet and the conference report might be available by tomorrow. My own guess is that will not be the case.

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

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IT IN ORDER FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject

to the call of the Chair, at any time today.

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

There was no objection.

ANTIriot LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with several of my colleagues in introducing a resolution calling for action on the antiriot bill. This legislation was passed in the form of an amendment to the civil rights bill last year by a vote of 389 to 25 in this body. Yet the Judiciary Committee has not acted upon the legislation.

Warnings of "a long hot summer" spread across the land, and already we have seen violence in three of our cities. While the antiriot legislation does not pretend to be the cure for all violence in our streets, it does outlaw professional agitators who move from place to place inciting riots and disturbances.

The people of this country want and desire relief from the fear that lives in the streets of our cities, both North and South. They want and desire agitators like Stokeley Carmichael, to be dealt with promptly and firmly.

Through the antiriot legislation, investigative authority would cross State lines, and the power to prevent violence and destruction would not be confined to State and local authorities. Most essential, it would allow the Nation to deal with what is a national problem, not just the affair of one State or city. The actions of the professional riot inciters threaten the life and property and rights of every American, whether he lives in the largest city or the quietest small town. None of us is safe.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this House has a responsibility here and that we have been prevented from fulfilling it. We should now have the opportunity to consider this legislation on its own merits, which are many, and show the Nation that we are not afraid to stand up to the people who advocate and work for the destruction of our homes, businesses and lives through violence in our streets.

I urge the adoption of the resolution calling for House action on the antiriot bill.

Gale
GALLANT ISRAEL

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

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today there is a frail and tenuous armistice in the Middle East. Having achieved a spectacular military victory, Israel has good cause to fear that she may lose the peace.

The recent hostilities against Israel were the latest in the past 20 years during the Arab nations have considered

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Hear, O Lord, when I cry with my voice: have mercy upon me and answer me.—Psalm 27: 7.

O God, our Father, who art from everlasting to everlasting, strengthen us and steady us in this shaken world. Though circumstances change, help us to keep our hands in Thine, and our faith in Thee firm with a deepening trust and a growing confidence.

Deliver us from small concerns about ourselves, from majoring in minors, from being torn by trifles, and help us to think great thoughts, to act from great motives, and to live by great deeds. Thus may we continue to keep our Nation great in might and in spirit.

We wait upon Thee for the benediction of Thy grace to free us from fear and futility, to quicken our spiritual life, to exalt our hopes for our country, and to deepen our faith in righteousness, good will, and peace.

In all things keep us close to Thee. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1577. An act to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, since the Members of the House were denied the opportunity of having their votes recorded when final action was taken on House Joint Resolution 459 yesterday, I am taking this opportunity to announce and to have it appear in the RECORD, so that there will be no question about what my position was on this legislation, that I voted against the Pepper amendment, because I thought it was a dilatory act, avoiding responsibility, and designed to postpone a responsibility we should be facing up to. I voted in favor of recommitting the bill. Then I voted against the final passage of the joint resolution. Of course, these were all voice votes, and unfortunately the RECORD does not show even the number who stood, in-

dicating their support for a recorded vote. Just another instance where the RECORD fails to reflect the true record of what transpires on the floor of the House.

May I also add it is difficult for me to understand why so many Members appear so anxious to avoid being recorded on legislation involving principles which were so vigorously debated for 2 days and yet appear to be anxious to be recorded on noncontroversial issues, such as the Defense Department appropriation bill, also passed this week, with only one dissenting vote.

NASA AND THE MILITARY

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned about a proper definition of programs and benefits by the space agency so that intelligent decisions may be made concerning national space objectives. Of particular interest is the issue of military considerations and possible application of NASA's efforts and expenditures to the national defense. This issue has been raised by NASA on several occasions.

On April 11, for example, while making a case for the immediate production of flight hardware for the Nerva nuclear rocket engine, Dr. Adams told the Advanced Research and Technology Subcommittee:

In addition, of course, this rocket will have other applications as well. We do know something about what the Soviets are doing and it is unfortunate we can't discuss that part of it here . . . because of the classified nature.

On April 5 James Webb said in a nationwide TV interview:

We wanted a complex that included Huntsville, the assembly plant at New Orleans, the Mississippi test, the Houston spacecraft and the Cape for the launching site. We wanted this complex so that if we ever had to fly big military payloads on these big boosters there was an integrated system and the industrial system in the country could flow the materials toward this system.

In line with my concern, I directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense on May 18 asking for a statement of his Department's position on the military significance of NASA's space program. I received a reply of May 31.

Regarding the Nerva nuclear rocket engine, the Defense Department letter, signed by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering said:

The Department of Defense has no identifiable requirement currently or in the foreseeable future for such a nuclear rocket engine.

The letter later said:

The majority of industrial facilities and government installations which support the Department of Defense space activities also support the NASA space program. I do not believe that any special network of NASA space installations is necessary to assure that industrial input will flow with ease from all portions of the country into such plants in the event of large scale military operations.

Again the Department of Defense offered:

I feel that the main contribution of NASA's space program to Defense is in the technology being developed rather than in major items of hardware.

And finally:

The DOD ballistic systems and technology programs, which have contributed heavily to NASA's space effort in the past, are expected to provide technology advancements of value to NASA in the future, particularly in such areas as guidance and control, upper stage propulsion, and reentry materials.

In the event that various Members of Congress may be considering NASA's potential military significance as relevant to their evaluation of NASA's budget requests, I thought it appropriate that I release both the text of the letter I received from the Department of Defense and my own letter of inquiry.

The full texts of both letters follow:

MAY 18, 1967.

HON. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There have been several recent references to the possible military significance of NASA's space program.

Two points are most prominently mentioned: (1) That military (classified) considerations lend urgency to the immediate production of NERVA engine flight hardware for testing, and (2) that it is desirable to have a network of space installation across the country so that in the event of large scale military operations, industrial input could flow with ease from all portions of the country into NASA's plants.

I specify these points, but I am also interested in the Department of Defense position toward the entire concept of NASA's military importance, if any. It would be useful to consider separately such questions as surveillance and weaponry, as well as to have an overall view of NASA's actual impact on our defenses.

I will be most grateful for your assistance in spelling out your Department's position on these matters at the earliest possible time.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE
RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RYAN: The Secretary of Defense has asked that I reply to your letter dated

H 7373

June 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

themselves in a state of permanent war against Israel. Three times since her difficult birth in 1948, Israel has shown the ability in such circumstances to repulse aggressive incursions, as she did so heroically last week.

Israel has neither the means nor the will to destroy her Arab neighbors. One need only speculate in horror about what might have occurred had the military balance tilted the other way. Israel's strength and determination saved the situation. Now an enduring peace must be constructed.

The Arab States believe that the longer they delay meaningful negotiations, the greater will become the pressure for Israel to accept something close to the status quo ante. In 1956 Israel bowed to diplomatic pressure in exchange for promised diplomatic guarantees and returned to her 1949 frontiers, only to have the use of the Suez Canal denied to her, border harassment continue, and finally, when Nasser felt strong enough, the Gulf of Aqaba blocked and the call of "holy war" raised against her.

The gallant nation of Israel must never be so threatened again.

The United States, as a world power and as a friend of Israel, has an historic opportunity to use its influence toward achieving a permanent settlement. We had this chance in 1949; we had it in 1957; if we pass it up in 1967, in all likelihood we shall be confronted with another Middle Eastern war in 1977, when resentments are deeper and weapons stronger.

In this era of cold war there have been too many armistice agreements and too few settlements.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of the United Nations during the past weeks were cause for grave disappointment. The U.N. emergency force was withdrawn from the Gaza strip and Sharm el-Sheikh without consultation and with most serious consequences. The Security Council debates consisted of the hurling of charges and countercharges, the venting of anger, with little cooperative diplomacy.

Nevertheless, let us not forget that the existence of the United Nations provided the vehicle for an early cease-fire, that Syrian and Israel commanders came to agreement in United Nations headquarters in Quinetera, and that in this atmosphere of mutual hostility and suspicion the United Nations aegis still offers a hope for the initiation of direct negotiations.

This crisis has again demonstrated that the United Nations cannot play a useful role unless it is supported by the great powers.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union must be made to realize that a settlement in the Middle East is in the Soviet interest as well as in the interest of world peace. The Soviets made a grave tactical and diplomatic blunder when they encouraged Nasser's designs. It is deplorable that the Soviets have continued on a dangerous course, risking a wider war. They must cease to supply arms to the Arab nations.

If a stable and peaceful Middle East is in the interest of ourselves and the So-

viet Union, it is certainly in the interest of the principals. Political hatreds have obstructed the peaceful development of the waters of the Jordan. A million Arabs are in a state of semipermanent homelessness and hopelessness because of political hatreds. Poor countries have had to devote a burdensome portion of their resources to armaments, and each spiral of armaments has generated a new cycle of hatreds.

Mr. Speaker, since the partition agreement of 1947, Israel has been encircled by hostile neighbors.

Her fighting spirit has been forged through 20 years of a continuing struggle for survival as she has been subjected to a steady campaign against her very existence. The Arab States have done everything in their power militarily, politically, and diplomatically to destroy Israel. In defiance of international treaty obligations and of the Security Council resolution of 1951, Israel shipping has been denied the use of the Suez Canal; Arab States boycott companies which do business with Israel and ships which call at Israel ports. For 20 years Israel has lived with commando raids and terrorists acts knowing that only her strength prevented her destruction.

The Arab States are so bent on destroying Israel that they have even undertaken acts contrary to their own self-interest.

One and three-tenths million refugees are deliberately kept in a state of degradation and agitation because of the promise that they will one day return to Palestine. To the half million who have never seen Israel, home is the refugee camp; and resettlement is not accomplished. Refugee commando groups, such as the "Palestine Liberation Army," have been created.

In 1955 a plan to develop cooperatively the waters of the Jordan, which was agreed to by Israel and Arab technicians, was rejected by the Arab governments, only to spite Israel. In 1964 an Arab summit meeting sought to divert the Jordan, which would have retarded both Israeli and Arab development.

Mr. Speaker, if the hatreds, resentments, terrorism, and acts of both economic and military warfare of the past 20 years are to cease once and for all, then there must be direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel. The details of a settlement are the responsibility of the parties, but the United States would be abdicating its responsibility if it did not use its influence to encouraging negotiations to begin.

As long as Israel feels that maintenance of her present positions is essential to her security, it is not reasonable to expect Israel to relinquish whatever territory she occupied at the time of the cease-fire until a peace settlement is achieved.

In order to achieve a just and enduring peace in the Middle East, there are certain objectives which must be met.

The most fundamental, and the key to any settlement, is the acceptance by the Arab nations of the reality of the existence of Israel. As Abba Eban said before the United Nations on June 6:

The first of these principles surely must be the acceptance of Israel's Statehood and

the total elimination of the fiction of its non-existence. It would seem to me that after 3,000 years the time has arrived to accept Israel's nationhood as a fact. Here is the only State in the international community which has the same territory, speaks the same language and upholds the same faith as it did 3,000 years ago.

A much more conscious and uninhibited acceptance of Israel's Statehood is an axiom requiring no demonstration. There will never be a Middle East without an independent and sovereign State of Israel in its midst.

Second, Israel must have access to international waterways. The closing of the Gulf of Aqaba was the act of aggression which precipitated the recent conflict. The right of innocent passage through the Strait of Tiran must be maintained. Also Israel must not be denied free transit through the Suez Canal. The right to use the Suez was guaranteed to Israel long ago, yet the promises have not been carried out. There must be an end to blockades and boycotts which interfere with peaceful commerce.

A peace settlement must guarantee the borders of Israel so that Israel will no longer be confronted with the infiltration of commandos, the shelling of settlements and the massing of invasion forces. The United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations must help both within and without the United Nations to guarantee the territorial integrity of Israel.

The Arab refugee question has persisted for years. Now is the time to resolve it. In the past Israel has offered compensation, but the Arab States have preferred to keep the refugee camps as a political issue rather than absorbing the refugees into the local economy. The United States, which has contributed the most to UNRRA, should insist that an effective plan be formulated for resettlement and compensation.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity is at hand to resolve the problems which have festered for so long and to achieve lasting stability in the Middle East. This will require an end to the arms race and the concomitant tensions to which the Soviets have constantly contributed. It will require the cooperation of the great powers. It will require a long range economic development concept for the entire region. In the final analysis, it will require a willingness on the part of the Arab States to live in peace—and that is all that Israel has ever asked—the right to live in peace. If the severe suffering and deprivation of the past 20 years is to be overcome, then this historic opportunity for a lasting peace must not be allowed to escape us.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES TO S. 953, AMENDING FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 953) an act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs.

June 16, 1967

POAGE, GATHINGS, STUBBLEFIELD, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION: AN AWARD FOR THE WORST ADMINISTERED FEDERAL AGENCY OF FISCAL YEAR 1967?

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 and 26 of this year, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Committee on Public Works, the committee on which I have the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member, held hearings on the progress of the Federal water pollution control program and its administration or lack thereof by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—FWPCA—an agency established in the Water Quality Act of 1965 within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—HEW—which agency was then abruptly transferred to the Department of the Interior by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966.

The Federal water pollution control program, those who favored the reorganization argued, had been plagued for some time by the lack of priority given to it within the Public Health Service. The 1965 act established the FWPCA as a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to give it the organizational status which the committee and the Congress felt were required to effectively carry out the important Federal water pollution control effort.

But without even consulting the members of the committee which has legislative jurisdiction over this all-important program, the President of the United States shot up to Congress a reorganization plan, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966, which, when effectuated, transferred the FWPCA from HEW to Interior.

During consideration in Congress of that reorganization plan, I and many other Members of Congress expressed serious concern over the possible effects this transfer could have on the overall administration of the program. We had thought, in setting up the FWPCA in the 1965 act, that everything was alright and that the program could then be administered smoothly and with adequate organizational status. Yet the President was determined to have still another agency-shaking transfer, and the reorganization plan was put into effect. This was done despite our cries that the FWPCA was going to lose competent personnel in this field where competent personnel is hard to come by. But "Oh, no!", said the administration spokesmen. We were assured by them in testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations that everything was going to be rosy with the transfer, and that no one in FWPCA was discontent with the transfer, that the program would suffer absolutely no loss in effectiveness or efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony presented by the administration witnesses before the Sul committee on Rivers and Harbors several weeks ago in response to inquiries by the subcommittee members surely reveals that the administration of this program is suffering—and suffering very badly. Some 60 percent of the PHS personnel are no longer with the agency.

In my seven terms in Congress and on the Committee on Public Works, I have never known of a Federal program of such importance as this one, and in which the administration has pushed so hard for "emergency" congressional increased authorization, being so badly administered. Perhaps it is not so much that the FWPCA hierarchy is badly administering the program as it is that they just are not administering period. It goes far beyond the shakeup which can naturally be expected by transferring an agency from one department to another. It is something much more than this.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Congress that has acted decisively on Federal water pollution control legislation on many occasions that something is very, very wrong with the administration of this program. And I am not alone in this opinion. I believe I am joined in it by many of my colleagues on the committee and in the Congress, by countless State and local administrators, by engineering consultants in this complex field, and even by publications which concern themselves with water resources management.

On April 27, I inserted in the RECORD, on pages H4789 to H4790 thereof, an article from the December 8, 1966, issue of the Engineering News-Record, a most respected professional publication. That article showed the gross inefficiency in the administration of the program, in the area of construction of sewage treatment works.

Mr. Speaker, May 10 marked the anniversary of the effectuation of the transfer required by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966. There were not any celebrations in the Nation that day on the effectiveness of FWPCA's first year under Interior. In my opinion, the progress of the program under FWPCA is little further along today than it was when reorganized last year. The agency itself is more poorly staffed and more organized than it was on May 10, 1966.

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors bear out everything that I am saying here today.

To further point out my contentions here today, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks at this point, an article from the Engineering News-Record of Thursday, May 4, entitled "Congress Ordered Fast Action, But—Pollution Agency Trickles Along." This article well points out the sorry state of affairs down at FWPCA.

As the article's opening paragraph points out:

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) marks its first year in the Department of Interior next week. But in the words of one bitter official "there probably won't be a party because I doubt if we could organize one."

No one could have said it better than that, Mr. Speaker.

After asking for a \$450 million authorization in fiscal year 1968 the President only required \$2 million, giving it low priority, while increasing highway beautification from \$80 million to \$160 million, demonstration cities requested from about \$100 to \$615 million and OEO poverty by 25 percent.

This shows lack of reality in setting priorities.

This proves a downgrading of water pollution control.

This proves a downgrading of ongoing, proven, and necessary programs in order to finance new.

The article follows:

CONGRESS ORDERED FAST ACTION, BUT—POLLUTION AGENCY TRICKLES ALONG

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) marks its first year in the Department of Interior next week. But in the words of one bitter official "there probably won't be a party because I doubt if we could organize one."

Organization is a dirty word in the federal government's newest dirty water agency. Established by Congress 16 months ago as an arm of the U.S. Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, FWPCA no sooner got its feet on the ground than it was shifted to Interior on May 10, 1966, under a presidential organization plan.

Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall predicted great things: "1966 will be the year of action in water pollution control."

But most of the action during the past year has centered on getting organized and helping the states get their water quality standards ready before the July 1 deadline. Many of the agency's other activities have suffered as a result.

Personnel is still one of the agency's biggest headaches. Of 326 commissioned PHS officers asked to make the transfer to Interior, 165 decided they'd rather fight than switch. The gap they left is not yet entirely filled.

The job of assistant commissioner for facilities, which carries the responsibility of the construction grants part of the program, is vacant. Mrs. Alveda Evans, former administrative assistant to FWPCA Commissioner Jame M. Quigley, is temporarily serving as legislative liaison officer.

About 22 of the 29 top men in FWPCA are still listed as acting assistant commissioner or division chief, because their jobs were reviewed and changed after the shift and, according to Quigley: "It took forever for us to write up the jobs and submit the new job descriptions to the Civil Service for approval."

With or without full job titles, many of the top officials may need a road map to find their way to work. The agency is perched in two buildings on Indiana Ave. and will probably need space in a third soon. The main building (called a flattrap by one staff member and a firetrap by another) is a rented beehive of activity; maintenance men plane door bottoms so they clear the rugs; telephone men roam about to keep phones and moving staff members together.

The construction grants division is at full staff, but acting division chief Thomas Ferry wishes it wasn't. His section was slated to have a roster of 195, but that was when the agency expected to have a total staff of 2,800. When Interior ordered a freeze at 2,100, he was told to level off at 165. Earl J. Anderson, acting assistant commissioner for technical programs admits his staff isn't organized and says he expects to replace lost PHS people "in about a year."

June 16, 1967

It can indeed be said that this has been and continues to be educational broadcasting's year. Public awareness of the potential of educational broadcasting has probably never been higher.

But the public's expectations of educational broadcasting also have increased. The challenge to make significant progress, therefore, is that much greater.

The significance of television to the growth and change—to the education—of young people cannot be overemphasized. Research indicates that children begin school with greater vocabulary, greater reading skills, greater awareness of the world as a result of television. They can, for example, read with ease most of the billboards advertising beer and soap.

In schools, of course, a strengthened television effort would have vast potential to improve the effectiveness of instruction. Given proper support for the development of excellence in quality, television can be used to demonstrate, to present specific learning experiences, to motivate independent performance, and, of course, to bring the events of the world into the classroom for analysis and discussion.

Really good television can help schools keep up with the rapidly changing face of our society, the rapidly changing skills and knowledge which we require, and the urgently changing requirements of peaceful and productive relationships with the variety of cultures and countries with which we have this planet.

To meet needs of these dimensions we need to enlist every resource at our disposal, not the least of which are the newest and most comprehensive means of communication.

But public television as envisioned in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 has potentialities far beyond classroom applications.

In a letter to the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, E. B. White spoke of the opportunity of noncommercial television in these words:

"Noncommercial television should address itself to the ideal of excellence, not the idea of acceptability—which is what keeps commercial television from climbing the staircase. I think television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's, and our Camelot. It should restate and clarify the social dilemma and the political pickle. Once in a while it does, and you get a quick glimpse of its potential."

Imagine public service broadcasting unconfined by the need to sell products, by the need to reach the largest total audience with commercial messages that all too often emphasize quantity of sales and not quality of product.

Imagine programming which could base its judgments about content on esthetic grounds or service to the citizen, enthusiastically rather than grudgingly.

Imagine television offerings which could be directed to special audiences without the necessity of considering whether such audiences are massive, without worrying about whether only 16.3 million watch the program compared to the 17.2 million watching another station.

Imagine, in short, a powerful communicative tool which is perceived as a means of enriching the lives of the American people rather than the bank accounts of American corporations.

Imagine having a real choice.

That is what may be in our future under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

The Act and its authorization of \$9 million is only a first step toward these goals. But

James Reston has hailed it as possibly "one of the transforming occasions of American life," comparing it to the Morrill Act which established land-grant universities in 1862, and quietly transformed American public higher education. It is a recognition on the part of the Congress and the President that this powerful medium of education is also a part of the Public Responsibility.

As public television develops, the investment will be large. Both the instructional aspects of television and the general educational aspects will require many times this year's proposed appropriation.

Public television will never be self-supporting, just as Kansas State College at Pittsburg will never be self-supporting and was never intended to be. It will require a continuing commitment of common treasures in the interest of growth and change—in the interest of education, which today may be the single great requirement for the preservation of our way of life.

This is a world of international and domestic tension. This is a world of technology which is outstripping our capacity to deal with it as human beings. This is a world which requires sensitivity and powers of judgment among its citizens in proportions unmatched in any place or time.

This is a world which requires the marshalling of all of our resources of education. The power of television is one of those resources, and it must be used so that the spirit of the individual is not suppressed but is allowed to flourish and grow.

Our goal is simply stated: we want to achieve the betterment of man through the proper application of man's knowledge. It will tax our wisdom, our strength, our purpose, our resources, to achieve that goal. It is the goal of education, in and out of institutions of learning.

That is the Public Responsibility.

RUSSIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there has, I feel, been some confusion and misunderstanding concerning the position of the Soviet Union in the Middle East crisis.

A provocative and intelligent column by Roscoe Drummond in the June 15 Washington Post cuts through the confusion and I believe gets to the truth about the dangerous game Russia has played in the Middle East as in other parts of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

RUSSIA AND MIDEAST: EFFORTS FOR PEACE OR WAR?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is this theory on the Middle East crisis: the Soviets certainly helped avoid war at this time.

This, I am convinced, is dangerous and wishful fiction that will get us in trouble if we don't watch out.

The premise on which this wishful idea is being built is that the Soviets deliberately decided that they would rather work with the United States to contain the conflict than to help Nasser win.

The hope behind this view of Moscow's role in the Middle East crisis is that the Soviet government will join with the West in encouraging the Arabs to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence with Israel.

It seems to me that what has happened thus far does not bear out this premise or give much substance to this hope.

I believe that the controlling facts are these:

1—By every device at its command, massive military aid, substantial economic assistance, plus total diplomatic support for the Arabs and total hostility to Israel—Moscow gave Nasser the go-ahead in his announced plan to destroy Israel. Was this detente? Was this Moscow's way of cutting back the cold war? Hardly. It was the most dangerous cold war venture since Khrushchev tried to secrete missiles in Cuba.

2—Was the Soviet Union holding any checkrein on Nasser and on what he would do with the help he was getting from Moscow? Was the Soviet Union thinking all along on how well it could cooperate with the United States to avert war or to contain it if it broke out? There is no such evidence. The evidence, as reported by Robert H. Estabrook, United Nations correspondent of The Washington Post, is that Soviet military equipment, especially spare parts, was being poured into Cairo on the very eve of the war, thus seeking to make sure that the Arabs would not run out of supplies as the fighting progressed.

3—Numerous news stories suggest that because Premier Kosygin told President Johnson over the Hot Line on the day the fighting started that he wanted to cooperate with the United States in restraining the belligerents, this meant that the Soviets put the highest premium on keeping the peace.

It is wiser to judge Soviet policy on the basis of its actions rather than on its words. The Soviets did not restrain the Arabs; only Israel restrained the Arabs.

Some suggest that because Moscow finally supported a U.N. call for a cease-fire without any Israeli pullback, this meant that the Soviets were acting with great prudence and eagerness to avert a spreading conflict.

This conclusion is unproved because the Soviets opposed the U.N. call for a cease-fire in the earliest stages of the war when it appeared that Nasser could win and accepted it only when it became clear that Nasser was losing.

The conclusion that Moscow was ready to work with the United States to contain the fighting is unproved because the necessity for doing so never arose. Israel won the war so quickly that the danger of the United States and the U.S.S.R. being drawn into it never developed and therefore the events of the past week cast little light on how prudently Moscow would have acted under different circumstances.

Obviously the Soviet Union wants no direct military confrontation with the United States and most certainly does not want world war. But the truth is that it helped start a war between Egypt and Israel, did nothing to contain it until Egypt was at the point of collapse, and therein showed that it was prepared to take the most perilous risk of starting a conflict it could not stop.

It would be a welcome dividend if Moscow decided to work for peace instead of conflict in the Middle East. But the record shows we had better not count on it.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL LAND BANK OF NEW ORLEANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on June 6 I had occasion to address the officials, membership, and staff of the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans as the bank celebrated its 50th anniversary. Chartered by the Congress on March 8, 1917, the bank made its first loan early in June, 50 years ago.

I was very happy to take part in this golden anniversary celebration. The Federal land bank system is one of the

June 16, 1967

I remember a controversy not very long ago in my home state of Minnesota, when claims were being made that its great university should be investigated because it was subversive. The fears of many, I believe, were made eloquent by the mother of a University sophomore. "I sent my daughter away to the University," she lamented, "and when she came back she just wasn't the same anymore." We are bound to be worried by change, but it is the price of growth.

Like the pioneers of this great region who made a great experiment with state support of public higher education, we are pioneering today on the national level. Some of the experiments being undertaken today may one day be judged as bold and visionary and magnificent as we now judge the great attempts of the past.

We have learned to think of education as a national resource rather than a purely private one or local one. And along with that change in our conception has come a parallel change in our method of support.

Among the graduates here today are many with bachelor's degrees, a good proportion with master's degrees, and some with specialist's certificates beyond that level of attainment. Every single one of you has been directly affected by the new federal involvement in higher education.

Many of you have had federal loans, and look forward with more or less enthusiasm to repaying all or part of them. Many have contributed to your own educations and to the college as well through the college work-study program, where 90 per cent of the money you have earned has come through federal grants.

Many have used library materials which federal support made possible. Federal support has contributed to particular programs in which students and faculty have been involved, and the list goes on, and it will grow longer.

And more than half of the graduates at this commencement will teach in schools where the federal involvement continues to grow. Many of the buildings were constructed with Federal assistance. More than \$4 billion in programs were administered by the U.S. Office of Education during the current fiscal year, and contributions came from many other agencies as well.

Public funds have always gone to education, of course. But we are beginning to see a growing federal involvement as we continue to see education as a part of the Public Responsibility. Education is now fully established as a public, national effort.

And the Public Responsibility for education is taking other forms as well. As a nation we are coming to realize that powerful educational forces exist outside the classroom and outside the formal educational institution.

We have always known that experience was a teacher of sorts, whether the best or something less than that. Now we are beginning to consider seriously the quality of the experiences that make up education outside the classroom.

One of these experiences, and my principal topic today, is the experience of television. It always comes as a shock to me to realize that most of you who are graduating today have lived virtually all of your lives with television.

That is a benchmark that separates us as generations, and it is also a sign of the growth and change that has characterized our lives. The founders of this college may have had a vision of 1,200 graduates in a single year of Kansas State College of Pittsburg, but I cannot imagine that they saw how pervasive a part of your lives television would be.

Because television has always been a part of your lives, you may view it somewhat differently from the way those of my generation do. The fact that the average Amer-

ican spends about 3½ hours a day watching television may not be a matter of concern or importance to you.

It may seem perfectly normal and acceptable to you that one and one-half billion man hours per week are spent in this country watching television. You may not be at all surprised by the phenomenal growth of television as a medium of communication and entertainment; within the span of your lifetime, nor troubled by television's impact on this country's citizens.

Indeed, you may simply view television as one of the great advances in civilization which your predecessors are proudly passing on to you.

To some considerable extent such a reaction would be quite understandable and would have some basis in fact. The technology which has made television possible is truly indicative of the means now available to weld together the people of this nation and the people of the world—to bridge areas of misunderstanding and make possible direct communication among cultures of various types. The technological capability, however, is clearly not being used entirely for these objectives.

Of the billion and a half man hours a week spent with television in this country, only the smallest fraction is devoted to enlightening the human mind or bettering the human condition. This magnificent medium has been used in this country primarily to titillate rather than teach, to entertain rather than educate.

Our failure to exploit the full potentiality of television provides the background for what may turn out to be one of the most important federal ventures in education of our time—the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

In his State of the Union message to the current Congress, the President declared that "we should develop educational television into a vital public resource." The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 has now passed the Senate, in a measure to provide for continued development of educational broadcasting to serve the needs of our people more completely.

This proposal is a clear recognition by the President and the Senate that television should be as much a part of our public concern as the highways upon which we drive, the lakes upon which we fish and in which we swim, the forests in which we hunt and hike, the air—hopefully pure—which we breathe.

We are concerned about our safety on the highways, our happiness in the outdoors, our health in our atmosphere. We also have—and are now recognizing—a public responsibility to assure the wisest and most beneficial use of the broadcast frequencies over which radio and television programs are disseminated.

The Radio Act of 1927 and the Communications Act of 1934 clearly established that the airwaves over which radio and television programs are transmitted into our homes belong to the people.

Stations which broadcast on assigned frequencies—or air waves—do so by the consent of the people. Only so long as they fulfill their obligations and maintain their operations in the public interest are they eligible to continue such transmissions.

The very basis upon which radio and television broadcasting exist—the airwaves over which the programs are transmitted—are a public resource belonging to all the citizens of this country. It is indeed time to more fully develop that resource to meet the highest aspirations of the citizenry.

Important progress can be made in that direction by developing educational television into a vital, dynamic force in our society—by helping it become a service truly alternative to the dulling diversions to which we have for the most part been submitted.

We have a well laid foundation upon which to build a growing and dynamic educational television service in this country. In 1951, 242 channels were reserved by the Federal Communications Commission for such educational television stations. By May of 1962, 82 ETV stations were on the air broadcasting on these assigned frequencies.

In 1962 the Congress enacted the Educational Television Facilities Program and for the first time support was available from the Federal Government to assist in the construction of new ETV stations.

That program is due to expire in July of this year, and so it is possible at this point to assess its success. When the program expires there will be 183 ETV stations on the air or under construction, more than doubling the number of such stations since the program was initiated.

The number of people served by these educational television stations will have increased from 105 to 155 million people. However, to achieve our goal of serving 95% of the people of each state with educational television, at least 200 more stations will be required.

At the same time that this growth in broadcast facilities has been taking place, ETV's impact on the society at large has also been increasing.

In 1962 for example, approximately 2½ million viewed an ETV station at least once a week. By 1966 that figure had more than doubled; ETV today is reaching more than 6 million American homes once a week.

It is possible to estimate that during any given week-day evening hour ETV is being viewed by 700,000 to 1 million people in this country. In addition, about 6½ million students from kindergarten to the 12th grade during the 1965-66 school year received some of their classroom instruction by way of those same educational television stations.

The quality of the programs presented on ETV has also shown some improvement. National Educational Television has perhaps dramatized this improvement of quality most.

The President's State of the Union message last January, for example, marked the first time that a live interconnection was established on a nationwide basis among educational television stations. Wide critical acclaim accrued to NET for the quality of its coverage of that speech and the commentary that preceded and followed it. This program and the discernible increase in regular program quality present clear evidence of ETV's potential.

Despite this progress, however, it is still accurate to say that ETV is merely on the threshold of the development needed to provide the service the nation requires.

Individual ETV stations suffer from a condition close to poverty as they attempt to meet the needs of their communities. NET's resources for programs of national significance and importance are in no way equal to the needs that are apparent. It has become quite clear that additional support is required for ETV to assure the growth required.

The Senate has already passed, under the brilliant leadership of Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, The Public Broadcasting Act. It is currently under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The Act will continue the educational television facilities program which was enacted in 1962 to assist in the construction of new educational broadcasting stations.

It will establish a Corporation for Public Broadcasting along lines generally proposed by the Carnegie Commission. And it will authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to conduct a study of instructional television to recommend the support and organization required to utilize television most effectively in formal instruction.