

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3143

Plant Manager, J. F. Queeny Plant, Monsanto Company, 1700 South Second Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

The U.S. Delegation in Geneva is now putting into final form the results of our agreements on the thousands of tariff classifications which were subject to negotiation in the Kennedy Round. Drafting the schedule of concessions to be granted by the United States is underway. Schedules of concessions granted by other countries are being checked as soon as they are received. These schedules will have to be approved by all participating countries before the U.S. can release details of the Kennedy Round agreement. According to present expectations, it will not be possible to release details of the agreement before June 30. Even then, more time may be needed to assemble data for public release since the legal documents for signature by governments are not too informative as to the significance of the agreement.

Though the Executive Branch is not able now to release details of the agreement, it is possible to provide some comment that may be useful in replying to Mr. Munie's inquiry and in considering the issues involved. In doing so it is necessary to place the issues on chemicals in perspective so that the significance of the Kennedy Round agreement can be fairly assessed.

U.S. domestic shipments of all chemicals were valued at \$33.8 billion in 1964, the statistical base year for the Kennedy Round negotiations. U.S. exports totalled \$2.4 billion while imports amounted to \$710 million. (Of the latter amount, 52 percent entered duty-free.) Our exports were therefore more than three times the value of imports. Imports amounted to slightly more than 2 percent of domestic sales.

In the part of the industry making benzenoid chemicals, which is the area subject to the American Selling Price (ASP) system of valuation, domestic shipments were valued at \$3.4 billion, exports at \$285 million and imports at \$53 million. Thus, as a percentage of all chemicals, the benzenoid area accounts for about 10 percent of domestic production, 12 percent of exports and 7 percent of imports. However, imports of benzenoid chemicals amounted to only 1.5 percent of domestic sales of benzenoids. Further, since only \$25 million of the \$53 million of imports were classified as "competitive" by the Bureau of Customs, and therefore subject to ASP, the ratio might be considered lower than one percent. The remainder, or \$28 million of benzenoid imports, were entered chiefly by 13 U.S. subsidiaries of foreign manufacturers. Since these were classified as "non-competitive" because there was no similar domestic production, they were not subject to ASP.

As you may know, the ASP system was adopted in the Tariff Act of 1922 to assist what was then an infant chemical industry. This system, which is highly restrictive to imports, has come under extremely harsh criticism of our trading partners abroad in recent years in light of our heavy export surplus in chemicals, particularly in the benzenoid area. Rightly or wrongly, our trading partners made the ASP system a central issue in the Kennedy Round, and it became clear several years ago that if the U.S. was to obtain tariff concessions for our chemical and other industries, it would have to do something about the ASP system. With that background the Tariff Commission in December 1965 instituted an investigation of the ASP system at the request of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. In late July 1966 the Commission filed its report (Tariff Commission Publication No. 181—July 1966). After much study and consideration by the agencies concerned in the Executive Branch, a request was made to the President seeking his authority to enter into negotiations for elim-

inating ASP. After obtaining the President's authorization the U.S. entered into intensive negotiations with the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom and Switzerland, the countries most concerned about ASP, with the clear understanding that any agreement entered into would provide a quid pro quo and be subject to legislation by Congress insofar as elimination of ASP was concerned.

The negotiation was extremely difficult in that other nations did not want to enter into an agreement which would be subject to approval or disapproval by the U.S. Congress. U.S. negotiators insisted that if any agreement was to be concluded, it would have to be in two self-balancing packages since (1) the U.S. could not obtain overall reciprocity if chemicals were excluded from the Kennedy Round settlement; and (2) any package to be presented to Congress on ASP would have to be one which could be accepted or rejected independently of the Kennedy Round settlement.

Briefly, the agreement reached at Geneva on chemicals entails two agreements. The first, which is incorporated in the Kennedy Round, will stand regardless of Congressional action on ASP. In this first agreement, the U.S. will reduce its duties on chemicals by an average of about 43 percent while other countries will reduce by about 25 percent. This latter figure is a preliminary estimate of the numerous reductions made by other countries and includes reductions ranging from 20 to 50 percent. Canada, negotiating as a country with special trade problems in accordance with agreement of other developed countries, will make cuts of varying degrees on a vast array of chemical products.

In the second package, which is subject to Congressional action on ASP, the U.S. would eliminate ASP and reduce duties above 20 percent down to that level except for coloring agents (dyes, pigments and azoics), sulphur drugs and several other products. The EEC, the U.K. and the U.S. would place in effect the remainder of the 50 percent reduction withheld in the first package, with the U.K. reducing some rates by over 60 percent. The EEC, the U.K. and Switzerland will take action on a non-tariff barrier to reciprocate for the elimination of ASP.

All countries, including the U.S., will except some chemical items from the full 50 percent reduction. Exceptions of other countries were made chiefly to balance off the U.S. maintenance of rates above 20 percent on coloring agents and sulphur drugs.

The effect of both agreements on chemicals would be to reduce sharply the rates on chemicals in major world markets. With the exception of items subject to ASP, U.S. rates in most cases were already relatively low and were no bar to imports. On the items subject to ASP, the U.S. will in either package, still retain the highest rates of duty of any industrialized country. The rates of other countries on U.S. exports will be reduced to very low levels, probably to a maximum of 12½ percent for the EEC and U.K. if the second package goes into effect.

The first package is a compromise which favors the EEC and the U.K. in regard to depth of reduction and the U.S. insofar as trade coverage is concerned. We estimate a significant positive balance in favor of the U.S. in the first package because the varied nature and heavy volume of our exports provide more opportunity to benefit from the 25 percent tariff cut than does the 43 percent reduction on our imports. Moreover, ASP will be retained.

The second package provides benefits in the U.K. and EEC markets which should provide further impetus for our exports. Our part of this package—elimination of ASP—is an action which was recommended in 1951 by the Treasury Department when Congress was considering customs simplification. In the last Congress, ASP was eliminated from

protective rubber footwear and the Senate Finance Committee late in 1966 asked the Tariff Commission to study and report on ASP as well as other valuation problems. The Commission report has been sent to the Committee but has not yet been made public.

The chief criticisms of the ASP system are its uncertainty and the very high rates of duty that result from its application. U.S. importers are not sure whether their shipments will be subjected to ASP, and even if they are, they do not know the amount of duty which will be assessed until the shipment is processed through Customs. Duties can and do run over 50 percent and in some cases over 100 percent. In the trading world of today, such a system of valuation is generally considered obsolete and overly restrictive to trade. In this respect this Department and the Foreign Service are constantly trying to obtain fair and equitable trading conditions for U.S. industry abroad and we believe that the success of our efforts is contingent to a large extent on our own willingness to remove similar barriers. We therefore support elimination of the ASP as a part of the second agreement on chemicals in the Kennedy Round.

In general, we do not expect any serious dislocations in the chemical industry from the Kennedy Round agreements. All concessions will be made in five equal installments over a period of four years and one day, and while there will be adjustments as prices change when tariffs are reduced, we expect that U.S. industry will have time to take such adjustments in stride. Moreover, we expect that gains from exports will offset any increase in imports.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. MCNEILL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy.


Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. GILBERT, Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] stated his feelings on the situation in the Middle East before an audience in Asbury Park, N.J.

Mr. HOWARD articulated the feelings shared by many of my colleagues and fellow Americans. At this time I would like to submit his remarks for insertion in the RECORD:

SPEECH BEFORE ISRAELI SOLIDARITY RALLY BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES J. HOWARD AT ASBURY PARK, N.J., JUNE 7, 1967

We meet tonight in a somber time in history and although we meet in a free city in a free nation, freedom is being once again placed under siege on our planet. The eyes of the world are tonight focused on the Middle East and most particularly on the tiny country of Israel. Once again this Jewish State is facing a threat to its independence and its very existence, a threat that comes from the hostile Arab world which encircles it.

We know that adversity and hostility are not new experiences to the Israeli people. From as far back as Biblical times the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were set upon time and time again by hostile neighbors, Syria, Babylon and ironically enough Egypt. We know and have sympathized with the fact that through the pages of history have been

recorded aggressive acts against the Jewish people, burning, killing, plundering, which led up to dispersal. For centuries the Jewish people wandered the globe, ridiculed, tormented and unaccepted. But through those years a hope and a dream persisted, a nation of Israel. Efforts toward this end and the concept of such a return to Jerusalem was exemplified in Zionism which has been embedded in Jewish thought since the early years of the Diaspora. Progression from the idea of Zionism to the reality of Israel began about 100 years ago. We are all familiar with the names of Moses Hess, Peretz Zmolenskin and Judah Pinsker, and the founder of the Zionist movement as we know it, Theodor Herzl. Herzl's organization of the first Zionist Congress in Switzerland in 1897 was followed by slow, but measured, steps which led to the creation of Israel in May of 1947. So for over 19 years we have seen the growth of democracy in the Middle East. We have proudly watched it become the model nation of the area, a model in education, in health, in economic progress and perhaps most importantly, a model for all of its neighbors to see that the best way to live is through the means of a democratically organized parliament and government.

Just a few weeks ago I had the honor of visiting this justifiably proud nation and people. I felt a pride myself, which I knew I shared with the Jewish members of this area in visiting the modern city of Tel Aviv, in watching its people, well fed and happy, and determined to do everything necessary to combat the clouds of Arab animosity that were forming over their very heads. I was proud to visit the city of Herzlia, where I spoke with the physician who operates the clinic built mostly through funds gathered and donated by the Histadrut and other concerned citizens of our own central New Jersey. The modern hospital on the hill behind Herzlia is an inspiration to all who visit it, especially when we realize that not many years ago the hospital served tuberculosis patients from only the immediate area, but now needs to devote only one wing of it for all the tuberculosis patients in the entire nation. Through hard work and cooperative effort Israel has become a island of hygiene in the ocean of disease that is known as the Middle East.

On the eastern shore of the Galilee or Lake Tiberius, I visited the Kibbutz of Ein-Gev. Here, at Ein-Gev, the animosity of the Arab world had already been felt, for less than two weeks before, the Syrian guns located on the hilltop a few hundred yards away had wantonly shelled this tiny communal colony. I saw the bomb craters in the playground, the schoolroom half blown apart, and visited an underground area that has one of the most discouraging names I have ever heard. It was called the Kindergarten Bomb Shelter, not a rusted relic of World War II but a necessary piece of "physical equipment" in Israel today. I spoke with Jack Steinberg, one of the leaders of the Kibbutz, and met his young daughter, who stood only a few feet from where one of the bombs landed but miraculously escaped injury. I was informed just this afternoon by the Israeli Embassy in Washington that little Ein-Gev received massive shelling from the Syrians yesterday but they had no report as to the number of casualties, and I can only wonder and hope concerning what remains of Ein-Gev and the condition of Jack Steinberg and his daughter.

These are but just a few of the memories I have of Israel in May of 1967, but what impressed me most and will live with me for the longest time was the air and attitude of the people of Israel. They are a young nation, actually a teenager in years. They are filled with national pride, pride in what they have accomplished and confident of their future. This generation of Israelis may indeed be called "the chosen people."

For centuries fathers told their sons, and they in turn their sons, that some day the Jewish people would have and build their own nation. This generation of Jews has been chosen to accomplish that mission. They have done well although harassed by the Arab nations around them and have no intention of being dispersed again.

One year ago, speaking in Lakewood on the 18th anniversary of Israel's Independence, I stated "Currently there are scant indications that her neighbors are willing to accept Israel as a reality but it is also a reality that Israel is here to stay." What I told the people of Lakewood last year, the nation of Israel is showing the world today. As Abba Eban said last night at the United Nations: "Egypt has openly proclaimed that Elath did not form part of Israel and had predicted that Israel itself would soon expire. That proclamation was empty. The prediction now lies in ruins." As Israel moves forward against its aggressors, let no one in or out of the United Nations nor in or out of the United States point a finger of condemnation upon her. Never before in history has a nation taken so much abuse for such a long period of time before insisting upon their rights as free people in a free world. A hard and bitter lesson was learned ten years ago in assuming that Nasser, after his bitter defeat, would allow Israel its territorial integrity. Let us not permit the lesson of the past ten years to reoccur in the next ten.

Let the people of the world know that when a free people are threatened our President, our government, and our Representative in Congress will stand on the side of justice . . . and in the Middle East, the word "justice" is pronounced Israel.

Mistake To Dismember OEO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday Major John V. Lindsay, of New York, a former Member of this House and a Republican, appeared on "Meet the Press." David Broder asked him the following question:

The House Republicans are trying to completely revamp the poverty program and in the process abolish Sargent Shriver's poverty agency. Do you think it's a good idea?

The mayor of the Nation's largest city made an answer which, I believe, merits the close attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He said:

We have had good luck and success with Mr. Shriver's OEO office and we find that in New York, at least, that it is wise to have a single office with which to deal in this enormously complicated program. It is a difficult program to administer at both ends of the stick, both in a locality and here in Washington, D.C. To dismember it and to put its various functions scattered about in five or six Federal agencies, I think would be a mistake. I fear that it would compound the problem of administration that not only exists in Washington but in all of the cities today.

In his column "Political Parade" in today's Washington Post, Mr. Broder has also analyzed John Lindsay's stature along his fellow American mayors and commented trenchantly on various

Republican responses to the almost overwhelming problems facing our cities. I am sure that this column, excerpts of which I at this point include in the RECORD will also be highly interesting to every Member of this House.

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1967]

THE OUTSIDER

(By David S. Broder)

HONOLULU.—After less than two years in office and still a very junior member of the club, New York's Mayor John V. Lindsay has established himself in the eyes of his fellow mayors as a spokesman and leader in the fight for urban America.

He emerged unmistakably at this week's meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors here as one of the strong men of municipal government. His was the dominant voice on the six-mayor "meet the press" panel, and his was the most influential viewpoint in the deliberations of the conference platform committee.

A veteran of these mayors' meetings rated Republican Lindsay among the "big three" of the organization, along with the two top Democrats, Detroit's articulate Jerome P. Cavanaugh and Chicago's Richard J. Daley, a four-term veteran almost universally regarded as America's most effective mayor.

Much as his victory in 1965 was cheered by the GOP as an early symptom of the recovery from the Goldwater disaster, Lindsay as mayor, it must be said, has made almost no effort to turn himself or his administration into a model or showcase of specifically Republican concern for city problems.

Still, when one sees the prestige Lindsay enjoys among his fellow mayors, it remains almost unbelievable that the Republican Party, ostensibly interested in the big city vote, lets an asset like him go to waste.

His constituency is the most important political prize in the country. Lindsay himself has more political glamour than any other Republican east of Ronald Reagan. Tall, broad-shouldered, good-looking, he stops traffic among the tourists and is probably the one Mayor in the country who is recognized by residents of a city other than his own.

Lindsay has an able staff, and he does his homework. He appeared to be the best-briefed man among the two dozen mayors on the resolutions committee.

He is still not a polished public speaker, but he has learned to make his points more clearly and succinctly than he did in the House. He carried the majority of mayors with him on the key policy statements on urban needs, welfare, crime, the antipoverty program and housing.

Politically, however, much of what Lindsay was promoting here runs directly contrary to the record his own Party is writing in Washington. Lindsay joined the unanimous vote in the resolutions committee for continuation of the model cities program, which most House Republicans opposed. Where House Republicans are currently trying to dismember Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, Lindsay argued for continuation of centralized administration of the antipoverty program, which he (unlike most Republicans and some mayors) pronounces a success, at least in New York City.

Most pointedly, Lindsay offered and had endorsed a resolution which "deploras" the action of the House of Representatives—claimed as a great victory by House Republicans—in cutting off further funds for the rent-supplements program.

In short, what Lindsay is asking of his fellow Republicans is a commitment to finance city programs on a top-priority basis with every dollar that can be spared from the Vietnam war. And that is a commitment the congressional Republicans from their rural and suburban districts do not seem prepared to make.

June 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7589

In releasing the report today, Mr. Freeman said, "The new era in agriculture gives us a realistic opportunity, as well as a challenge, to set up our goals for the future. Building on the accomplishments of recent years, we can now define our objectives for tomorrow. This is the purpose of our current Agriculture/2000 project, a blueprint for action now and in the years ahead. The fact that U.S. agriculture has entered a new era makes Agriculture/2000 a realistic undertaking.

Among the 1966 advances cited by the Secretary are:

Disappearing surpluses.—"For the first time in more than a decade agriculture is now generally free of surpluses," the report says. The surpluses of wheat, feed grains, rice, milk, butter, and cheese are no more. The new cotton program, combined with increased domestic and foreign use, is cutting sharply into the cotton surplus.

Government investment sharply down.—In 1966, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in farm commodities "fell to \$4.4 billion, the lowest since 1953. CCC investment is now \$4 billion below the peaks reached in 1956 and 1959."

Income sharply up.—"Realized farm net income in 1966 climbed to \$16.3 billion—over \$2 billion more than in 1965 and about \$4½ billion more than in 1960." Net income per farm in 1966 averaged \$5,024, 20 percent more than in 1965 and 70 percent above 1960. For the first time in half a century, parity of income for adequate size family farmers "is clearly in sight."

Flexible farm programs.—Farm production can now be guided and brought into balance by means of farmer self-determination with government assistance. "Under the flexible provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, farmers are expected to bring back into 1967 production about 18 million acres, mostly wheat and feed grains, out of the 63 million acres diverted in 1966."

Rebirth in rural America.—"The revitalization of rural America continues, with more farm and nonfarm rural people enjoying pure water, better community facilities, improved schools, medical services, and an increasing number and variety of off-farm jobs." The report points out that USDA advanced \$1.2 billion in loans in 1966 to more than 700,000 rural families, helping them to build new homes, establish more productive farming enterprises, and develop water and sewer systems.

Better diets.—"USDA food assistance programs now help improve diets and nutrition for 45 million Americans—school children, low-income families, and others who have inadequate diets. The Food Stamp and the Commodity Distribution Programs for needy families were available at the end of calendar 1966 in over 2,100 counties and cities in all States and the District of Columbia. More than 18 million children were served low-cost, nutritious school lunches."

Expanding exports and food aid abroad.—"Exports of farm products reached all-time highs of \$6.7 billion for fiscal 1966 and \$6.9 billion for the calendar year, registering gains of 10 percent and 11 percent, respectively, over the corresponding year-earlier periods." U.S. grain shipments to drought-stricken India saved 60 million persons from starvation.

Growing resource conservation.—"Conservation treatment for soil, water, timber, and wildlife was applied on over a million farms with government cost-share assistance in 1966." USDA continued to give technical assistance to nearly 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts that include about 99 percent of the nation's farms. The Department approved construction assistance to 89 watershed projects covering 6 million acres. The National Forests had a record timber harvest for the fourth consecutive year.

More consumer services.—"USDA inspected for wholesomeness and safety close to 90 percent of all the meat and poultry sold in the United States, a new record." It graded 60 percent of the meat (excluding pork) and 63 percent of the poultry sold, thus helping consumers select the qualities they needed for specific cooking purposes. Further progress was made in wiping out animal diseases, some of which are transmissible to humans. By chemical, biological, and other means the Department continued to protect fruits and vegetables against pest damage. New foods and crop varieties were developed for better living.

NEW ERA—NEW RESPONSIBILITIES

"Probably never before," the Secretary says in the report, "has the change in the position and responsibilities of American agriculture from one year to the next been so great as in 1966."

Having entered a new era, U.S. agriculture now faces new responsibilities, Mr. Freeman continues. "A great and growing array of challenges—in the countryside, in the national economy, and in the world. . . .

"We must build the American family farm into an even more productive, effective, and prosperous unit of the economy.

"We must help to revitalize and reinvigorate the whole of rural America.

"We must lead the crusade for a world free from hunger.

"We must expand our areas of vital services to assure that the abundance produced by American farms, the resources available in farm and rural America, and the knowledge developed by agricultural science are used to support an era of better living for all our people."

A NEW PLATEAU

In releasing the report, the Secretary pointed out that although farm income in 1966 was 40 percent more than in 1960 and farm prices averaged 13 percent higher, it is proving difficult to continue the advance in 1967. "We have reached a new plateau. Farmers still face big problems. The art of balancing production with demand is far from perfected. Largely as a result of a bumper world grain crop and increased domestic production of hogs, cattle, poultry and milk, farm prices have dropped sharply from the peak reached last August.

"We are using all available programs, including price support, purchase programs, and other marketing aids, to strengthen farm prices and income. We expect farm prices to strengthen and farm income to come close to last year's record. It is vital that the gains of recent years be not only maintained but expanded. Despite their immense contributions to the economy, our farmers are still being inadequately rewarded."

Mr. Freeman concludes his report with an epilog in which he says: "Ours is an age of collapsed time. We see more technological and scientific progress in a year—perhaps in a month—than our ancestors saw in a century. . . .

"The challenge of our generation is to turn the scientific, technological, and information explosions to the advantage of the human race.

"And we in agriculture are particularly challenged—because agriculture can, must, and, I believe, will provide many of the most basic tools. Fortunately, the continuing progress of the year 1966 gives promise that agriculture can and will meet its Challenge—Today and Tomorrow."

A CHOICE OF APPOINTMENT

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all Americans who believe in the fairness of advancement through merit, ability, and qualification will agree in the wisdom in the appointment to the Supreme Court of Mr. Thurgood Marshall.

The appointment by President Johnson of Mr. Marshall as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court is a well-deserved tribute to a brilliant jurist, a law scholar, an experienced and able attorney, and an outstanding American.

The appointment has received widespread acclaim. I am glad to report that recent editorials in the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner have commended our President for this nomination.

The Nashville Tennessean stated in its editorial:

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a candidate for the Supreme Court with better recommendations than Mr. Marshall's.

The Nashville Banner states in its editorial:

On its merits the only valid basis for such judicial appointment, or for impartial evaluation of it, the nomination accords with reasoned judgment.

I fully concur with the view that Mr. Marshall "has accented the law and constitutional processes . . . and condemned violence as the method of its implementation."

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD the editorials from the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner endorsing Thurgood Marshall's appointment:

A CHOICE OF APPOINTMENT

There are two reasons why Mr. Thurgood Marshall should have been appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

One—and the most important—is that he has superior qualifications for the job. The supporting reason is the simple demand of justice that he be the first member of his race to serve on the nation's highest court.

No justice now sitting on the Supreme Court has higher qualifications in ability and experience than Mr. Marshall has.

The new associate justice finished law school at the head of his class. As general counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he argued 32 cases before the Supreme Court, winning all but three of them.

His landmark victory was the 1954 decision by the court outlawing segregation in the schools.

Mr. Marshall then served four years as a federal judge on the U.S. Second Court of Appeals in New York. He was appointed U.S. Solicitor General in 1965. As solicitor general, he argued 18 cases for the government before the Supreme Court. He won 13 of them.

Thus the record of Mr. Marshall's ability and experience is clear and convincing. So is the record of his love for the devotion to the law, and his adherence to legal processes for the settlement of issues.

Yet, despite his undisputed qualifications, some will say he should not have been appointed to the Supreme Court and that his appointment was made on the basis of political considerations.

There can be little doubt that political results may come from the appointment of Mr. Marshall. But this is no reason why the appointment should not have been made.

H 7590

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20, 1967

The new associate justice—grandson of a slave and son of a Pullman steward—symbolizes the rapid progress of his race over the past two generations. And the most spectacular progress was brought about through his own initiative and skill before the bar of justice.

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a candidate for the Supreme Court with better recommendations than Mr. Marshall's. If his appointment sprang from political considerations—and what Supreme Court appointment did not—the nation can be thankful that the political forces worked out to put such an outstanding legal talent on the court.

MARSHALL IS QUALIFIED

President Johnson's nomination of Thurgood Marshall as Associate Justice Tom C. Clark's successor on the U.S. Supreme Court comes as no surprise. That the nominee would become the first Negro on that tribunal was almost a foregone conclusion, as widely speculated at the time of his 1965 appointment as Solicitor General.

In the latter capacity—No. 3 official in the Justice Department—he has capably borne the responsibilities assigned; the government's lawyer in cases before the supreme bench, having personally argued 19 of these. Of further significance as to preparatory experience, he served for about three years as a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals handling cases from New York, Connecticut and Vermont.

Thus he has not only scholarship in law, but a background of judicial record, as a basic qualification. As firmly as any present member of the Supreme Court, and more so than most of these, he has spoken out against elements of anarchy in the civil rights movement—and that as recently as June 7 of this year.

Admittedly the strong advocate of racial equality—within the meaning of full citizenship and opportunity incorporated in that term—he has accented the law and constitutional processes to that end and condemned violence as the method of its implementation.

On its merits, the only valid basis for such judicial appointment, or for impartial evaluation of it, the nomination accords with reasoned judgment.

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

[Mr. FULTON of Tennessee's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FLAG DESECRATION AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded passage of H.R. 10480 which purports, among other things, to be a bill to prohibit the burning of the flag. We also adopted an amendment offered by Mr. BRESTER and myself to require that the word "knowingly" be inserted before the words "cast contempt" making it clear that the House intended a contemptuous state of mind on the part of the accused. It is to be noted that the word "burning" was added to the bill during the Committee of the Whole by a committee amendment.

Both of these amendments were passed in the Committee of the Whole by an overwhelming vote. They are, however, not a part of the legislation we have just passed because of the parliamentary effect of the passage in the Committee of the Whole and the subsequent defeat in the House of the Wyman amendment. Because of the fate of the Wyman amendment the words "burning" and "knowingly" were both deleted from the bill as finally passed.

It was of vicious intent of an overwhelming number of Members that those words should be included. It is hoped that an opportunity will present itself to correct this matter before H.R. 10480 finally becomes law.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR SETTLEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the five-point proposal for settlement in the Middle East offered by the President yesterday is a fair and sensible approach to lasting peace in that explosive area of the world. President Johnson has urged an even-handed solution to the basic problems which underly both the outrageous aggression against Israel over the last 20 years and Israel's rebirth as a State in 1948. He has called on the parties to move the temporary cease-fire towards a permanent armistice by sitting in conference with the Israelis to iron out at least some of the immediate problems which threaten the peace and security of the Middle East—problems such as Arab recognition of Israel and the Palestine refugee question. Of equal significance is the President's plea for a monitored limitation of the arms race in the Middle East. There are grave doubts that this war would have occurred had not the Arab military been supplied with Soviet weapons, just as there is some doubt about Israel's ability to meet the Arab threat without the aid of Western munitions. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on his strong and forthright stand on the Arab-Israel hostilities. After listening to Premier Kosygin's remarks less than an hour after President Johnson's address, unfortunately, I cannot refrain from mentioning at this time that I feel his approach on this important attempt to bring about a two-party negotiation was a direct insult on the American people, and could no way lead to permanent peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. SATTERFIELD), for today, June 20, 1967, on account of illness in his family.

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. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ROTH), for 10 minutes, on June 22.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. ROTH), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT), for 15 minutes, today; and 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:

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. FARICK in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY to extend her remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. McCLORY) to revise and extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. KEE.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado) prior to the passage of the bill H.R. 10480.

Mr. ROONEY of New York to extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. ECKHARDT) notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be \$275 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ROTH) during debate on desecration of the flag today.

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

Mr. REINECKE in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma.

Mr. DOLE, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$247.50.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. BUTTON in three instances.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. BROCK in two instances.

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

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in 10 instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. WHITENER in three instances.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. IRWIN in five instances.