

tic spending. Economy in government represents instead what our Nation can afford during this period of international crisis. This Congress is capable of making these hard decisions in the traditional manner—through the authorization and appropriations processes.

Since 1950, our public debt has grown by 28.4 percent. In the same period, personal debt grew by 448 percent, State and local government debt by 348 percent, and corporate debt by 219 percent. In terms of percentage of our Nation's ability to produce, the national debt, as a ratio of gross national product, has declined from 133 percent at the end of World War II to 45 percent today. These figures offer the basis for a realistic appraisal of the national debt burden today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final comment before concluding my remarks. The sequence of temporary debt limits, as provided in current law, has served to set the debt limit in response to the budget, a case of the tail wagging the dog. The correct order—the order consistent with true fiscal responsibility—is to establish a permanent debt limit which will, in fact, be considered when the budget is prepared. This is what the committee's bill, H.R. 10867, does. It asserts our congressional prerogatives for real fiscal discipline.

The American people are prepared to tighten their belts in this critical period of our Nation's history. But they are tiring of the cant and rhetoric which have surrounded these repetitious and unnecessary debates on the debt ceiling. The advocates of the recommittal motion assume some sort of "gullibility gap"—but I caution them that the public recognizes publicity stunts in the name of fiscal responsibility.

We cannot afford to risk the "chaos" which our distinguished chairman has outlined for the sake of pointless opposition, or phony fiscal arguments.

I recommend H.R. 10867, as adopted by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, for immediate passage.

file "Victory" Without Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by David Lawrence, published in the U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1967, entitled "Victory Without Peace?"

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

"VICTORY" WITHOUT PEACE?
(By David Lawrence)

We have heard during past wars pleas from nonparticipants calling for a "peace without victory."

We have just witnessed the military triumph of the Israeli armies over the combined

forces of Egypt, Syria and Jordan. But will this turn out to be a "victory" without peace? If so, it will be due almost entirely to the mistaken policy of the Soviet Government in encouraging the Arab countries to adopt an uncompromising position toward the issues that must be realistically met if there is to be peace in the Middle East.

The new adversary that Israel faces is the Soviet Government. In insisting on a resolution in the United Nations Security Council for a "cease-fire," did not Moscow know full well that, while this would stop the fighting, it might not bring a settlement of the basic controversies which caused the war itself? Do the Soviets want an unsettled Middle East for the same reason they have helped to prolong the war in Vietnam—to make trouble for the United States?

By severing diplomatic relations with Israel and compelling Communist-bloc countries in Eastern Europe to do the same, the Soviets have lined up a formidable group to prevent any settlement except on terms favorable to the losers on the battlefield.

The game of the Soviet Government apparently is to perpetuate in the Middle East the hold that it had vainly hoped would be strengthened by the \$2 billions of armament supplied to Egypt. Defeat of the Arab armies, however, doesn't seem to have shaken the confidence of the Soviets that they can still gain their ends by propaganda maneuvers and by intensifying the antagonism of the Arabs toward the people of Israel.

The fundamentals of a peace settlement are not difficult to outline. Passage of the seas by way of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba must not be left to the whim of a dictator in Cairo or elsewhere who can open or close these waterways at will. There must be an international agreement and a readiness to set up a United Nations peacekeeping force to resist any move toward the re-establishment of such barriers to peace. As for territorial boundaries, these can be adjudged to conform to the principles of self-determination of peoples.

The significant fact is that Israel has won on the battlefield her right to independence. This nation should long ago have been recognized as a state by the surrounding peoples. Acceptance on all sides is now even more essential to an era of peace.

Also, some formula of international supervision should be devised to assure Israel's continued possession and control of the entire city of Jerusalem. This means more sentimentally to the Israelis than retention of much of the additional territory they have just won.

But of what avail are constructive peace proposals if the Soviet Government is hostile to them and seeks to keep the Middle East in confusion? Certainly the economic sanctions which have been recklessly imposed on American and British businesses by the Arab governments can only delay the reconstruction of the area as a useful entity in world commerce.

It is true, of course, that defeated peoples do not easily give up their feelings of bitterness and resentment. Since this is a time for reconciliation, the process will not be helped if spokesmen for the Soviet Union in the United Nations forum continue to insist on charging the United States with having actually participated in the war and given direct assistance to the Israelis.

The Soviet Government has made a grievous mistake in publicizing this falsehood. There is no more effective way to alienate American public opinion than to accuse the United States of having started or engaged in the Middle East war. Whatever chance there has been of developing a better understanding between Moscow and Washington could be summarily wiped out if this line of policy is maintained by the Soviets.

The Soviet Union should understand, moreover, that if it interjects its power to keep the Arabian countries in a state of continuous belligerency, the United States may find it

necessary to send supplies and in other ways support the Israelis.

Israel can afford to be patient and even magnanimous. It can join with neighboring countries in programs of rehabilitation and relief, especially for the refugees who have been driven from their homes by past friction and the latest war.

As for the United Nations, it is faced with a severe test. The outcome can well mean either the disintegration of that body or its attainment of a truly influential role in world affairs.

Peoples everywhere want peace between Egypt and Israel, and they hope and expect moderation by the victors as well as sensible readjustment by the defeated. There can be peace only when the major powers use wisely their skills of mediation and join together in a reasonable compromise that will enable the peoples of the Middle East hereafter to live amicably with their neighbors.

Schlitz Works for a Beautiful America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., of Milwaukee, is showing commendable initiative in keeping our country beautiful.

In the thought that it will be of interest to Members of this body, I include a description of the Schlitz antilitter program:

"How would an empty beer can look here?"

The question, posed alongside an un-sullied wooded lakeshore scene, is not exactly the one you'd expect a brewing firm to bring up in a national advertisement. But that's the candid anti-litter approach the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Company is taking in an ad addressed to the millions of Americans who will take to the great outdoors this Fourth of July holiday.

The message Schlitz hopes to get across is: "Leave that special spot of yours as beautiful as you found it."

The full-page ad is scheduled for Life (June 30) issue, Look (July 11) and Sports Illustrated (June 26).

Robert A. Uihlein Jr., Schlitz president and board chairman, said the company felt that "brewers and others who package consumer products in disposable containers should help convince people that it's in everyone's best interest to keep our beauty spots clean.

"While we have no control over the use or misuse of the products we make, we feel we have a duty to campaign against the ugliness of litter. After all, we enjoy a beautiful America, too," Uihlein declared.

The ad asks: "How would an empty beer can look here? Or old soda pop bottles? Or watermelon rinds? Don't answer. We all know. . . ."

"It's not that people are messier today than they used to be. It's just that today there are a lot more people. And the mess adds up mighty fast."

Enjoy the great outdoors this Fourth of July, the ad urges, but then—"leave that special spot of yours as beautiful as you found it. You'll feel good about it all the way home."

The ad was created by the Leo Burnett Company of Chicago, agency for the Schlitz brand of beer.

From Caesar to Napoleon, from Socrates to Albert Schweitzer, men have risen step by step, according to well known principles. That is not what we call being a man of destiny. They are men of time, men of talent. The inspired men are fewer. Whence they came, from whence they get their power, by what rule they get that power, we know not. They arise from the shadow and vanish in the mist. We see them, but we know them not. Where did Shakespeare get his genius, Mozart, his music, Burns, his poetry—where but from God? And from the same source came Lincoln's power to carry out his awesome mission to make America a new and united nation. It was from this same Divine Source that Lincoln derived his courage, endurance, judgment and mercy.

In conclusion what can I say about Abraham Lincoln that has not already been said in the thousands of books which have been written about him?

Only this: I am not ashamed to use the word *love* to express my feelings about him. Respect is too cold, admiration too distant, affection completely inadequate to indicate the depth of our feeling about him.

I might give you just three of the reasons for this extraordinary esteem and reverence for the man. They are:

First: The surpassingly simple words of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address have been described by some as a masterpiece of eloquence for which history affords no model "except perhaps the Scriptures." More than 100 years have passed since its delivery, yet that memorable address is still the trumpet call for people who yearn to seize the burden and glory of freedom, wherever there is oppression and tyranny.

Second: Among the treasures of humanity is Lincoln's second inaugural address. It projected the great future of our country as a united nation.

Third: His Emancipation Proclamation inaugurated a new and important period in American history. It was this edict that abolished forever the evil curse of slavery. Today, a century later, freedom is still the great unfinished business of the world. The civil rights explosion now going on merely reaffirms our determination to extend equal opportunity to all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed. The fight for civil rights is the final tribute to Lincoln's life which has taught us that freedom and human rights must inevitably crush bigotry and discrimination wherever it raises its ugly head. This glorious dream is about to be realized. Let us therefore emphasize and proclaim to the world Lincoln's basic philosophy, that ours is a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

These words of Lincoln are particularly meaningful to people behind the Iron Curtain. They are easily translated into the language of these suppressed millions for whom there is one symbol of American friendship—the name of Abraham Lincoln—to them the Great Emancipator!

In today's psychological warfare (the cold war), Lincoln is our formidable secret weapon against international intrigue. Lincoln's *image* is, by far, the best asset we have in our diplomatic pouches. His sorrows and joys, his faith in people, his gentleness, his strength and weakness—these are the elements that challenge the propaganda of our enemies and provide our best defense against them.

If America is to remain a great power, it must return to *faith in God*, as did our forefathers. In addition to our dedicated Lincoln, among others, there was GEORGE WASHINGTON, who said, "Our people know it is impossible to rightly govern without God and the Bible"; PATRICK HENRY, "The Bible is worth all other books which have been written"; ANDREW JACKSON, "That book (the Bible) is the rock on which this Republic

rests"; WILLIAM PENN, "Men who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

In the epic that Lincoln lived, every man saw him in a different light and has read into him the contradictions and passions of his own mind and soul. But to *deprived people*, handicapped by poverty and brutally unfavorable social status, Lincoln symbolizes the truth that *Democracy is a way of life* in which every citizen can, by his own effort, achieve the best of which he is capable and what is equally as important, that he can rely on Divine Guidance as the decisive element for his success.

Statement on the Public Debt Limit

SPEECH

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1967

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, through an error, the following statement was omitted in the Record of June 21. I include it in the Appendix on this date and am assured that it will be printed with the other material on the public debt debate in the permanent Record:

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal discipline imposed upon our Nation's finances by periodic review of the public debt limit is, in my opinion, a worthwhile objective. It has been recognized as such since the Second Liberty Bond Act became the law of the land 48 years ago.

However, the exercise we are engaged in today is more mischief than responsibility.

The legislative process provides for authorizing expenditures and further review in the appropriation process. The hearings, reports, and consideration in committee and then in both Houses of Congress give ample opportunity to draw the line on spending for the defense and non-defense needs of the United States. But once the contracts are let and the salaries earned, it is unconscionable to tell the Treasurer of the United States that he cannot pay the bills.

As I told the House 2 weeks ago:

... our military expenses, dollarwise, are at the peak of World War II. We are in crisis today, and we are living a world where crisis piles upon crisis. If we are going to tie the hands of an Administration during these times by refusing to let them pay the bills that we authorized and appropriated, in my judgment we are failing the American people in our responsibility to them.

That is exactly what will happen if this bill is defeated today. Today is June 21. The new fiscal year begins in 9 days. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means warned yesterday before the Rules Committee, a failure of this legislation today will result in "chaos—in the stock market and everywhere else."

The financial integrity of the U.S. Government—based on our great wealth and our great prosperity—is at stake today.

This is the third time this year we have interrupted the business of Congress to consider the statutory limitation on the public debt. If the view from

across the aisle prevails, it will be followed by two, three, and maybe four more debt limit bills before the end of the year. This provides ample opportunity to publicize the so-called conservative view toward Federal spending, but it accomplishes little else.

The alternative proposed in the recommittal motion might satisfy the needs of the Treasury until September. I emphasize "might" because of the volatile demands for defense expenditures. The sudden Middle East crisis a fortnight ago shows just how fast our defense commitments could change. The Treasury requires an adequate debt limit cushion to meet our Nation's commitments swiftly and surely.

The committee's bill provides this cushion. We recommend a permanent ceiling at \$358 billion—including sales participations. We grant the Secretary some flexibility in his debt management through a \$7 billion temporary authority beginning in fiscal year 1969 and by extending the definition of "note" from 5 to 7 years. The Secretary and the Director of the Budget estimate that this limit will carry us through fiscal year 1968, providing that Vietnam or other defense commitments do not escalate rapidly.

Two weeks ago I stated on the floor of the House:

... I do not agree that we can have guns and butter. I believe there are a lot of things we should be cutting down on, but this great Nation can afford guns and bread. We have great problems here at home, and we cannot kick them under the rug. If we delay their consideration, they are only going to pile up on us.

Every Member of this House believes in economy in government—as I do. The appropriations process gives the Congress the authority to determine where and when to hold the line on expenditures. We have the responsibility for seeing that our moneys are wisely spent.

The recommittal motion in effect surrenders this responsibility. It shifts the responsibility for fiscal decisions to the executive branch. I, for one, am not willing to surrender these congressional prerogatives.

Let us look at our administrative budget of \$136 billion for fiscal 1968. Already committed is \$80 billion for defense, \$14 billion for interest on the public debt, \$4.9 billion for veterans' insurance and benefits; \$4.2 billion for public assistance grants, \$1.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and \$15.3 billion in payments on prior contracts and obligations.

This leaves about \$20 billion in relatively controllable civilian expenditures. What does this include?—\$1.8 billion in "food for peace"; \$1.1 billion for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; \$0.75 billion for higher education grants and facilities; funds for operating the FBI, the regulatory agencies, the National Park Service, et cetera. We must not waste our resources on inefficient or undesirable expenditures; but we cannot deny our people essential services or security.

Mr. Chairman, economy in government does not consist of "demands for a new budget" or groaning about domes-

June 23, 1967

The OCR also hopes to make a major contribution to the use of coal by the development of a new system for treating sewage and organic wastes with coal. OCR and our Water Pollution Control Administration are working jointly on this program. If successful, a large new market for coal would be created, with beneficial effects on both our water resources and our national economy. This is an excellent example of today's integrated approaches to matters of environment and resource use.

Other important activities of our Department pertaining to coal include the exploration and related programs of the geological Survey in providing information on the location, extent and quality of our coal reserves. This is particularly significant in the growth of the coal industry in the West. Also, the Survey, along with the Water Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Mines, is engaged in a cooperative program of acid mine drainage control, one of the toughest technical problems we face.

We continue to be deeply involved in research in mine safety. Mine safety involves not only the obvious and important humanitarian considerations, but also is essential to efficiency and economic operations. Among significant recent achievements has been the development of a highly effective automatic methane monitor to reduce explosions. Other promising projects include new methods of roof bolting, the use of liquid plastic to stabilize fractured rock, and the development of a system approach to mining in relation to safety. Great progress has been made in safety over the years, to which your industry has contributed immeasurably. Increasing mechanization and productivity of your industry require continuing changes in safety equipment and procedures. Our programs of safety research and education will be adjusted accordingly.

The Department of the Interior, as the principal Government agency dealing with the full range of energy problems, is deeply concerned that there be an assured dependable supply for energy from diverse resources at lowest cost consistent with other national objectives. Let me state, broadly, some of the other major objectives for energy, as we see them:

To preserve the quality of the environment—air, water and land—while obtaining the needed energy resources.

To conserve the Nation's fuel, geothermal and hydropower potential resources by using them wisely and efficiently.

To maintain sufficient reserves for national security.

To maintain safe and healthy working conditions during extraction and processing of fuel resources.

To provide a climate for industry to produce efficiently under competitive conditions the fuels required for the domestic economy and foreign trade.

Within these broad energy objectives there is room for coal to grow. Without question, your industry is on the go. Notwithstanding the complex problems you face, the outlook for coal is brighter now than at any time in recent history. How fast and how far you go towards attaining production of 800 million tons per year by 1980 will depend largely on the effectiveness with which all of us meet the challenges of competitive energy sources and environmental problems.

As a Nation, we have been blessed with an abundance of coal reserves—by far the largest of our fossil fuels—dispersed throughout most of the country. Your industry has a remarkable record of achievements. You have demonstrated progressive foresight, technical competence and managerial ability. You have the support of industries with which you have close operational and economic affinity. I think, on this 50th anniversary of your Association, you can look forward to the fulfillment of coal's great promise with utmost confidence!

WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT FOR 1968 CROP

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, this afternoon Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced the wheat acreage allotment for the 1968 crop. The figure he arrived at was 59.3 million acres, a reduction of 9 million acres from the allotment in effect for this year's crop.

I would like to go on record here as being in full accord with the Secretary that a reduction in the allotment was in order.

Much has been said and written lately about the population explosion and food shortages, and I share the concern of those who see this as perhaps our most difficult problem in the future.

Nevertheless, today there is reserve agricultural production capacity in this country. If this reserve were turned loose, surpluses would build up once again and the farmer would suffer from the resulting lower prices.

The wheat certificate program which is now in effect is basically a good program. Under it we have worked off the surpluses, expanded our sales of wheat abroad and have increased returns to the farmer.

Secretary Freeman has projected that the 59.3-million-acre allotment for next year will result in a level of production ample to meet our domestic and foreign needs yet not so large that it would add to the present reserve, which is now at about the level it should be.

I congratulate Secretary Freeman for his effective administration of the wheat certificate program and for wisely deciding that the 1968 allotment should be reduced.

KOSYGIN'S PROPAGANDA VERSUS PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR PEACE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, regarding the appearance of Russian Premier Kosygin at the United Nations earlier this week, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared in the June 20 edition of the *Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser*.

In part the editorial states that Kosygin's speech charging the United States with aggression in Vietnam as well as the responsibility for the Middle East conflict was a brazen propaganda effort to gloss over the bloody hands of Communist pirates committed to a policy of world conquest and to discredit the only nation strong enough to thwart their aims.

Now that Kosygin's fingers are burned, he is trying to use the General Assembly of the United Nations to pull his chestnuts out of the fire.

The General Assembly can strengthen its own prestige as well as encourage lasting peace in the Middle East by supporting the sound American program.

I commend the editor of the *Advertiser* for so clearly and candidly outlining the true reality of Soviet ambitions in the Middle East.

There is no question in my mind that Premier Kosygin's United Nations appearance was simply calculated to draw attention from the dreadful failure of the Soviet's foreign policy in the Middle East.

I think we can assure Premier Kosygin that he has fooled no one but himself.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

KOSYGIN OFFERS PROPAGANDA—JOHNSON, PROGRAM FOR PEACE

Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin's charge before the U.N. General Assembly that the United States was to blame for the Middle East war was as absurd as Arab claims that our planes had attacked them.

His speech charging the United States with aggression in Vietnam as well as with responsibility for the Middle East conflict was a brazen propaganda effort to gloss over the bloody hands of Communist pirates committed to a policy of world conquest and to discredit the only nation strong enough to thwart their aims.

The string of lies fully supported predictions that the purpose of the Soviets in calling for the emergency meeting was to spread their own poison propaganda rather than to bring peace and justice to the tortured Middle East.

His attempt to blame Israel for the conflict with the Arabs was no more convincing than his attack upon the United States. He had supplied Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser and his Arab allies with mountains of tanks, planes, guns and munitions for threats against Israel.

His government had supported Nasser in his warlike action of barring Israeli ships from the Gulf of Aqaba. His representatives in the United Nations had stalled and obstructed when the United States tried to obtain action to avoid an explosion.

He did not show his concern until the overwhelmingly larger force of Arabs that he had armed began taking a historic thumping from Little Israel.

The crushing defeat of Nasser and his allies humiliated the Soviet Union, Premier Kosygin and his fellow hoodlums as well as the Arabs.

Now that Kosygin's fingers are burned, he is trying to use the General Assembly of the United Nations to pull his chestnuts out of the fire.

In contrast to his transparent propaganda tirade, President Johnson presented a realistic picture of world problems and offered sensible means of solving them during his address Monday morning to the National Foreign Policy Conference for Educators.

Besides reviewing American efforts for peace and progress in the Latin states, Europe, Asia and Africa, he presented a specific five-point program for solving the difficulties of the Middle East.

The program included:

1. Every nation has a fundamental right to life and to the respect of its neighbors.
2. All nations of the area must attack the problem of according justice to the Palestine refugees.
3. The right of free maritime passage through international waterways must be assured all nations.
4. The large nations of the world as well as the small powers of the area must limit the wasteful and destructive arms race.
5. Political independence and territorial integrity must be granted all nations of the area.

These principles recognize the rights and the just claims of those on both sides of the prolonged conflict. Only by giving proper attention to them will old animosities be removed and a lasting peace assured.

Instead of trying to use the General Assembly to impose demands upon either side, as Kosygin did in his attack on Israel, President Johnson declared the parties to the conflict should themselves work out the just terms of peace.

June 23, 1967

projections are evidence that the coal industry—both management and labor—has some imaginative, forward looking thinkers.

Although the outlook for coal is generally favorable, your industry is confronted with challenges that will put to the test your ingenuity and technology. You are well aware of these challenges. Foremost among them are the accelerating growth of nuclear power generation and the compelling environmental problems of air pollution, stream contamination and land surface destruction. You have your work cut out for you.

With coal no longer powering the Nation's railways, the generation of electricity is its chief market. But nuclear power has established a foothold in one of coal's major market areas—the TVA region—and nuclear is obtaining an unexpectedly rapid increase in commitments for new electric generating capacity throughout the Nation. Over 50 percent of the new capacity ordered last year was nuclear and I have seen estimates that it will reach 75 percent this year. As for uranium supply, the AEC estimates that reserves are double the highest estimates for nuclear fuel requirements by 1980, by which time breeder reactors are expected to be developed, and that while there may be some cost increases they will not be great enough to upset the present competitive position of nuclear energy.

On the other hand, electric power production is doubling every 10 years and nuclear energy will not drive coal out of that market. Coal currently provides more than 55 percent of our total generation of electric power and can still double its sales for power production by 1980. But to do so it will have to become increasingly cost competitive with nuclear, and more importantly, solve the problems of air pollution.

Transcending all other problems for coal in the eyes of the public is air pollution. The American public has become aroused over the dangers of air pollution. This is a good thing. But it has special meaning for the coal industry. Let me give you just one example. In New York City there exists a very active Citizens-for-Clean-Air organization. Just the other day I saw a newspaper clipping quoting its chairman as follows: "It's a joke in the nuclear age . . . to go on building coal-burning powerplants." This quote to me dramatizes one of the big problems facing the coal industry.

It serves no good purpose to point out that air pollution is caused by many of man's activities that have no relationship to coal. The fact that only about 1/3 of contaminants in the atmosphere result from generation of heat and power by fuel combustion is beside the point. The point is that coal is a significant contributor to air pollution, particularly in areas of heavy industrial concentration and large population centers, and the public demands that air pollution be attack and defeated.

This may mean increased costs for new processes and equipment to reduce air pollution from the burning of coal. If we fail to develop the new processes or equipment, it will mean lost markets. The Department of the Interior's coal experts advise me that if air pollution regulations with respect to SO₂ levels at Federal installations in New York, Philadelphia and Chicago are extended to all plants in those three cities—just those three cities—and if we do not clean up the coal combustion process, between 1966 and 1980 you will sell some 100 million tons less of coal.

Just as Americans are aware of the unpleasantness and unhealthfulness of air pollution, we must recognize that costs of a cleaner atmosphere will have to be absorbed by producers, users, and the ultimate beneficiaries—the public. All must share the burden.

It is gratifying to know that independently and in cooperation with others, including the

government and the electric power utilities, your industry has taken steps toward reducing air pollution from coal. Are you doing all that you can? Only you can answer that question.

In the Department of the Interior we, too, ask ourselves: "Are we doing all we can?" Our frank answer has to be "no." But we aren't relaxing; we are looking for the means to do more.

Our marching orders came last January from President Lyndon B. Johnson in his message on Protecting our National Heritage. He said:

"Sulfur compounds—created wherever coal or oil is burned—threaten the environment of almost every city and town in America.

"We must recognize that in dealing with fuels for industry and motor vehicles, we are dealing with matters of enormous importance to every section of the nation and to many economic interests. America's technology and natural resources development are intimately involved in any program that affects fuels and their uses. Great investments have been made on given assumptions about these fuels and uses.

"These considerations require that we approach the pollution problem with respect for its complexity and its economic implications.

"But the health of our people, and indeed the health of the whole urban and rural environment, also require us to approach the pollution problem with urgency and tenacity."

An exciting prospect in the air pollution field, we believe, is a project Interior has undertaken with welcome help from the Public Health Service to perfect an alkalized alumina process for the removal of sulfur dioxide from residues of fossil fuel combustion. This process appears to thrive on sulfur-rich fuels—the more sulfur in the fuel, the more we can remove and sell to balance the costs with the benefits. We would like to move our process along more rapidly—the times demand quick action—and we think we can do this, possibly quite soon.

Not only are we exploring the economic reclamation of sulfur, sulfuric acid and other commercial useful products from the residues of fossil fuel combustion, but we are studying methods for increasing efficiencies in combustion. The gains would be twofold: cleaner air and more efficient use of our natural resources. This is conservation with a capital "C."

There may be little need to remind you that land and water despoliation have become serious problems for all extractive industries. The President has called for a national crusade to restore and protect the quality of our environment. Other national and state leaders as well as business and citizen groups have warned that in our search for clean water and usable space America can no longer afford practices that harm such resources.

At this point I want to commend those responsible producers of your industry who voluntarily have instituted effective programs of land restoration and acid drainage prevention in advance of regulations. The Mined-land Conservation Conference, an affiliate of your Association, has actively promoted educational programs on land conservation.

To alleviate the problems of land and water despoliation, the Bureau of Mines and other Interior agencies are working to develop a variety of land and water pollution prevention and control methods. We are putting the finishing touches on the nationwide study of strip and surface mining authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Our recommendations coming out of this study have gone to the Executive Office of the President.

If coal is to realize its potential in the

future, large sums will be required for research and development in all phases of production, distribution and utilization of coal, including programs of environmental improvement and protection. Government will help where it can and should. The goal must be maximum public benefit at minimum cost.

Because coal contains an almost infinite number of chemical constituents, I have the feeling that one day, under the quickening pace of technological research, its role as a chemical resource will be applied to countless purposes—from fabrics to sophisticated fuels for the space age—and that its values for such uses may approach and exceed its value for conventional uses as we know them today. Already the potentials for coal are being explored for such a wide range of uses as proteins in our food, the manufacture of carbon black, and the production of gasoline.

Recently Secretary Udall dedicated at Cresap, West Virginia, our Office of Coal Research's pilot plant aimed at the conversion of coal to competitive priced gasoline. It is our first pilot plant. The decision to move to pilot plant stage came only after successful benchwork and process development, and after very careful independent analysis. The plant is now in the "shakedown" phase of operation, and the entire plant will be on stream within the next few months. Secretary Udall expressed the hope that this pilot plant will provide the data needed for design of a commercial plant by the early 1970s, and operation of a commercial plant by industry prior to 1975.

If this supplemental source of gasoline provides as little as 10 percent of the market by 1980, it will account for approximately 100 million tons of coal; and if the savings are as low as one cent per gallon, total savings to the American public will approximate \$2 billion per year.

Another substantial project of our Office of Coal Research is development of several processes for synthetic pipeline gas from coal. These processes include hydro-gasification in which the American Gas Association is participating; the gasification of lignite; and the two-stage, high-pressure gasifier at your own BCR lab.

When the production of high B.t.u. gas from coal becomes economically feasible as a supplement to natural gas, it seems reasonable that costs to consumers will be less than if natural gas were the only source of supply. Here again, if only 10 percent of the market in 1980 were to be supplied by gas from coal, it would provide markets for another 100 million tons per year of coal.

The successful conversion of coal to both liquid and gaseous fuels not only will benefit consumers and your industry, but it will add importantly to our nation's security through flexibility of energy supplies and opportunities for substitutions and interchanges among fuel and energy sources. The war in the Middle East and the possible consequences to our supply of foreign oil dramatizes the point.

Another OCR program scheduled for operation this year is a pilot plant at the University of West Virginia for the production of bricks and other construction materials from fly-ash. The Bureau of Mines program includes the testing of a fluidized-bed process for increasing the efficacy and lowering the costs of fly-ash removal. This is the kind of double-play action we're coming to expect from Walter Hibbard and George Fumich.

Development of a commercial market for these waste materials should induce electric generating plants to install equipment in their plants for more efficient fly-ash collection. Our people estimate that the use of fly-ash for bricks could result in by-product credits that would reduce power plant fuel costs by two cents per million B.t.u.'s, and thus help coal remain competitive with nuclear.

Once they have done that, he declared, "they can count with confidence upon the friendship and the help of the people of the United States.

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

The contrast between the two addresses mirrored the differences between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States and between the objectives of their governments.

Kosygin spread propaganda for Communist expansion. President Johnson charted a conscientious course for peace and human progress.

The General Assembly can strengthen its own prestige as well as encourage lasting peace in the Middle East by supporting the sound American program.

MEMORIAL IN SUPPORT OF DEEPER AND WIDER SHIP CHANNELS IN COLUMBIA AND WILLAMETTE RIVERS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague, Senator HATFIELD, and myself, that Enrolled House Joint Memorial 5, adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, in support of the deepening and widening of the ship channels in the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, Oreg., be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

(Sponsored by Representatives Bennett, Bradley.)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia and Willamette Rivers are the major waterways in the Northwest open to seagoing commerce; and

Whereas there is a complex of facilities now under construction, known as the Rivergate Project, and possibly others, that will greatly increase demands made upon these rivers as avenues for marine transportation; and

Whereas seagoing vessels are being built much larger, with consequently greater demand for deeper and wider channels; and

Whereas the present channel depth of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers does not accommodate these largest vessels of today; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized expeditiously to provide for the deepening and widening of the ship channels in the Columbia and Willamette Rivers to such extent as will accommodate larger vessels, so that the economy of the nation may be benefited and the prosperity of the Northwest and its ports be continued and promoted.

(2) The Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause a copy of this memorial to be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each house of Congress and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

AUTO WORKERS' STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers, has presented me with a copy of a statement adopted unanimously by that international union's executive board, dealing with the situation in the Middle East, at its meeting in Toronto on June 16.

Because this is a thoughtful assessment of the needs for a peace settlement with durability, recognizing the realities of the severe problems before us as a result of the Arab-Israel explosion, and properly advocating the fullest use of United Nations resources, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the text of this expression of concern by the UAW may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

UAW EXECUTIVE BOARD URGES DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS BY MIDEAST NATIONS—ASKS U.N. ECONOMIC DRIVE TO AID REGION

The following statement was adopted unanimously by the UAW International Executive Board at its quarterly meeting in Toronto, Ontario, on June 16, 1967 and is being released simultaneously in Detroit and Washington:

"In the tragic area of the Middle East, the guns are now silenced and a precarious cease fire is in effect. If hostilities are not to recur, there must be a frank facing up to underlying and unresolved problems and of the hard realities which now exist in the region, and a concerted and determined effort must be made to find a peaceful solution to these problems.

"While the major responsibility for dealing with these issues rests with the Arab states and with Israel, the world powers and other nations have an obligation to help create a climate of trust and cooperation in the region, without which there can be no substantial progress toward a lasting peace.

"For many years there has been a drum-beat by certain Arab leaders and nations inflaming passions by a call for a 'holy war to annihilate Israel and the Jews.' For 20 years the blind hatred and irrational passion of certain Arab leaders have inflamed relations in the Middle East. These leaders have refused to recognize the existence of Israel and its right to live as a sovereign and independent nation and as a member of the community of nations. Instead of accepting Israel in a spirit of cooperation and coexistence, these Arab leaders have continued their propaganda of a holy war directed at the destruction of the reckless and indefensible attitude and triggered the unprovoked action demanded by the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of U.N. forces from the Gaza strip and the Straits of Tiran and the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships.

"These actions followed by the full mobilization of Arab military forces surrounding the border of Israel and the open threats by Arab leaders to wage a holy war of annihilation against Israel and its people constituted, by any rational standard, an act of aggression against the State of Israel.

"It certainly does not serve the cause of peace or coexistence for leaders of the Soviet Union and the Arab nations to further inflame these passions by making deliberately wild and malicious charges which seek to equate Israel's defense against these calculated efforts to annihilate her with the brutal military aggression of the Hitler regime. What is needed is reason, not recrimination.

"As is always the case in war, it has many innocent victims. Thousands of civilians

have been injured and many more have been up-rooted from their homes and swell the already large numbers of displaced refugees. It is of the highest priority that the United Nations, through its appropriate agency and backed by full support of the UN members, move with all speed and compassion to provide adequate emergency care for the injured and aid the homeless. In addition, the UN should call upon Israel and each of her Arab neighbors to enter into direct negotiations in an effort to settle not only the basic issues in conflict but also to find a just, equitable and compassionate resettlement of the thousands of refugees.

"There can be no basis for peace between Israel and the Arab nations without a firm and open acceptance by all of the right of each nation and its people to exist. Basic to this fundamental and elemental principle is the right of each nation to free and innocent access to and passage through international waterways essential to world commerce and national survival. This specifically includes access and passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

"The right of a people not to be strangled is not a negotiable matter. It must be an uncontested right underscored and guaranteed by the community of world nations.

"The world anxiously awaits an extension of the current precarious cease fire into a negotiated and durable peace treaty among the nations of the Middle East. If this hope is to be achieved, it must be anchored in agreements directly entered into through voluntary negotiations between Israel and each of her Arab neighbors. Tempting as it may be to certain world powers, history, none-the-less, tragically reveals that the terms of a just and lasting peace cannot be imposed from without.

"It is also equally clear that a return to past formulas on the terms of the 1949 or 1956 settlements which have demonstrated their own weakness and unworkability and finally ended in hostilities is not the answer. Such difficult issues which involve questions of national security, boundaries and borders, resettlement of refugees and other matters can best be settled through direct negotiations. In such direct confrontation there can evolve a realization that each has more in common than in conflict.

"To achieve this will require a turn away from an ever escalating and devastating arms race, which has been encouraged by the major powers, and a turn toward a common effort to develop the vast economic and social resources of the entire region and its people. The desert thirsts for water which can make it bloom. Parched and rocky hillsides can become lush with orchards and vineyards. Disease and illiteracy, which have been the historic legacy of vast areas of the Middle East, can be eliminated. It is toward these tasks of economic development and a common effort to raise living standards that each nation in the region should devote its energies and resources.

"The war has disrupted and seriously threatens the economies of many of the countries of the Middle East. If chaos and political instability are to be avoided, substantial external economic assistance must be mobilized and diverted to the region. The United Nations, rather than become embroiled in fruitless recriminations which can only further inflame passions in the area and further divide people and nations, should concentrate its energies and efforts on the creation of a special UN Economic and Social Development Authority for the Middle East to spearhead the urgent tasks confronting the people of the entire region. Such rewarding peaceful efforts should command the generous and wholehearted support of all nations.

"The need is for a sustained period of calm and serious and direct negotiations

June 23, 1967

pointed toward a settlement of major issues and regional economic cooperation to stimulate growth and a drive toward improved health, education and higher living standards.

"This region, which has contributed so much to the cultural heritage of civilized man, can and must find its way to contribute equally to man's search for peace and justice."

**MRS. VIRGINIA MAE BROWN:
FRIEND OF THE RAILROAD PAS-
SENGERS**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, the increasingly critical situation involving rail service in and out of the State of West Virginia has not escaped the attention of Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, a West Virginian and member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And, having delved into the facts of the matter, I note that Mrs. Brown has applied greatly needed commonsense to the tangled situation involving the continued scheduling of trains in the eastern areas including Virginia, West Virginia, and Ohio.

Mrs. Brown's vigorous action in the recent Chesapeake & Ohio proceedings, following the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.'s petition to discontinue certain passenger train service, has been applauded in an editorial in the *Fairmont, W. Va., Times* on June 20. Having supported her appointment to the Commission, I am especially gratified to note her actions as a member of the ICC. I feel that my faith in her judgment and conscientious performance of duty is being vindicated.

I join with the *Times* editor in calling her, "Champion of the Passengers."

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper editorial be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

CHAMPION OF THE PASSENGERS

A champion of the people who still prefer to ride passenger trains has been found on the Interstate Commerce Commission in the person of *Virginia Mae Brown*, the former West Virginia insurance commissioner. President Johnson may not have had this angle in mind when he named Mrs. Brown to the ICC, but train-riders may live to reap the benefits of her presence on the committee.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has for far too long listened to the walls of railroad executives about the losses being incurred on passenger traffic. Some of the requests for abandonment of trains can doubtless be supported by the red-ink figures on the operation charts, but there are cases where the roads are simply trying to get out from under.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway went to the ICC for permission to abandon two of its best-known passenger operations, the *Sportsman* and the *Fast Flying Virginian*, leaving only one "name" train on its main line through Southern West Virginia. The C & O, with the Baltimore & Ohio firmly in its grasp and looking for additional corporate acquisitions, raised the usual argument that "diminishing passenger traffic" was forcing it to give up the trains in question.

Mrs. Brown showed by the road's own figures that travel increased by 15,400 passengers from 1964 to 1966 instead of "diminishing" as the C & O contended. She filed

a vigorous dissent to an order requiring the railroad to continue running the trains for six months, insisting that the full legal limit of a year should have been invoked.

The C & O isn't the only railroad that has been cutting back passenger service to an almost irreducible minimum. Its "affiliate," the B&O, may be offering fewer trains through this part of the state than when its main line first went through in 1852. "Name" trains are disappearing all over the country.

The ICC has tolerantly permitted abandonment of passenger traffic in order that the railroads, can pile up profits handling freight. The C&O-B&O, for instance, makes a great deal of money hauling coal out of West Virginia, but it doesn't give a tinker's dam whether anyone rides its passenger trains.

Vigorous dissent by Commissioner Brown and all those she can align on her side to the current ICC policy seems to be the only means of keeping a single passenger train running anywhere east of the Mississippi.

**SOCIAL SECURITY EXEMPTION FOR
AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN**

Mr. MORSE, Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, Senator HATFIELD and myself, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks, a copy of enrolled House Joint Memorial 17 which was adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

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

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 17

(Sponsored by Representative Peck, Senator Fadeley, Representative Bessonette, Bradley, Carson, Davis, Elder, Graham, Harlan, Holmstrom, Jernstedt, Kennedy, Leiken, Meek, Redden, Richards, Frank Roberts, Rogers, Thornton, Willits, Senators Bain, Eivers, Ireland, Morgan, Musa, Thiel.)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas most categories of public assistance include an earnings exemption whereby recipients are allowed some earnings without reduction in grants; and

Whereas the earnings of an adult on an Aid to Dependent Children grant, other than a small allowance for extra costs, are fully deductible from the grant; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend an earnings exemption to adults on Aid to Dependent Children grants comparable to that given recipients of other categories of aid.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

EDWARD L. JAMES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, the June 20 issue of the *Fairmont, W. Va., Times* commented on the death of a West Virginian of unusual merit—Edward L. James.

One aspect of his life, his firm belief in education, is especially noteworthy. His own efforts to continue his personal education through reading and study

were meritorious, and his diligence in enabling his seven children to secure college degrees is worthy of equal attention and commendation. His contribution toward resolving complex issues of our times will be long remembered within the State of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper editorial be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

EDWARD L. JAMES

Those who knew Edward L. James during the half-century of his interest in State Democratic politics will regret to hear of his tragic death on Sunday.

The 74-year-old produce company president was fatally injured when an ambulance headed for the scene of a drowning collided with his car.

The shocking accident removed from an active role in business civic and political affairs one of Charleston's best known residents. He was often a member of the West Virginia delegation at Democratic National Conventions and made numerous appearances before committees at such gatherings.

Although he was graduated as valedictorian of his class at the old Garnet High School in Charleston, he entered his father's produce business immediately and did not continue his formal education. But constant reading and research made him a well-informed man, especially in those areas where his interests centered.

Probably nothing gave him as much satisfaction as seeing all seven of his children receive college degrees. Two are in the family firm and the rest have entered the professions.

While he was a leader of his own race, honors came to him not so much because he was an outstanding Negro but because he had distinguished himself by his own efforts. He and Mrs. James were twice guests at state dinners in the White House, and he was on familiar terms with the great men of his time.

Eddie James brought great credit to the state of West Virginia and the tragedy of his death at 74 will be widely mourned.

**MOVEMENT TOWARD BILINGUAL
EDUCATION IN ENGLISH AND
SPANISH**

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, it was heartening to me to see an article in the *Dallas Morning News* of Sunday, June 18, 1967, reporting what is, to me, one of the most exciting educational movies of this decade as applied to the Southwest—the attempt to provide an equal educational opportunity for the Spanish-speaking. These people, who comprise 12 percent of the population of the Southwestern United States, have always had the obstacle of language to overcome in our American schools, and sometimes have encountered actual punishment for any slip into their own mother tongue, Spanish.

To encourage and to utilize this promising movement toward a better method of instruction for Spanish-speaking students, I introduced in the Senate S. 428, the bilingual American education bill, cosponsored by a number of my colleagues in the Senate, which is mentioned in the UPI article by Preston McGraw. Presently the Special Senate Subcommittee on Bilingual Education is holding hearings on the bill, with Cali-

June 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8797

Once they have done that, he declared, "they can count with confidence upon the friendship and the help of the people of the United States.

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

The contrast between the two addresses mirrored the differences between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States and between the objectives of their governments.

Kosygin spread propaganda for Communist expansion. President Johnson charted a conscientious course for peace and human progress.

The General Assembly can strengthen its own prestige as well as encourage lasting peace in the Middle East by supporting the sound American program.

MEMORIAL IN SUPPORT OF DEEPER AND WIDER SHIP CHANNELS IN COLUMBIA AND WILLAMETTE RIVERS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague, Senator HATFIELD, and myself, that Enrolled House Joint Memorial 5, adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, in support of the deepening and widening of the ship channels in the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, Oreg., be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

(Sponsored by Representatives Bennett, Bradley.)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia and Willamette Rivers are the major waterways in the Northwest open to seagoing commerce; and

Whereas there is a complex of facilities now under construction, known as the Rivergate Project, and possibly others, that will greatly increase demands made upon these rivers as avenues for marine transportation; and

Whereas seagoing vessels are being built much larger, with consequently greater demands for deeper and wider channels; and

Whereas the present channel depth of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers does not accommodate these largest vessels of today; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized expeditiously to provide for the deepening and widening of the ship channels in the Columbia and Willamette Rivers to such extent as will accommodate larger vessels, so that the economy of the nation may be benefited and the prosperity of the Northwest and its ports be continued and promoted.

(2) The Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause a copy of this memorial to be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each house of Congress and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

AUTO WORKERS' STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers, has presented me with a copy of a statement adopted unanimously by that international union's executive board, dealing with the situation in the Middle East, at its meeting in Toronto on June 16.

Because this is a thoughtful assessment of the needs for a peace settlement with durability, recognizing the realities of the severe problems before us as a result of the Arab-Israel explosion, and properly advocating the fullest use of United Nations resources, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the text of this expression of concern by the UAW may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

UAW EXECUTIVE BOARD URGES DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS WITH MIDEAST NATIONS—ASKS U.N. ECONOMIC DRIVE TO AID REGION

The following statement was adopted unanimously by the UAW International Executive Board at its quarterly meeting in Toronto, Ontario, on June 16, 1967 and is being released simultaneously in Detroit and Washington:

"In the tragic area of the Middle East, the guns are now silenced and a precarious cease fire is in effect. If hostilities are not to recur, there must be a frank facing up to underlying and unresolved problems and of the hard realities which now exist in the region, and a concerted and determined effort must be made to find a peaceful solution to these problems.

"While the major responsibility for dealing with these issues rests with the Arab states and with Israel, the world powers and other nations have an obligation to help create a climate of trust and cooperation in the region, without which there can be no substantial progress toward a lasting peace.

"For many years there has been a drumbeat by certain Arab leaders and nations inflaming passions by a call for a 'holy war to annihilate Israel and the Jews.' For 20 years the blind hatred and irrational passion of certain Arab leaders have inflamed relations in the Middle East. These leaders have refused to recognize the existence of Israel and its right to live as a sovereign and independent nation and as a member of the community of nations. Instead of accepting Israel in a spirit of cooperation and coexistence, these Arab leaders have continued their propaganda of a holy war directed at the destruction of the reckless and indefensible attitude and triggered the unprovoked action demanded by the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of U.N. forces from the Gaza strip and the Straits of Tiran and the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships.

"These actions followed by the full mobilization of Arab military forces surrounding the border of Israel and the open threats by Arab leaders to wage a holy war of annihilation against Israel and its people constituted, by any rational standard, an act of aggression against the State of Israel.

"It certainly does not serve the cause of peace or coexistence for leaders of the Soviet Union and the Arab nations to further inflame these passions by making deliberately wild and malicious charges which seek to equate Israel's defense against these calculated efforts to annihilate her with the brutal military aggression of the Hitler regime. What is needed is reason, not recrimination.

"As is always the case in war, it has many innocent victims. Thousands of civilians

have been injured and many more have been up-rooted from their homes and swell the already large numbers of displaced refugees. It is of the highest priority that the United Nations, through its appropriate agency and backed by full support of the UN members, move with all speed and compassion to provide adequate emergency care for the injured and aid the homeless. In addition, the UN should call upon Israel and each of her Arab neighbors to enter into direct negotiations in an effort to settle not only the basic issues in conflict but also to find a just, equitable and compassionate resettlement of the thousands of refugees.

"There can be no basis for peace between Israel and the Arab nations without a firm and open acceptance by all of the right of each nation and its people to exist. Basic to this fundamental and elemental principle is the right of each nation to free and innocent access to and passage through international waterways essential to world commerce and national survival. This specifically includes access and passage through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba.

"The right of a people not to be strangled is not a negotiable matter. It must be an uncontested right underscored and guaranteed by the community of world nations.

"The world anxiously awaits an extension of the current precarious cease fire into a negotiated and durable peace treaty among the nations of the Middle East. If this hope is to be achieved, it must be anchored in agreements directly entered into through voluntary negotiations between Israel and each of her Arab neighbors. Tempting as it may be to certain world powers, history, none-the-less, tragically reveals that the terms of a just and lasting peace cannot be imposed from without.

"It is also equally clear that a return to past formulas on the terms of the 1949 or 1956 settlements which have demonstrated their own weakness and unworkability and finally ended in hostilities is not the answer. Such difficult issues which involve questions of national security, boundaries and borders, resettlement of refugees and other matters can best be settled through direct negotiations. In such direct confrontation there can evolve a realization that each has more in common than in conflict.

"To achieve this will require a turn away from an ever escalating and devastating arms race, which has been encouraged by the major powers, and a turn toward a common effort to develop the vast economic and social resources of the entire region and its people. The desert thirsts for water which can make it bloom. Parched and rocky hillsides can become lush with orchards and vineyards. Disease and illiteracy, which have been the historic legacy of vast areas of the Middle East, can be eliminated. It is toward these tasks of economic development and a common effort to raise living standards that each nation in the region should devote its energies and resources.

"The war has disrupted and seriously threatens the economies of many of the countries of the Middle East. If chaos and political instability are to be avoided, substantial external economic assistance must be mobilized and diverted to the region. The United Nations, rather than become embroiled in fruitless recriminations which can only further inflame passions in the area and further divide people and nations, should concentrate its energies and efforts on the creation of a special UN Economic and Social Development Authority for the Middle East to spearhead the urgent tasks confronting the people of the entire region. Such rewarding peaceful efforts should command the generous and wholehearted support of all nations.

"The need is for a sustained period of calm and serious and direct negotiations

S 8798

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 23, 1967

pointed toward a settlement of major issues and regional economic cooperation to stimulate growth and a drive toward improved health, education and higher living standards.

"This region, which has contributed so much to the cultural heritage of civilized man, can and must find its way to contribute equally to man's search for peace and justice."

**MRS. VIRGINIA MAE BROWN:
FRIEND OF THE RAILROAD PAS-
SENGERS**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the increasingly critical situation involving rail service in and out of the State of West Virginia has not escaped the attention of Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, a West Virginian and member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And, having delved into the facts of the matter, I note that Mrs. Brown has applied greatly needed commonsense to the tangled situation involving the continued scheduling of trains in the eastern areas including Virginia, West Virginia, and Ohio.

Mrs. Brown's vigorous action in the recent Chesapeake & Ohio proceedings, following the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.'s petition to discontinue certain passenger train service, has been applauded in an editorial in the *Fairmont, W. Va., Times* on June 20. Having supported her appointment to the Commission, I am especially gratified to note her actions as a member of the ICC. I feel that my faith in her judgment and conscientious performance of duty is being vindicated.

I join with the *Times* editor in calling her, "Champion of the Passengers."

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper editorial be printed in the *Record* at this point.

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

CHAMPION OF THE PASSENGERS

A champion of the people who still prefer to ride passenger trains has been found on the Interstate Commerce Commission in the person of *Virginia Mae Brown*, the former West Virginia insurance commissioner. President Johnson may not have had this angle in mind when he named Mrs. Brown to the ICC, but train-riders may live to reap the benefits of her presence on the committee.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has for far too long listened to the walls of railroad executives about the losses being incurred on passenger traffic. Some of the requests for abandonment of trains can doubtless be supported by the red-ink figures on the operation charts, but there are cases where the roads are simply trying to get out from under.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway went to the ICC for permission to abandon two of its best-known passenger operations, the *Sportsman* and the *Fast Flying Virginian*, leaving only one "name" train on its main line through Southern West Virginia. The C & O, with the Baltimore & Ohio firmly in its grasp and looking for additional corporate acquisitions, raised the usual argument that "diminishing passenger traffic" was forcing it to give up the trains in question.

Mrs. Brown showed by the road's own figures that travel increased by 15,400 passengers from 1964 to 1966 instead of "diminishing" as the C & O contended. She filed

a vigorous dissent to an order requiring the railroad to continue running the trains for six months, insisting that the full legal limit of a year should have been invoked.

The C & O isn't the only railroad that has been cutting back passenger service to an almost irreducible minimum. Its "affiliate," the B&O, may be offering fewer trains through this part of the state than when its main line first went through in 1852. "Name" trains are disappearing all over the country.

The ICC has tolerantly permitted abandonment of passenger traffic in order that the railroads can pile up profits handling freight. The C&O-B&O, for instance, makes a great deal of money hauling coal out of West Virginia, but it doesn't give a tinker's dam whether anyone rides its passenger trains.

Vigorous dissent by Commissioner Brown and all those she can align on her side to the current ICC policy seems to be the only means of keeping a single passenger train running anywhere east of the Mississippi.

**SOCIAL SECURITY EXEMPTION FOR
AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, Senator HATFIELD and myself, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the *Record* at this point in my remarks, a copy of enrolled House Joint Memorial 17 which was adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 17

(Sponsored by Representative Peck, Senator Fadeley, Representatives Bessonette, Bradley, Carson, Davis, Elder, Graham, Harlan, Holmstrom, Jernstedt, Kennedy, Leiken, Meek, Redden, Richards, Frank Roberts, Rogers, Thornton, Willits, Senators Bain, Eivers, Ireland, Morgan, Musa, Thiel.)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas most categories of public assistance include an earnings exemption whereby recipients are allowed some earnings without reduction in grants; and

Whereas the earnings of an adult on an Aid to Dependent Children grant, other than a small allowance for extra costs, are fully deductible from the grant; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend an earnings exemption to adults on Aid to Dependent Children grants comparable to that given recipients of other categories of aid.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

EDWARD L. JAMES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the June 20 issue of the *Fairmont, W. Va., Times* commented on the death of a West Virginian of unusual merit—Edward L. James.

One aspect of his life, his firm belief in education, is especially noteworthy. His own efforts to continue his personal education through reading and study

were meritorious, and his diligence in enabling his seven children to secure college degrees is worthy of equal attention and commendation. His contribution toward resolving complex issues of our times will be long remembered within the State of West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper editorial be printed in the *Record* at this point.

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

EDWARD L. JAMES

Those who knew Edward L. James during the half-century of his interest in State Democratic politics will regret to hear of his tragic death on Sunday.

The 74-year-old produce company president was fatally injured when an ambulance headed for the scene of a drowning collided with his car.

The shocking accident removed from an active role in business, civic and political affairs one of Charleston's best known residents. He was often a member of the West Virginia delegation at Democratic National Conventions and made numerous appearances before committees at such gatherings.

Although he was graduated as valedictorian of his class at the old Garnet High School in Charleston, he entered his father's produce business immediately and did not continue his formal education. But constant reading and research made him a well-informed man, especially in those areas where his interests centered.

Probably nothing gave him as much satisfaction as seeing all seven of his children receive college degrees. Two are in the family firm and the rest have entered the professions.

While he was a leader of his own race, honors came to him not so much because he was an outstanding Negro but because he had distinguished himself by his own efforts. He and Mrs. James were twice guests at state dinners in the White House, and he was on familiar terms with the great men of his time.

Eddie James brought great credit to the state of West Virginia and the tragedy of his death at 74 will be widely mourned.

**MOVEMENT TOWARD BILINGUAL
EDUCATION IN ENGLISH AND
SPANISH**

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was heartening to me to see an article in the *Dallas Morning News* of Sunday, June 18, 1967, reporting what is, to me, one of the most exciting educational movies of this decade as applied to the Southwest—the attempt to provide an equal educational opportunity for the Spanish-speaking. These people, who comprise 12 percent of the population of the Southwestern United States, have always had the obstacle of language to overcome in our American schools, and sometimes have encountered actual punishment for any slip into their own mother tongue, Spanish.

To encourage and to utilize this promising movement toward a better method of instruction for Spanish-speaking students, I introduced in the Senate S. 428, the bilingual American education bill, cosponsored by a number of my colleagues in the Senate, which is mentioned in the UPI article by Preston McGraw. Presently the Special Senate Subcommittee on Bilingual Education is holding hearings on the bill, with Cali-

June 23, 1967

for the passage of resolutions, or at least for the wishes of the Senate to be brought to bear, there might be time for constructive changes, short of breaking down an entire, elaborately constructed mechanism for international tariff arrangements.

file

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE SUMMIT: THANKFULNESS AND HOPE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I cannot help wondering how many people in the United States and elsewhere feel as I do about the present world situation. And I have mixed feelings.

I am so thankful that the conflict in the Middle East did not bring the nuclear powers into another countdown. As terrible as the suffering, death, and destruction were in those countries, the threat to all people of the whole world was much greater.

The nuclear powers are always involving every human being when they face one another in a crisis. The issue is not country or nationality but humanity itself. We dare not become casual or calloused about this fact.

I am so thankful that the President and Premier Kosygin have gotten together at Glassboro for a meeting. It was unbelievable that these leaders could let political formalities stop conversation. The fate of the future—of mankind—is involved with the behavior of these men.

There is cause for being thankful for the limited crisis in the Middle East and the summit meeting at Glassboro. But is there really cause for hope?

So quickly the human victory gives way to the threat of defeat. I am thankful for the conversations of the world leaders but I must see some cooperation if I am to have hope. Today's newspapers dramatically announce the summit meeting and on the same page show pictures and statistics of the gory realities of Vietnam.

This is why I have mixed feelings. I want to be thankful. But I also want to be hopeful. To be hopeful is almost foolish as long as the fighting in Vietnam is fueled and escalated by Russia and the United States. What we are both actually doing there speaks for our future, and it looks hopeless to many.

The people of the United States and the people of Russia—both just people of the human race—must let the world leaders know that their hopes are more important than petty politics. They must let these leaders know that losing face or political prestige is not the greatest problem. They must applaud conversation and insist on cooperation.

Pouring military aid into the Middle East and the Far East, by Russia and the United States, has gotten us both into deeper involvements. Especially when we both claim to preserve national interests by supporting military regimes which actually involve our own military might more and more.

This is not to say that military considerations are unimportant. It is to say that the total interests of the Nation and the world must be evaluated in terms broader than those seen in the present military course of the great powers.

Mr. President, this is a plea for rationality. This is a plea for increased conversation and cooperation by the United

States and Russia. This is a plea for Americans and Russians to take a fresh look at their national interests and their foreign policies, with respect to each other.

This is a plea for world politics which uses power to promote peace. We must avoid the devilish temptation to use peace only as an excuse for proving power.

This is a plea for peace which has its proof in mankind's hope for the future. Thankfulness for things past is a good feeling. Hopefulness for things to come is of greater consequence and a good feeling that we cannot do without.

JUSTICE MARSHALL OF MARYLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last week President Johnson nominated Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall to be a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. The retirement of Justice Tom C. Clark could be equaled only by the appointment of an equally fine master of the law.

Solicitor General Marshall's record as an advocate and jurist is unsurpassed to date. He has appeared before the Supreme Court more than 50 times, winning 29 of 32 cases before being elevated to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

While serving as legal counsel for the NAACP, he pioneered the legal theory that persuaded the Court to adopt the 1954 Brown decision, making unconstitutional school segregation.

Thurgood Marshall brings the total of Marylanders who have served on the High Court to six. Since the day he attempted to enter the University of Maryland School of Law until his nomination last week, he has made every effort to point up inequities and injustices in our system and yet take concerted and constructive steps to terminate them.

As the senior Senator from Maryland, I acknowledge and praise him as a loyal son, and solicit and encourage Senators to bring about the speedy confirmation of the nomination of one of Maryland's finest men—Thurgood Marshall.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Baltimore Afro-American of June 17, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RIGHT THING, RIGHT TIME, RIGHT PLACE,
RIGHT MAN

When the U.S. Senate confirms the appointment of Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall as an associate justice of the Supreme Court—a certainty—an historic legal cycle will have been completed.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson, history will show, is the first President in the history of this nation to select a lawyer of color to serve on the highest court of the land.

It will further show that Solicitor Marshall, the first man of his race to serve as the No. 3 man in the U.S. Department of Justice, is the sixth Marylander to become a Supreme Court justice.

Other Marylanders have been:
Justice Robert H. Harrison, 1789 to 1790.
Justice Thomas Johnson, 1791 to 1793.
Justice Samuel Chase, 1796 to 1811.
Justice Gabriel Duval, 1812 to 1835.
Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, 1836 to 1864.

It is more than poetic justice that Mr. Marshall is the first Marylander to be named to the high court since Mr. Justice Taney.

As Chief Justice 100 years ago it was Judge Taney who delivered the infamous 6 to 3 Dred Scott Decision which legally preserved slavery.

The majority verdict, read by Chief Justice Taney, held that:

"Dred Scott was a slave, not a citizen, hence he had no rights under the Constitution, which was made by whites for whites."

That decision, which angered President Abraham Lincoln and tormented both slaves and abolitionists alike, was rendered March 6, 1857.

On May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court, headed by the current Chief Justice, Earl Warren, ruled:

"Segregation in public schools is inherently unequal and therefore unconstitutional."

For all practical purposes that decision sounded the death knell for all forms of legally-sanctioned segregation—or slavery in a more sophisticated form.

The one man mostly responsible for that historical decree is Thurgood Marshall, who unleashed a brilliantly slashing, and relentless attack on the institution of slavery and all of its ramifications, including school segregation.

He was chief counsel in the case of Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.

It was on the plaintiff's side of the bar in the hallowed chambers of the Supreme Court that Mr. Marshall's booming voice thundered the evils of school segregation.

It echoed around the world and thus put into motion judicial wheels which churned out the beginning of the social revolution.

Now Mr. Marshall has been designated a member of the court before which he so eloquently pleaded.

When he is confirmed there is no apprehension here of his performance.

Truth is, there never has been, whether he was pleading the cause of victims of discrimination and segregation as he did for a quarter century;

Or writing an opinion for the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York, or advocating the government's cause as Solicitor General, there was never any doubt about his ability and in most cases, the outcome.

As the nation's most brilliant civil rights lawyer, Justice-designate Marshall argued and won 29 Supreme Court cases.

A brilliant attorney, distinguished jurist, and able Federal officer, his appointment to the nation's highest court seems natural.

President Johnson said it best:
"I believe he earned that appointment; he deserves the appointment. He is best qualified by training and by very valuable service to the country."

"I believe it is the right thing to do; the right time to do it; the right man and the right place."

We can only add:

"Mr. President, we concur!"

PRESIDENT JOHNSON: ARCHITECT OF A NEW FEDERALISM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, President Johnson has long advocated a close partnership between the Federal Government and the States. This partnership is indispensable if our Federal grant-in-aid programs are to accomplish their goals.

The President knows the States and localities receiving assistance under Federal programs are the final link between national programs and the individuals such programs are designed to serve. Because of this knowledge and because of his belief in the importance of strengthening our democratic system of government, he is working to improve relation-

June 23, 1967

I submit that love for your neighbors, the children, requires provision for excellent education. If so, the love quickly becomes citizens' committees, planning meetings, millage campaigns, voting and money. In your expenditure of time, energy and resources you may not meet a single flesh and blood child. Yet you will have acted in love toward them.

The same thesis applies in all kinds of areas. How do you love the disenfranchised, the dropout, the impoverished, the handicapped or any other people who cannot solve their problems by themselves? Certainly they need personal friendship and individual attention. We all do. They also need the services that can only be provided by the joint action of society.

Legislation, research projects, agencies and institutions devoted to specialized services are all possible avenues of opportunity and justice for people. None of them just happen. They come into being as people care enough to give themselves to the battle for them. Civil rights acts, mental health programs and rehabilitation centers are illustrative of acts of love in the public domain. They represent ways by which men and women, clergy included, have responded to the command to love their neighbor.

Consider the Biblical command to be stewards of the gifts of God. That requires the acknowledgement that God is the fee owner of the whole creation. We are his stewards, temporary trustees, charged to return an earth that he been improved by our management. As stewards we are to use the created order to ennoble man's life, to bring joy and fullness to his earthly stay. A proper stewardship of the earth can do that.

A moment's reflection indicates how far we are from the ideal. By treating the creation as our own, to be exploited for our momentary pleasure, we pollute and corrupt and deface and dehumanize. What kind of stewards will receive clear lakes and rivers and hand back open sewers and littered sloughs?

As stewards we have the opportunity, yes the responsibility, to create communities, cities and nations that are warm and human, brimming with beauty and brightness, designed to enable people to work and play, laugh and cry, live and die without ugliness, bitterness and warfare as daily companions.

To make such a possibility a reality requires devoted public service, as well as private action, by a whole array of citizens. Clergymen are included!

TILLAMOOK, OREG., SOUTH JETTY PROJECT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Oregon [Mr. HARTFIELD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, a copy of the enrolled House Joint Memorial 9, adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Oregon Legislative Assembly, in support of funds for planning and construction of the south jetty at Tillamook Bay, Oreg.

Although the President's budget does not request funds for the Tillamook south jetty project for fiscal 1968, I am pleased to state that Senator HARTFIELD and I are giving enthusiastic support to the request for an appropriation of \$500,000 for this project for the coming fiscal year. This is the amount that could be used, effectively and efficiently, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, subject to the usual limitations set forth by the corps. The project is urgently required to prevent erosion damage on Bay Ocean Spit in the vicinity of Tillamook Bay,

Oreg. The initiation of construction work on this project in the coming fiscal year and the advancement of the project to that extent, will reflect economy in the long run due to constantly increasing costs in connection with public works projects.

The Tillamook Bay south jetty project is most meritorious and initial construction should be undertaken this year.

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

[Oregon Legislative Assembly, 1967 regular session]

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

(Sponsored by Representative Hanneman, Senator Naterlin.)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas Tillamook Bay is the only potential deep water port between Newport and Astoria, a coastal distance of more than 100 miles; and

Whereas the absence of a deep water port along the north central coast of Oregon creates a severe hazard to the safety of coastal shipping; and

Whereas a considerable amount of funds have already been spent for rehabilitation of the north jetty; and

Whereas the Federal Government has previously recognized the necessity for construction of the south jetty in order to complete the project; now, therefore,

Be it Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds for planning and construction of the south jetty at Tillamook Bay, Oregon.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

THE KENNEDY ROUND, CANDOR, AND THE RULE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the Kennedy round of trade negotiations will be consummated on June 30 with the signing of the final instruments of negotiation by the participating nations, including the United States.

While near-final arrangements were announced to the press some weeks ago, negotiations about specific commodities and precise tariffs is still going on in Geneva, and probably will continue until shortly before the June 30 expiration of the legislation which permits U.S. participation in the Kennedy round.

A number of Senators have attempted to learn prior to the finalizing of arrangements, what the Kennedy round has in store for particular commodities. Most lawmakers have learned, to their consternation, that specifics of the intricately built tapestry of tariff will not be revealed to them until after the fact—after the signing of final instruments on June 30.

On June 8, I wrote the Honorable William Roth, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, requesting information as to "any contemplated decrease in the tariff rate on raw wool." I was informed by letter June 16:

Participants have agreed that the rule of confidentiality of offers must prevail until the final agreement is signed. I am, therefore, unable to comment on the possibility of tariff reductions on any specific items.

Three days after receiving Mr. Roth's letter, I was notified by the Department of Agriculture that Ambassador Roth "has informed us that specific information about items that may be subject to trade negotiation cannot be disclosed at this time."

Mr. President, I am fully in accord with the necessity for some degree of confidentiality. The intricate web of give and take in tariff and related matters is like the wall of interlocking stones which collapses when any stone is removed. To this extent, I can sympathize with our trade negotiators in wishing to secure finalization of their many years of effort, so that a general liberalization of tariffs worldwide can be achieved.

But, in my judgment, it is distorting the issue when Senators and Congressmen are kept in the dark on a subject which is constitutionally within their purview.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 notwithstanding, the Constitution reposes in the Congress prerogatives for the establishment of tariffs. Despite the finalization of the Kennedy round in only a week, the U.S. Congress will certainly be in a position to legislate changes in the international agreement; however, as the office of Ambassador Roth has informed me, such action could either reopen negotiations, or could bring about the invocation of sanctions or the imposition of penalties against the United States.

There are two ancillary agreements which will come before the Senate for ratification in the form of treaties. However, the basic provisions of the Kennedy round will not be something which will be subject to Senate ratification in toto. The Senate will have before it the international grains agreement and a treaty with respect to the American selling price.

The basic question which disturbs me is the lack of information made available to the one-third of Government which, as a matter of fact, is charged with the responsibility for tariff setting. With respect to Mr. Roth's comments about the rule of confidentiality, his office clarified this position. It admitted flatly that the remarkably convenient "executive privilege" is the instrument of latitude behind which the specifics of tariff negotiation are being concealed. It is gratifying to know that Congress is not being exempted from important facts by a gentleman's agreement reached at Geneva.

Much has been said on and off the Senate floor about the credibility gap—about Government's secrecy and lack of candor. This, in my mind, is one more example of the Government's disinclination to tell the truth at the only time when the truth can have value. It will be tenfold more difficult for the Senate to protect American business interests after June 30. The Congress has a right to know what the Kennedy round means to each of our domestic industries before it is too late to influence the final form of the agreements.

Were the Senate to be informed about what the Kennedy round means in time

June 23, 1967

of a million dollars a month for the guerrilla campaign, plus bigger sums later on. Continued over many months, this would be big money in Bolivia, with a national budget of only 60 million dollars a year.

Bolivia's economy, which teetered on the brink of collapse for years, now is rated strong enough to absorb some shocks.

The state-owned tin mines, which produce 90 per cent of the country's foreign-exchange earnings, are working profitably for the first time since they were nationalized in 1952.

Direct U.S. economic aid is putting 30 million dollars a year into Bolivia. Other loans and private investments will add several millions more during 1967.

Construction, a major source of employment, is reviving.

But the economy is not strong enough to resist many sizable political shocks—such as a military take-over triggered by officer dissatisfaction with the Government's handling of the guerrillas. That is the longer-range worry posed by the continued presence of the guerrillas.

THE U.S. VIEWPOINT

The guerrilla outbreak also poses a real quandary for the U.S.

Washington would like to see the guerrillas defeated, quickly and decisively. But the U.S. is avoiding any appearance of getting involved in any fighting.

At Bolivia's request, U.S. training of Bolivian Army units in antiguerrilla tactics has been speeded up. A 15-man Special Forces training team is working with a Bolivian battalion that, it is expected, ultimately will become the main force against the guerrillas. Helicopters and some communications equipment have been delivered for antiguerrilla work.

But U.S. military men—and even Peace Corps men—have been pulled out of the guerrilla zone. Bolivian requests for napalm, heavy military equipment and more aircraft were turned down.

In La Paz, there is genuine doubt that the U.S. could, through military involvement or economic aid, shape the future of a country like Bolivia even if it wanted to.

Says one seasoned follower of Bolivian affairs: "The U.S. cannot defeat the guerrillas in Bolivia. The Bolivians still can, if they have the will to do it. Bolivia has the potential to be a prosperous, free country—if Bolivians, themselves, have the will."

[From the Washington Star, June 21, 1967]

CASTRO FORGES STRONG SUPPORT

(By Carl T. Rowan)

If you've been waiting for Fidel Castro's Communist regime to be crushed by popular revolt, forget it.

Cuba's government is the most stable in Latin America and there is "absolutely no serious opposition to Castro," according to totally reliable reports from Havana.

Under Russian guidance, Castro has set up a police state apparatus that diplomats call "one of the most effective in the world."

And he has moved shrewdly to toss favors to students and lift old injustices off the peasants and Negroes, with the result that even his bitterest enemies admit that the bearded ex-rebel has a significant popular following.

Beyond that, of the three men most likely to challenge Castro's leadership, he has had one killed, another imprisoned, the third, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, dropped out of sight on March 21, 1965.

The key to governmental stability in Cuba is Interior Minister Ramiro Valdez, "the J. Edgar Hoover of Cuba—plus," as some diplomats describe him.

Under Russian guidance, Valdez set up a neighborhood spy system called the Committee for the Defense of Revolution. This group gives out free polio shots, issues ration cards

and engages in various public service projects to maintain close rapport with the people. Its main purpose, however, is to ensure that every Cuban is watched by several others.

The Department of State Security has a covert unit whose responsibility is to penetrate every factory, women's club, children's group. These hidden informers have played havoc with non-Communist efforts to maintain intelligence agents on the island.

But Castro's solid position also arises from the fact that Cuba has about 100,000 "becados," or students with government scholarships. Castro has made education his big push, and non-Communist diplomats concede that he has made great progress.

Thus Cuban students are said to form the core of Castro's backers.

Then, one of Castro's first acts was to declare all beaches open to all Cubans. This scored heavily with Cuba's Negroes and urban workers whom the Batista regime had barred from choice bathing areas.

One Negro, Juan Almeida, is now acting minister of defense and made the May Day speech normally given by Fidel. Fidel's brother, Raul, still holds the title of defense minister, but rumors have it that Fidel gave power to Almeida when he had a falling out with Raul. Other reports, seemingly more reliable, say Raul broke his kneecap skiing in Eastern Europe and is merely recuperating.

Fidel's strong position is evidenced by the fact that the armed bands that opposed him early in his regime no longer roam the countryside. There is now no visible overt opposition to Castro in Cuba.

American officials have concluded that if Castro is to be overthrown, it will come through a "palace revolt" that no one now expects.

Castro moved to close the door on palace revolts years ago when he had his men shoot down the plane of Camilo Cienfuegos, a sort of coequal during the revolution. Then, in the summer of 1959, another top fellow-rebel, Huber Matos, was hauled before a kangaroo court after he protested the drift toward communism, Matos is still in prison.

And Che Guevara? Every diplomat and intelligence agent has his own guess as to whether Castro had him killed, or whether this architect of insurgency is doing just what Castro claims, sneaking about Latin America planning other revolutions.

Castro has about 50,000 political prisoners behind bars. There are also about 28,000 Cubans whom Castro distrusts and calls "gusanos" (worms). He has put them in UMAs (Military Units to Aid Production), a sort of combination concentration camp-Georgia chain gang-job corps operation.

Told that Castro and the Communists seem to have Cuba in an iron grip, an ever-hopeful American asked a free world diplomat if maybe bad health would get the Cuban dictator.

"No, he seems strong as an ox," was the reply. "And he's even got the sense to take whiskey and women in moderation."

PERMANENT SETTLEMENT OF CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the weeks and months ahead we would be wise to consider all sensible and feasible proposals for a permanent settlement to the crisis in the Middle East. I have received a letter from a professor of Middle Eastern studies who makes what appears to be several sensible proposals. In order to share these comments and recommendations with the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Prof. R. Stephen Humphreys of the Department of Near Eastern Lan-

guages and Literatures of the University of Michigan be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, Ann Arbor, Mich., June 12, 1967.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Now that the recent Arab-Israel war seems to have ended, at least for the time being, the United States will inevitably find itself profoundly involved in any attempts by the belligerents and interested parties to reach a settlement. I wish to express my hope and confidence that you will exert all possible influence to keep this country from any policy of narrow partisanship or vindictiveness.

The easy thing for this country would be to kick Nasser now that he appears to be down, for we have long been bedeviled by his ambitions, and irritated (perhaps unduly) by his contemptuous rhetoric. And now he has been brought to the edge of disaster precisely by his own ambition and vainglory. It would be easy for the United States to support Israel's harsh demands, all the more so religion, sentiment, and our own large Jewish community unite us to this latter country. Even so, we must resist these all too human temptations, and recall our tradition of humanity and understanding towards the vanquished—a tradition which was once, in the Reconstruction Era, abandoned with disastrous results. In particular, we cannot forget our great material and cultural interests in the Arab world, nor that the Arabs do indeed have a case against Israel and Zionism, however ineptly Messrs. Tomeh and Awad al-Kony may present it.

Our material interests are basically access to the oil of the Near East, and the forestalling of a monopoly of Russian influence in the area. Culturally, the United States has many ties to the Arab world, and it will suffice to name the American University of Beirut, the American University of Cairo, and the fellowships and archaeological expeditions sponsored by the American Research Center in Egypt. All this will surely be sacrificed, and so needlessly, if the United States takes a partisan and emotional stand in its future policy towards the Arab world. It is essential that we make every effort to establish peace terms which are at once acceptable to both parties, and give some hope of stability. This will be no easy task, to say the very least, and will surely require an infinite patience on our part. But if such terms exist at all, the United States should be in a strong position to find them and get them accepted, since this government has, or ought to have, a considerable influence with Israel, while the Arabs are in an extremely weak position, albeit their demands and claims will have a very self-interested Russian support.

A settlement along the following lines would, I think, adequately safeguard our own interests and the legitimate goals of the belligerent parties:

I. The frontiers ought to be drawn along the 1949 armistice lines, with the exception of Jerusalem. These boundaries are not always terribly rational. I know, but to change them around would surely create more problems than it would solve. In particular, Israel cannot be permitted to retain the west bank of the Jordan River, because this tract, small as it is, is the only part of Husayn's kingdom which makes Jordan at all economically viable. The Gaza strip, too, with its large population of Arab refugees, cannot very well be absorbed in a Jewish state without great further hardship to these people.

II. Israel has a legitimate interest in securing herself from further commando raids

June 23, 1967

from the Arab side of the line, and therefore I would recommend a system of broad demilitarized zones. These would remain under the administrations of the countries out of which they were carved, but they would be patrolled by U.N. security forces, whose presence would have to be guaranteed by international agreement. It should be clear that the countries which administered these districts would have full economic, political, and fiscal rights in them. Tentatively, I would suggest the following demilitarized zones: all parts of Jordan west of the Jordan River; on the rest of Israel's eastern border, Jordanian and Syrian troops would withdraw east of a line marked by Qneitra, Irbid, Karak, and Petra; the Gaza Strip and large parts of eastern Sinai, with al-Arish being the closest permissible Egyptian outpost. Israel is rather too narrow a country for such large withdrawals on its side of the line, but it too should remove its armed frontier posts at least.

This sort of arrangement will certainly be most unpalatable to both parties, and Israel especially will not wish to accept it, but the kind of unmediated confrontation of hostile forces which has existed for the last twenty years is a severe threat to peace and local security, and cannot be permitted to be reinstated.

III. Jerusalem ought to be internationalized if at all possible. If Israel cannot be made to surrender her jurisdiction, then she must provide for free access to the city and its shrines for all three faiths, and for citizens of all states.

IV. The Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal must be declared international waterways, open to ships of all states not in a condition of active hostility to Egypt. But the administration and revenues of Suez must remain in Egyptian hands, for the canal is vital to her terribly strained economy.

V. Some system of arms control must be instituted. This is not an area which I pretend to know anything about, but it would seem to me that a multi-lateral agreement between the Powers would be the most effective instrument or arms control.

VI. Finally, there is the problem of the refugees from the war of 1948. (Pray God we have none from this last struggle.) This is surely the most intricate and emotion-laden of all the issues confronting Israel and the Arabs, and I would be deceiving only myself if I pretended to have an easy solution. Nevertheless, until this question is settled, there cannot be peace between the Arabs and Israel. Essentially, a solution will require that the Arabs give up the delusion that they can sweep the Jews out of Palestine and thereby restore the refugees to their old lands; but it will equally require that the Israelis stop turning their backs on a group of people for whose plight they bear a most heavy responsibility. It is impracticable to resettle these refugees in Israel, of course, but perhaps she could bear a certain proportion of the cost of establishing them elsewhere. Something must be done, at any rate, in spite of all the opposition that any plan will have to face, and we cannot realistically expect the Arab states to bear the whole burden of a solution. They will be badly enough taxed to absorb the refugees into their social-economic structures.

These arrangements ought to be embodied in a treaty signed by Israel and the Arab states. Such a treaty, of course, will be an implicit admission by the Arabs that Israel does in fact exist as a state, and hence that they no longer have the right to call for her annihilation. This admission of what to us appears a patent fact will prove a severe strain for the Arab leaders, and an even greater one for their people. We must realize that any Arab leader who makes such an admission is as good as forfeiting the loyalty of his people, for a time at least, and he will need all the support we can give him to hope to stay in power.

I shall conclude by noting that last week's war was the product of fifty years of mutual hostility and contempt between Arab and Jew. We cannot expect that the arrangements which I have outlined above, or any others, will do away with this heritage. Nevertheless, I feel that we can no longer afford the luxury of avoiding an attempt to bring this confrontation to an end. Those of us who are students of the Near East often comment that only Israel unites the Arabs, but we know that is not the case. The Palestine problem is the thing which most of all rends the Arab world and turns its members against themselves. It is the thing which makes impossible a rational calculation of national goals, agreements between the Arab states based on common interests, etc. It is long since time that the United States did its utmost to rid the world of this curse.

With sincere regards,

R. STEPHEN HUMPHREYS.

PAYMENT OF PHYSICIANS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a much-needed amendment to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965. Under part B of Medicare, the Supplemental Medical Insurance Benefits for the Aged, a physician may receive payment for covered services in two ways. These two methods are referred to as "direct billing" and "assignment." Under the latter, the patient and the doctor complete the insurance form, and the doctor sends the completed form to the carrier. Under the direct billing method, the doctor sends to the patient an itemized bill, the patient pays the physician, receives a receipted itemized bill, and this is sent to the carrier for reimbursement.

It is when the direct billing alternative is used that a most serious problem has arisen insofar as the senior citizen patient is concerned. To illustrate this point, I shall quote from the testimony that the poverty subcommittee received from Mr. William R. Hutton, executive director of the National Council of Senior Citizens:

One reason many elderly poor do not benefit from Medicare is direct billing by doctors who treat the elderly. How this deprives seniors of needed health care is shown in the case of the National Council member who reported waiting six months for reimbursement of a doctor bill for major surgery.

In order to get a receipted itemized bill so he could collect Medicare insurance, the member borrowed from a personal loan firm to pay his doctor bill. The member tells us the loan accumulated interest at a frightening rate.

As the months passed, with no Medicare reimbursement, the loan firm became impatient for repayment. It threatened court action. To satisfy the lender that the loan actually went to pay a doctor bill covered by Medicare, our member asked the Medicare payment agency, in this case Blue Shield, for a statement confirming the fact it was considering the Medicare claim of our member. The payment agency refused this request.

Fortunately for our member, the Medicare reimbursement came through before the loan firm could file a collection suit.

The National Council of Senior Citizens recommends a system that requires doctors to send their bills directly to Medicare payment agencies as they presently do under Blue Shield plans or allow patients to send unreceipted bills instead of receipted ones as the law now directs. Medicare would either pay the doctor directly or send the reim-

bursement to the patient for transmission to the doctor.

Obviously, Mr. President, this kind of situation cannot and should not be allowed to continue. It is strange indeed that a measure, the purpose of which was to relieve the financial strain and hardship for many of our senior citizens, has resulted in some cases in heartache, frustration, and hardship. The bill that I introduce will eliminate this hardship.

My bill, Mr. President, would permit the patient to be reimbursed on the basis of an itemized bill. The patient would be able to secure payment from the carrier by presenting an itemized bill instead of a paid receipt. This would eliminate the case illustrated by the testimony of Mr. Hutton and others where the citizen had to borrow money to pay his doctor bill. I urge that the Committee on Finance act expeditiously on the bill.

LUCE SPEAKS TO NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Honorable Charles F. Luce, Under Secretary of the Interior, spoke to those attending the 50th anniversary convention of the National Coal Association on June 19, delivering an effective discussion of coal's promising future.

I have secured a copy of his remarks and wish to make them available to the Members of the Senate in continuing the observance of this week as National Coal Week.

This week of June 18 through June 24 was so designated by Presidential proclamation, which it was my privilege to read to those in attendance at the convention on June 19.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Under Secretary Luce's remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF CHARLES F. LUCE, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 19, 1967

Your organization grew out of a request by President Woodrow Wilson in 1917, through his Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, for organized assistance from the coal industry in the war effort.

An anniversary, especially a Golden Anniversary, is traditionally an occasion to reminisce. Today, however, I want to take only a very brief look backward, and then turn to the challenges and opportunities confronting the National Coal Association today and tomorrow.

In retrospect, coal was the foundation upon which our great American industrial society was built. The coal industry has weathered many changes in the national economy and national defense requirements. You have successfully met the competition of rapid growth of alternate sources of energy by devising new concepts of management and new technologies in the mining, processing, transportation and utilization of coal. Your remarkable accomplishments in recent years, characterized by a gain in average productivity from 7 to more than 18 tons per man day in little over a decade, have received worldwide recognition. Coal production, this year an estimated record 550 million tons, is expected to reach 800 million tons by 1980. All of these developments and

"Some of the guys are so careless! Today a buddy of mine called 'La Dai' ('Come here') into a hut and an old man came out of the bomb shelter. My buddy told the old man to get away from the hut and since we have to move quickly on a sweep, just threw a hand grenade into the shelter.

"As he pulled the pin the old man got excited and started jabbering and running toward my buddy and the hut. A GI, not understanding, stopped the old with a football tackle just as my buddy threw the grenade into the shelter. (There is a four-second delay on a hand grenade.)

"After he threw it, and was running for cover (during this four-second delay), we all heard a baby crying from inside the shelter! "There was nothing we could do.

"After the explosion we found the mother, two children (ages about six and twelve, boy and girl) and an almost newborn baby. That is what the old man was trying to tell us.

"The shelter was small and narrow. They were all huddled together. The three of us dragged out the bodies onto the floor of the hut.

"It was horrible.

"The children's fragile bodies were torn apart, literally mutilated. We looked at each other and burned the hut.

"The old man was just whimpering in disbelief outside the burning hut. We walked away and left him there.

"My last look was: an old, old man in ragged, torn, dirty clothes on his knees outside the burning hut, praying to Buddha. His white hair was blowing in the wind and tears were rolling down.

"We kept on walking, then the three of us separated. There was a hut at a distance and my squad leader told me to go over and destroy it. An oldish man came out of the hut.

"I checked and made sure no one was in it, then got out my matches. The man came up to me then, and bowed with his hands in a praying motion over and over.

"He looked so sad. He didn't say anything, just kept bowing, begging me not to burn his home.

"We were both there, alone, and he was about your age, Dad. With a heavy heart, I hesitatingly put the match to the straw and started to walk away.

"Dad, it was so hard for me to turn and look at him in the eyes but I did.

"I wish I could have cried but I just can't any more.

"I threw down my rifle and ran into the now blazing hut and took out everything I could save—food, clothes, etc.

"Afterwards, he took my hand, still saying nothing, and bowed down, touching the back of my hand to his forehead.

"Well, Dad, you wanted to know what it's like here. Does this give you an idea?

"Excuse the poor writing but I was pretty emotional, I guess, even a little shook.

"Your Son."

The rest of my son's letter goes on to describe what the routines of his life in Vietnam are like. Needless to say, I was very much disturbed to read this letter. My sixteen-year old daughter had read it before I did and when I went to her room to ask her if I could read the letter, I found her crying. I asked her the reason, and she replied by handing me the letter.

I have not been a dove as far as the Vietnamese war is concerned, though I have not been a strong hawk either. But I think that the American people should understand what they mean when they advocate a continuation and even an escalation of our war effort in Vietnam.

They should understand that war doesn't consist only of two armies made up of young men in uniform, armed and firing at each other across the open fields, with bugles blowing and flags waving. The American people should understand what a war such as this

does to our young men whom we send overseas to carry out our Government's foreign policy.

I guess what I am saying is that whatever course American public opinion backs should be supported by knowledge and understanding of the concrete results of that course and not by illusions.

file

A GI's Dad.

THE NEAR EAST CRISIS—SPEECH BY ABBA EBAN IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I note that two important speeches delivered on June 19, 1967, and dealing with the Near East crisis—that of President Johnson before the Foreign Policy Conference for Educators, and of Premier Kosygin before the United Nations General Assembly—were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 20, 1967, on pages H7552 to H7557, inclusive.

A third important speech on the Near East crisis was also delivered on June 19, 1967, before the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, Abba Eban.

I think it essential that all of these statements be given as wide a circulation as possible in order to understand the contending viewpoints concerning this vital area.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of the speech delivered by Mr. Eban before the General Assembly of the United Nations, as reported in the official record of that body.

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

MR. EBAN (Israel). The subject of our discussion is the Middle East, its past agony and its future hope. We speak of a region whose destiny has profoundly affected the entire human experience. In the heart of that region, at the very centre of its geography and history, lives the very small nation called Israel. This nation gave birth to the currents of thought which have fashioned the life of the Mediterranean world and of vast regions beyond. It has now been re-established as the home and sanctuary of a people that has seen six million of its sons exterminated in the greatest catastrophe ever endured by any family of the human race.

Now, in recent weeks, the Middle East has passed through a crisis whose shadows darken the world. This crisis has many consequences but only one cause. Israel's right to peace, to security, to sovereignty, to economic development, to maritime freedom—indeed, its very right to exist—has been forcibly denied and aggressively attacked. This is the true origin of the tension which torments the Middle East. All the other elements of the conflict are the consequences of this single cause.

There has been danger; there is still peril, in the Middle East because—and only because—Israel's existence, sovereignty and vital interests have been and are being vitally assailed. The threat to Israel's existence, its peace, security, sovereignty and development, have been directed against it in the first instance by neighbouring Arab States; but all the conditions of tension, all the temptations to aggression in the Middle East, have, to our deep regret, been aggravated by the unbalanced policy of one of the great Powers which, under our Charter, bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of interna-

tional peace and security. I shall show how the Soviet Union has, for fifteen years, been unfaithful to that trust. The burden of responsibility lies heavy upon it. Today's intemperate utterance illustrates the lack of equilibrium and objectivity that has contributed so much to the tension and agony of Middle Eastern life.

I come to this rostrum to speak for a people which, having faced danger to its national survival, is unshakably resolved to resist any course which would renew the perils from which it has emerged. The General Assembly is chiefly preoccupied by the situation against which Israel defended itself on the morning of 5 June. I shall invite every peace-loving State represented here to ask itself how it would have acted on that day if it faced similar dangers.

But if our discussion is to have any weight or depth, we must understand that great events are not born in a single instant of time. It is beyond all honest doubt—beyond all honest doubt—that between 14 May and 5 June Arab Governments, led and directed by President Nasser, methodically prepared and mounted an aggressive assault designed to bring about Israel's immediate and total destruction. My authority for that conviction rests on the statements and actions of Arab Governments themselves. There is every reason to believe what they say and to observe carefully what they do.

During Israel's first decade the intention to work for its destruction by physical violence had always been part of the official doctrine and policy of Arab States. But many Members of the United Nations hoped, and some believed, that relative stability would ensue from the arrangements discussed in the General Assembly in March 1957. An attempt was then made to inaugurate a period of non-belligerency and coexistence in the relations between Egypt and Israel. A United Nations Emergency Force was to separate the armies in Sinai and Gaza. The maritime Powers were to exercise free and innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran. Terrorist attacks against Israel were to cease. The Suez Canal was to be opened to Israel shipping, as the Security Council had decided six years before.

In March 1957 these hopes and expectations were endorsed in the General Assembly by the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Canada and other States in Europe, the Americas, Africa, Asia and Australasia. These assurances, expressed with special solemnity by the four Governments which I have mentioned, induced Israel to give up positions which it then held at Gaza and at the entrance to the Strait of Tiran and in Sinai. Non-belligerency, maritime freedom, and immunity from terrorist attack were henceforth to be secured not by Israel's own pressure, but by the concerted will of the international community. Egypt expressed no opposition to these arrangements. Bright hopes for the future illuminated this Hall on that day ten years ago.

There were times during the past decade when it seemed that a certain stability had been achieved. As we look back it becomes plain that the Arab Governments regarded the 1957 arrangements merely as a breathing space enabling them to gather strength for a later assault. At the end of 1962 President Nasser began to prepare Arab opinion for an armed attack that was to take place within a few brief years. As his armaments grew, his aggressive designs came more blatantly to light. On 23 December, 1962, he said:

"We feel that the soil of Palestine is the soil of Egypt and of the whole Arab world. Why do we mobilize? Because we feel that the land is part of our land, and are ready to sacrifice ourselves for it."

The present Foreign Minister of Egypt, Mr. Mahmoud Riad, echoed his master's voice:

"The sacred Arab struggle will not come to an end until Palestine is restored to its owners."

In March 1963, the official Cairo Radio continued the campaign of menace:

"Arab unity is taking shape towards the great goal—i.e., the triumphant return to Palestine with the banner of unity flying high in front of the holy Arab march."

The newspaper *Al-Gumhuriya* published an official announcement on the same day:

"The noose around Israel's neck is tightening gradually . . . Israel is no mightier than the empires which were vanquished in the Arab east and west . . . The Arab people will take possession of their full rights in their united homeland."

Egypt is not a country in which the Press utters views and opinions independently of the official will. There is thus much significance in the statement of Al-Akhbar on 4 April of that year:

"The liquidation of Israel will not be realized through a declaration of war against Israel by Arab States, but Arab unity and inter-Arab understanding will serve as a hangman's rope for Israel."

The Assembly will note that the imagery of a hangman's rope or of a tightening noose occurs frequently in the macabre vocabulary of Nasserism. He sees himself perpetually presiding over a scaffold. In June 1967, in Israel's hour of solitude and danger, the metaphor of encirclement and strangulation was to come vividly to life.

In February 1964, Nasser enunciated in simple terms what was to become his country's policy during the period of preparation. I quote his simple words:

"The possibilities of the future will be war with Israel. It is we who will dictate the time; it is we who will dictate the place."

A similar chorus of threats arose during this period from other Arab capitals. President Aref of Iraq and President Ben-Bella of Algeria were especially emphatic and repetitive in their threat to liquidate Israel, but they were far away. The Syrian attitude was more ominous because it affected a neighbouring frontier. Syrian war propaganda has been particularly intense in the past few years. In 1964, the Syrian Defense Minister, General Abdulla Ziada, announced:

"The Syrian army stands as a mountain to crush Israel and demolish her. This army knows how to crush its enemies."

Early last year Syria began to proclaim and carry out what it called a "popular war" against Israel. It was a terrorist campaign which expressed itself in the dispatch of trained terrorist groups into Israel territory to blow up installations and communications centres and to kill, maim, cripple and terrorize civilians in peaceful homes and farms. Often the terrorists, though trained in Syria, would be dispatched through Jordan or Lebanon. The terrorist war was formally declared by President Al-Atassi on 22 May 1966 when he addressed soldiers on the Israeli-Syrian front in these words:

"We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war that will destroy the Zionist base."

It is a strange experience, in this hall of peace, to be sitting with a fellow representative whose philosophy is, "We want total war with no limits."

The Syrian Defense Minister, Hafiz Asad, said two days later:

"We shall never call for, nor accept peace. We shall only accept war . . . We have resolved to drench this land with our blood, to oust you, aggressors, and throw you into the sea for good."

From that day to this not a week has passed without Syrian officials adding to this targid stream of invective and hate. From that day to this, there has not been a single month without terrorist acts, offensive to every impulse of human compassion and international civility, being directed

from Syria against Israeli citizens and territory. I would have no difficulty at all in swelling the General Assembly's records with a thousand official statements by Arab leaders in the past two years announcing their intention to destroy Israel by diverse forms of organized physical violence. The Arab populations have been conditioned by their leaders to the anticipation of a total war, preceded by the constant harassment of the prospective victim.

From 1948 to this very day there has not been one statement by any representative of a neighbouring Arab State indicating readiness to respect existing agreements on the permanent renunciation of force, especially the Charter agreement or to recognize Israel's sovereign right to existence; or to apply to Israel any of the central provisions of the United Nations Charter.

For some time Israel showed a stoic patience in her reaction to these words of menace. This was because the threats were not always accompanied by a capacity to carry them into effect. But the inevitable result of this campaign of menace was the burden of a heavy race in arms. We strove to maintain an adequate deterrent strength, and the decade beginning in March 1957 was not monopolized by security considerations alone. Behind the wall of a strong defence, with eyes vigilantly fixed on dangerous borders, we embarked on a constructive era in the national enterprise. These were years of swift expansion in our agriculture and industry; of intensive progress in the sciences and arts; of a widening international vocation, symbolized in the growth of strong links with the developing world. And thus at the end of her first decade Israel had established relations of diplomacy, commerce and culture with all the Americas, and with nearly all the countries of Western, Central and Eastern Europe. In her second decade she was to build constructive links with the emerging countries of the developing world with whom we are tied by a common aspiration to translate national freedom into creative economic growth and social progress.

Fortified by friendships in all five continents; inspired by its role in the great drama of development; intensely preoccupied by tasks of spiritual co-operation with kindred communities in various parts of the world, and in the effort to assure the Jewish survival after the disastrous blows of Nazi oppression; tenaciously involved in the development of original social ideas—Israel went on with its work. We could not concern ourselves exclusively with the torrent of hatred pouring in upon us from Arab Governments. After all, in the era of modern communications a nation is not entirely dependent on its regional context. The wide world is open to the voice of friendship. Arab hostility towards Israel became increasingly isolated, while Israel's position in the international family became more deeply entrenched. Many in the world drew confidence from the fact that a very small nation could, by its exertion and example, rise to respected levels in social progress, scientific progress and the humane arts.

And so our policy was to deter the aggression of our neighbours so long as it was endurable; to resist it only when failure to resist would have invited its intensified renewal; to withstand Arab violence without being obsessed by it; and even to search patiently here and there for any glimmer of moderation and realism in the Arab mind. We also pursued the hope of bringing all the great Powers to a harmonious policy in support of the security and sovereignty of Middle Eastern States.

It was not easy to take this course. The sacrifice imposed upon our population by Arab violence was cumulative in its effects. But as it piled up month by month the toll of death and bereavement was heavy. And in the last few years it was evident that this

organized murder was directed by a central hand.

We were able to limit our response to this aggression so long as its own scope appeared to be limited. President Nasser seemed for some years to be accumulating inflammable material without an immediate desire to set it alight. He was heavily engaged in domination and conquest elsewhere. His speeches were strong against Israel. But his bullets, guns and poison gases were for the time being used to intimidate other Arab States and to maintain a colonial war against the villagers of the Yemen and the peoples of the Arabian Peninsula.

But Israel's danger was great. The military build-up in Egypt proceeded at an intensive rate. It was designed to enable Egypt to press its war plans against Israel while maintaining its violent adventures elsewhere. In the face of these developments Israel was forced to devote an increasing proportion of its resources to self-defence. With the declaration by Syria early in 1965 of the doctrine of a "day by day military confrontation" the situation in the Middle East grew darker. The Palestine Liberation Organization, the Palestine Liberation Army, the Unified Arab Command, the intensified expansion of military forces and equipment in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and more remote parts of the Arab continent—those were the signals of a growing danger to which we sought to alert the mind and conscience of the world.

In three weeks between 14 May and 5 June, Egypt, Syria and Jordan, assisted and incited by more distant Arab States, embarked on a policy of immediate and total aggression.

June 1967 was to be the month of decision. The "final solution" was at hand.

There was no convincing motive for the aggressive design which was now unfolded. Egyptian and Soviet sources have claimed—and we heard the claim repeated today—that a concentrated Israeli invasion of Syria expressed by troop concentrations was expected during the second or third week in May. No claim could be more frivolous or far-fetched. It is true that Syria was sending terrorists into Israel to lay mines on public roads and, on one occasion, to bombard the Israeli settlement at Manara from the Lebanese border. The accumulation of such actions had sometimes evoked Israeli responses limited in scope and time. All that Syria had to do to ensure perfect tranquility on its frontier with Israel was to discourage the terrorist war. Not only did it not discourage these actions, it encouraged them. It gave them every moral and practical support. But the picture of Israeli troops concentrations in strength for an invasion of Syria in mid-May was a monstrous fiction. Twice Syria refused to co-operate with suggestions made by the United Nations authorities and accepted by Israel for a simultaneous and reciprocal inspection of the Israeli-Syrian frontier. On one occasion the Soviet Ambassador complained to my Prime Minister of heavy troop concentrations in the north of Israel. But when invited to join the Prime Minister that very moment in a visit to any part of Israel which he liked, the distinguished envoy brusquely refused. The prospect of finding out the truth at first hand seemed to fill him with a profound disquiet. There is only one thing to be said about Prime Minister Kosygin's assertion this morning that there were heavy concentrations of Israeli troops on the Syrian frontier in mid-May; the only thing to say about that assertion is that it is completely untrue. There is only one thing to be said about these descriptions of villages being burned and inhabitants being shot; these are false, inflammatory words of propaganda designed to inflame passions in an area already too hot with tension. By 9 May the Secretary-General of the United Nations from his own sources on the ground had ascertained that no such Israeli troop concentrations existed. This fact had been directly communicated

to the Syrian and Egyptian Governments. The excuse had been shattered, but the allegation still remained. The steps which I now come to describe could not possibly have any motive or justification in an Israeli troop concentration in the north which both Egypt and Syria knew did not exist. Indeed the Egyptian build-up ceased very quickly even to be described by its authors as the result of any threat to Syria. Let us now see how the design of May and June began to unfold.

On 14 May Egyptian forces began to move in strength into Sinai.

On 16 May the Egyptian Command ordered the United Nations Emergency Force to leave the border. The following morning the reason became clear. For on 17 May, at 6 in the morning, Radio Cairo broadcast that Field Marshal Amer had issued alert orders to the Egyptian armed forces. Nor did he mention Syria as the excuse. His orders read:

"1. The state of preparedness of the Egyptian Armed Forces will increase to the full level of preparedness for war, beginning 14.30 hours last Sunday.

"2. Formations and units allocated in accordance with the operational plans will advance from their present locations to the designated positions.

"3. The armed forces are to be in full preparedness to carry out any combat tasks on the Israel front in accordance with developments."

On 18 May, Egypt called for the total removal of the United Nations Emergency Force. The Secretary-General of the United Nations acceded to this request and moved to carry it out, without reference to the Security Council or the General Assembly; without carrying out the procedures indicated by Secretary-General Hammarskjold in the event of a request for a withdrawal being made; without heeding the protesting voices of some of the permanent members of the Security Council and of the Government at whose initiative the Force had been established; without consulting Israel on the consequent prejudice to its military security and its vital maritime freedom; and without seeking such delay as would enable alternative measures to be concerted for preventing belligerency by sea and a dangerous confrontation of forces by land.

It is often said that United Nations procedures are painfully slow. This one, in our view, was disastrously swift. Its effect was to make Sinai safe for belligerency from north and south; to create a sudden disruption of the local security balance; and to leave an international maritime interest exposed to almost certain threat. I will not say anything of the compulsions which may have led to those steps; I speak only of consequences. I have already said that Israel's attitude to the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations has been traumatically affected by this experience. What is the use of a fire brigade which vanishes from the scene as soon as the first smoke and flames appear? Is it surprising that we are resolved never again to allow a vital Israeli interest and our very security to rest on such a fragile foundation?

The clouds now gathered thick and fast. Between 14 May and 23 May, Egyptian concentrations in Sinai increased day by day. Israel took corresponding precautionary measures. In the absence of an agreement to the contrary, it is of course legal for any State to place its armies wherever it chooses in its territory. But it is equally true that nothing could be more uncongenial to the prospect of peace than to have large armies facing each other across a narrow space, with one of them clearly bent on an early assault. For the purpose of the concentration was not in doubt. On 18 May, at 24 hours, the Cairo Radio *Saut El Arab* published the following Order of the Day by Abdul Muhsin Murtagi, the General then Commanding Sinai:

"The Egyptian forces have taken up positions in accordance with a definite plan.

"Our forces are definitely ready to carry the battle beyond the borders of Egypt.

"Morale is very high among the members of our armed forces because this is the day for which they have been waiting—to make a holy war in order to return the plundered land to its owners.

"In many meetings with army personnel, they asked when the holy war will begin—the time has come to give them their wish."

On 21 May, General Amer gave orders to mobilize reserves.

Now came the decisive step, the turning point. All doubt that Egypt had decided upon immediate or early war was now dispelled. For, appearing at an air force base at 6 o'clock in the morning, President Nasser announced that he would blockade the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran to Israeli ships, adding: "The Jews threaten war and we say by all means we are ready for war."

On 25 May, Cairo Radio announced: "The Arab people is firmly resolved to wipe Israel off the map and to restore the honour of the Arabs of Palestine."

On the following day, 26 May, Nasser spoke again:

"The Arab people wants to fight. We have been waiting for the right time when we will be completely ready. Recently we have felt that our strength has been sufficient and if we make battle with Israel, we shall be able, with the help of God, to conquer. Sharm-el-Sheikh implies a confrontation with Israel."—These are Nasser's words.—"Taking this step makes it imperative that we be ready to undertake a total war with Israel."

Writing in *Al Ahran* on 26 May, Nasser's spokesman, Mr. Hasanein Heykal, wrote, with engaging realism:

"I consider that there is no alternative to armed conflict between the United Arab Republic and the Israeli enemy. This is the first time that the Arab challenge to Israel attempts to change an existing fact in order to impose a different fact in its place."

On 28 May, President Nasser had a Press conference. Indeed, he was now having them every day. He said:

"We will not accept any possibility of co-existence with Israel." And on the following day:

"If we have succeeded to restore the situation to what it was before 1956, there is no doubt that God will help us and will inspire us to restore the situation to what it was prior to 1948."

There are various ways of threatening Israel's liquidation. Few ways could be clearer than to ask to move the clock of history back to before 1948, the date of Israel's establishment.

The troop concentrations and blockade were now to be accompanied by encirclement. The noose was to be fitted around the victim's neck. Other Arab States were closing the ring. On 30 May, Nasser signed the defense agreement with Jordan, and described its purpose in these terms:

"The armies of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon are stationed on the borders of Israel in order to face the challenge. Behind them stand the armies of Iraq, Algeria, Kuwait, Sudan and the whole of the Arab nation.

"This deed will astound the world. Today they will know that the Arabs are ready for the fray. The hour of decision has arrived."

These are not the words of response to any anticipated aggression. These are words of indoctrination about a warlike initiative.

Similarly, on 4 June, Nasser made a statement on Cairo Radio after signing the Protocol associating Iraq with the Egyptian-Jordanian Defense Pact. Here are his words:

"We are facing you in the battle and are burning with desire for it to start in order

to obtain revenge. This will make the world realize what the Arabs are and what Israel is . . ."

Nothing has been more startling in recent weeks than to read discussions about who planned, who organized, who initiated, who prepared, who wanted and who launched this war. Here we have a series of statements, mounting crescendo from vague warning through open threat to precise intention.

Here we have the vast mass of the Egyptian armies in Sinai with seven infantry and two armoured divisions, the largest force ever assembled in that peninsula in all its history. Here we have 40,000 regular Syrian troops poised to strike at the Jordan Valley from advantageous positions in the hills. Here we have the mobilized forces of Jordan with their artillery and mortars trained on Israel's population centres in Jerusalem and along the vulnerable narrow coastal plain. Troops from Iraq, Kuwait and Algeria converge towards the battlefield at Egypt's behest. Nine hundred tanks face Israel on the Sinai border, while two hundred more are poised to strike the isolated town of Elath at Israel's southern tip. The military dispositions tell their own story. The Southern Negev was to be sundered in a swift decisive blow. The Northern Negev was to be invaded by armour and bombarded from the Gaza Strip. From 27 May onward, Egyptian air squadrons in Sinai were equipped with operation orders—which are now in our hands—instructing them in detail on the manner in which each Israeli air field—and they are pathetically few in number—were to be bombarded, thus exposing Israel's crowded cities to easy and merciless assault. Egyptian air sorties came in and out of Israel's southern desert to reconnoitre, inspect and prepare for the attack. An illicit blockade had cut Israel off from all its commerce with the eastern half of the world.

Those who write this story in years to come will give a special place in their narrative to the blatant decision to close the Strait of Tiran in Israel's face. It is not difficult to understand why that outrage had such a drastic impact. In 1957 the maritime nations, within the framework of the United Nations General Assembly, correctly enunciated the doctrine of free and innocent passage through the Strait. When that doctrine was proclaimed—and incidentally, not challenged by Egypt at the time—it was little more than an abstract principle for the maritime world. For Israel it was a great but unfulfilled prospect; it was not yet a reality. But during the ten years in which we and the other States of the maritime community have relied upon that doctrine and upon established usage, the principle has become a reality consecrated by hundreds of sailings under dozens of flags and the establishment of a whole complex of commerce and industry and communication. A new dimension has been added to the map of the world's communications, and on that dimension we have constructed Israel's bridge towards the friendly States of Asia and East Africa, a network of relationships which is the chief pride of Israel in its second decade and on which its economic future largely depends.

All this, then, has grown up as an effective usage under the United Nations flag. Does Mr. Nasser really think that he can come upon the scene in ten minutes and cancel the established legal usage and interests of ten years?

There was in this wanton act a quality of malice. For surely the closing of the Strait of Tiran gave no benefit whatever to Egypt except the perverse joy of inflicting injury on others. It was an anarchic act, because it showed a total disregard for the law of nations, the application of which in this specific case had not been challenged for ten years. And it was, in the literal sense, an act of arrogance, because there are other nations

in Asia and East Africa which trade with the Port of Elath, as they have every right to do, through the Strait of Tiran and across the Gulf of Aqaba. Other sovereign States from Japan to Ethiopia, from Thailand to Uganda, from Cambodia to Madagascar, have a sovereign right to decide for themselves whether they wish or do not wish to trade with Israel. These countries are not colonies of Cairo. They can trade with Israel or not as they wish, and President Nasser is not the policeman of other African and Asian States.

When we examine, then, the implications of this act, we have no cause to wonder that the international shock was great. There was another reason for that shock. Blockades have traditionally been regarded in the pre-Charter parlance, as acts of war, and now as acts of aggression. To blockade, after all, is to attempt strangulation—and sovereign States are entitled not to have their trade strangled.

The blockade is by definition an act of war, imposed and enforced through armed violence. Never in history have blockades and peace existed side by side. From 24 May onward, the question who started the war or who fired the first shot became momentarily irrelevant. There is no difference in civil law between murdering a man by slow strangulation or killing him by a shot in the head. From the moment the blockade was imposed, active hostilities had commenced and Israel owed Egypt nothing of her Charter rights. If a foreign Power sought to close Odessa, or Copenhagen or Marseilles or Montreal or New York harbour by the use of force, what would happen? Would there be any discussion about whether a shot had been fired? Would anyone ask whether aggression had begun? Less than a decade ago the Soviet Union proposed a draft resolution in the General Assembly on the question of defining aggression. The resolution reads:

"In an international conflict that State shall be declared an attacker which first commits one of the following acts:

(a) Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another State."

This act constituted in the Soviet view direct aggression as distinguished from other specified acts designated in the Soviet draft as indirect aggression. In this particular case, the consequences of Nasser's action had been fully announced in advance. On 1 March 1957, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, my predecessor, announced that:

"Interference, by armed force, with ships of Israel flag exercising free and innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba and through the Strait of Tiran, will be regarded by Israel as an attack entitling it to exercise its inherent right of self-defence under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and to take all such measures as are necessary to ensure the free and innocent passage of its ships in the Gulf and in the Strait."

The representative of France declared that any obstruction of free passage in the Strait or Gulf was contrary to international law "entailing a possible resort to the measures authorized by Article 51 of the Charter".

The United States, inside and outside of the United Nations, gave specific endorsement to Israel's right to invoke her inherent right of self-defence against any attempt to blockade the Gulf. Nasser was speaking with acute precision, therefore, when he stated that Israel now faced the choice either to be choked to death in her southern maritime approaches or to await the death blow from northern Sinai.

Nobody who lived those days of Israel between 24 May and 5 June will ever forget the air of heavy foreboding that hovered over our land. Penned in by hostile armies ready to strike, affronted and beset by a flagrant act of war, bombarded day and night by predictions of our approaching extinction, forced into a total mobilization of all our manpower, our economic and commerce

beating with feeble pulse, our main supplies of vital fuel choked by a belligerent act, we in Israel faced the greatest peril to our existence that we had known since our resistance against aggression nineteen years before, at the hour of our birth.

By the end of May, our children were building air-raid shelters for their schools. There was peril wherever Israel looked, and she faced it in deepening solitude. On 24 May and on succeeding days, the Security Council conducted a desultory debate which sometimes reached a point of levity. Russian and oriental proverbs were wittily exchanged. On 24 May, the Soviet representative asserted that he saw no reason for discussing the Middle Eastern situation at all. The Bulgarian representative uttered these unbelievable words:

"... at the present moment there is really no need for an urgent meeting of the Security Council." (S/PV.1341, page 16)

Those words were spoken on 24 May, one and a half days after the imposition of the blockade, which held world peace trembling in the balance.

A crushing siege bore down upon us. Multitudes throughout the world began to tremble for Israel's fate. The single consolation lay in the surge of public opinion which rose up in Israel's defence. From Paris to Montevideo, from New York to Amsterdam, tens of thousands of people of all ages and parties, groups and affiliations, marched in horrified protest at the approaching stage of politicicide, the murder of a State. Writers and scientists, religious leaders, trade union movement, liberal and labour movements, and even the communist parties in France, Holland, Switzerland, Norway, Austria and Finland asserted their view that Israel was a peace-loving State, whose peace was being wantonly denied. In the history of our generation it is difficult to think of any other hour in which progressive world opinion rallied in such tension and agony of spirit to any cause.

To understand the full depth of pain and shock, it is necessary to grasp the full significance of what Israel's danger meant. A small sovereign State had its existence threatened by lawless violence. The threat to Israel was a menace to the very foundations of the international order. The State thus threatened bore a name which stirred the deepest memories of civilized mankind, and the people of the threatened State were the surviving remnant of millions who in living memory had been wiped out by a dictatorship more powerful, though scarcely more malicious, than Nasser's Egypt. What Nasser had predicted, what he had worked for with undeflecting purpose had come to pass—the noose was tightly drawn.

So on the fateful morning of 5 June, when Egyptian forces moved by air and land against Israel's western coast and southern territory, our country's choice was plain. The choice was to live or perish, to defend the national existence or to forfeit it for all time. I will not narrate what then transpired.

From these dire moments Israel emerged in five heroic days from awful peril to successful and glorious resistance. Alone, unaided, neither seeking nor receiving help, our nation rose in self-defence. So long as men cherish freedom, so long as small States strive for the dignity of their survival, the exploits of Israel's defence forces will be told from one generation to another with the deepest pride. Today, again, the Soviet Union has described our resistance as aggression and sought to have it condemned. There is no foundation for this assertion, and we reject it with all our might. Here was armed force employed in a just and righteous defensive cause, as righteous as the defenders of freedom at Valley Forge; as just as the expulsion of Hitler's bombers from the British skies; as noble as the protection of Stalingrad against the Nazi hordes, so was the defence of Is-

rael's security and existence against those who sought our nation's destruction. What should be condemned is not Israel's action, but the attempt to condemn it. Never have freedom, honour, justice, national interest and international morality been so righteously protected.

While fighting raged on the Egyptian-Israeli frontier and on the Syrian front, we still hoped to contain the conflict. Jordan was given every chance to remain outside the struggle. Even after Jordan had bombarded and bombed Israel territory at several points, we still proposed to the Jordanian monarch that he abstain from any continuing hostilities. I sent a message to him to this effect through General Odd Bull, the United Nations representative, at 12:30 p.m., some hours after the beginning of hostilities. A message to this effect reached him several hours after the outbreak of hostilities on the southern front on 5 June.

Jordan tragically answered not with words but with a torrent of shells. Artillery opened fire fiercely along the whole front with special emphasis on the Jerusalem area. It was a day of ordeal and of agony, and of death and of bereavement in Jerusalem streets. Thus Jordan's responsibility for the second phase of the concerted aggression is established beyond doubt. Surely this responsibility cannot fail to have its consequences in the peace settlement. As death and injury rained on the city, Jordan had become the source and origin of Jerusalem's fierce ordeal. The inhabitants of that city can never forget this fact, or fail to draw its conclusions.

I have spoken of Israel's defence against the assaults of neighboring States. This is not the entire story. Whatever happens in the Middle East for good or ill, for peace or conflict, is powerfully affected by what the great Powers do or omit to do. When the Soviet Union initiates a discussion here, our gaze is inexorably drawn to the story of its role in recent Middle Eastern history. It is a sad and shocking story; it must be frankly told.

There was in Soviet policy a brief but important period of balanced friendship. In 1948 the Soviet Union, in the Security Council, condemned what it called "Arab aggression". But in the last fourteen years the picture has changed. First of all there has been the arms race.

Since 1955, the Soviet Union has supplied the Arab States with 2,000 tanks, of which more than 1,000 have gone to Egypt. It has supplied the Arab States with 700 modern fighter aircraft and bombers; more recently with ground missiles, and Egypt alone has received from the USSR 540 field guns, 130 medium guns, 200 120-mm mortars, 695 anti-aircraft guns, 175 rocket launchers, 650 anti-tank guns, 7 destroyers; a number of Luna M and Sopka 2 ground-to-ground missiles, 14 submarines and 46 torpedo boats of various types, including missile-carrying boats. The Egyptian army has been trained by Soviet experts. Most of the equipment was supplied to the Arab States after the Cairo summit conference of Arab leaders in January 1940, which agreed on a specific programme for the destruction of Israel; after they had announced and hastened to fulfill this plan by accelerating arms purchases from the Soviet Union. The great proportions of Soviet assistance in the military field are attested to by the startling fact that in Sinai alone the Egyptians abandoned equipment and offensive weapons of Soviet manufacture whose value is estimated at \$2 billion.

Together with the supply of offensive weapons, the Soviet Union has encouraged the military preparations of the Arab States.

Since 1961 the Soviet Union has assisted Egypt in its desire to conquer Israel. The great amount of offensive equipment supplied to the Arab States strengthens this assessment.

Thus a great Power, professing devotion to peaceful settlement and the rights of States, has for fourteen years afflicted the Middle East with a headlong armaments race; with the paralysis of the United Nations as an instrument of security; and with an attitude of blind identification with those who threaten peace against those who defend it.

The constant increase and escalation of Soviet armaments in Arab countries have driven Israel to a corresponding though far smaller procurement programme. Israel's arms purchases were precisely geared to the successive phases of Arab, and especially Egyptian, rearmament. On many occasions in recent months we and others have vainly sought to secure Soviet agreement for a reciprocal reduction of arms supplies in our region. These efforts have borne no fruit. The expenditure on social and economic progress of one half of what has been put into the purchase of Soviet arms would have been sufficient to redeem Egypt from its social and economic ills, and corresponding diversion of resources from military to social expenditure would have taken place in Israel. A viable balance of forces could have been achieved at a lower level of armaments, while our region could have moved forward to higher standards of human and social welfare. For Israel's attitude is clear. We should like to see the arms race slowed down. But if the race is joined, we are determined, for our very existence, not to lose it. A fearful waste of economic energy in the Middle East is the direct result of the Soviet role in the constant stimulation of the race in arms.

It seems clear from Arab sources that the Soviet Union has played an alarmist role in spreading incendiary reports of Israeli intentions amongst Arab Governments.

On 9 June President Nasser said:

"Our friends in the USSR warned the visiting parliamentary delegation in Moscow at the beginning of last month, that there exists a plan of attack against Syria."

A great Power is telling Egypt that Israel is about to attack Syria. This is ten days after the Secretary-General of the United Nations has published a report stating that there are no troop concentrations at all in northern Israel against Syria.

Similarly, an announcement by TASS of 23 May states:

"The Foreign Affairs and Security Committee of the Knesset have accorded the Cabinet, on 9 May, special powers to carry out war operations against Syria. Israeli forces concentrating on the Syrian border have been put in a state of alert for war. General mobilization has also been proclaimed in the country . . ."

There is not one word of truth in this story. But its diffusion in Arab ears could only have an incendiary result.

Cairo Radio broadcast on 28 May an address by Marshal Gretchko at a farewell party in honour of the former Egyptian Minister of Defence Shams ed-Din Badran:

"The USSR, her armed forces, her people and Government will stand by the Arabs and will continue to encourage and support them. We are your faithful friends and we shall continue aiding you because this is the policy of the Soviet nation, its party and government."

Now this promise of military support came less than a week after the illicit closing of the Strait of Tiran, an act which the Soviet Union had done nothing to condemn. So much, then, for the arms race and for the portrayal of Israel, in anxious Arab ears, as being poised for some fictitious aggression.

At the same time, the Security Council's role had been paralysed, for the Soviet Union has exercised its veto right there five times. Each time a just or constructive judgment has been frustrated. It is important that we should analyse what these vetoes have been.

On 22 January 1954, France, the United Kingdom and the United States presented a draft resolution to facilitate irrigation work

on the west bank of the River Jordan in the Bnot Yaakov Canal project. The Soviet veto paralysed regional water development for several years. On 29 March 1954, a New Zealand resolution, simply reiterating United Nations policy against blockade on the Suez Canal, was frustrated by Soviet dissent. On 19 August 1963, a United Kingdom and United States resolution on the murder of Israelis at Almagor, on Israel territory, was denied adoption by Soviet opposition. On 21 December 1964, the Soviet Union vetoed a United Kingdom and United States resolution deploring incidents at Tel Dan, including the shelling of Dan, Dafne, Shaar Yashuv. Finally, on 2 November 1966, Argentina, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand and Nigeria joined to express regret at "infiltration from Syria and loss of human life caused by the incidents in October-November 1966"—a mild expression of regret at the loss of life by Syrian infiltration, one of the few resolutions in United Nations history sponsored by representatives from all the five continents.

Let me then summarize what the proposals are that have been vetoed: The use of water for irrigation instead of being wasted—veto. Free passage in international waterways—veto. An expression of regret that Israeli citizens had been murdered on Israeli soil—inadmissible, veto. An expression of regret at the bombardment of Israeli villages from Syrian guns—impossible, veto. And a resolution by eight countries, from five continents, expressing, in the most mild terms, regret at the infiltration from Syria and loss of human life in October-November 1966—the door is closed even to such mild expressions of condemnation.

Now this use of the veto has had a dual effect. First, it has prevented any resolution to which an Arab State was opposed from being adopted by the Council. The Council has therefore become a one-way street. Secondly, it has inhibited the Security Council from taking constructive action in many disputes between an Arab State and Israel because of the certain knowledge that the veto would be applied in whatever was deemed to be an Arab interest. The consequences of the Soviet policy have been to deny Israel the possibility of just and equitable treatment in the Security Council, and very largely to nullify the Council as the constructive factor that it should be in the affairs of the Middle East.

Does all this really add up to a constructive intervention by a great Power in the Arab-Israeli tension? The position became graver when we recall the unbridled invective against the Permanent Representative of Israel in the Security Council. In its words and in a letter to the Israel Government, the Soviet Union has formulated an obscene comparison between the Israel defence forces and the Hitlerite hordes which overran Europe in the Second World War. There is a flagrant breach of elementary human decency and of international morality in this odious comparison—Israel with Hitler Germany. Our nation never compromised with Hitler Germany. It never signed a pact with Hitler Germany, as did the Soviet Union in 1939. To associate the name of Israel with the accursed tyrant who engulfed the Jewish people in a tidal wave of slaughter is to violate every canon of elementary taste and of fundamental truth.

In the light of this history, the General Assembly will easily understand Israel's reaction to the Soviet initiative in convening this special session, not for the purpose of proposing constructive or balanced solutions, but for the purpose of condemning our country and recommending the withdrawal to the position and situation that existed before 5 June.

In respect of the request for a condemnation, I give a simple answer to the Soviet Government. That Government's record in the stimulation of the arms race, in the paralysis of the Security Council, in the

encouragement throughout the Arab world of unfounded suspicion of Israel's intentions, the constant refusal to say a single word of criticism at any time of declarations threatening the violent overthrow of Israel's sovereignty and existence—all this gravely undermines your claims to objectivity. You come here in our eyes not as a judge or as a prosecutor, but rather as a legitimate object of international criticism for the part that you have played in the sombre events which have brought our region to a point of explosive tension. If the Soviet Union had made an equal distribution of its friendship amongst the peoples of the Middle East, if it had refrained from exploiting regional tensions for the purposes of its own global policy, if it had stood in even-handed devotion to the legitimate interests of all States, then the crisis which now commands our attention and anxiety would never have occurred.

To the charge of aggression, I answer that Israel's resistance at the lowest ebb of its fortunes will resound across history, together with the uprising of our battered remnants in the Warsaw Ghetto, as a triumphant assertion of human freedom. From the dawn of its history the people now rebuilding a State in Israel has struggled often in desperate conditions against tyranny and aggression. Our action on 5 June falls nobly within that tradition. We have tried to show that even a small State and a small people have the right to live. I believe that we shall not be found alone in the assertion of that right, which is the very essence of our Charter.

Similarly, the suggestion that everything goes back to where it was before 5 June is totally unacceptable. The General Assembly cannot ignore the fact that the Security Council, where the primary responsibility lies, has emphatically rejected such a course. It was not Israel, but Syria, Egypt and Jordan, which violently shattered the whole fabric and texture of inter-State relations which existed for a decade since 1957. That situation has been shattered to smithereens. It cannot be recaptured. It is a fact of technology that it is easier to fly to the moon than to reconstruct a broken egg. Something organic has been destroyed; something new must be built. Therefore, the Security Council acted wisely in rejecting the backward step now advocated again by the Soviet Union. To go back to the situation out of which the conflict arose would mean that all the conditions for renewed hostilities would be brought together again. I repeat what I said to the Security Council. Our watchword is not backward to belligerency, but forward to peace.

What the Assembly should prescribe, in our view, is not a formula for renewed hostilities, but a series of principles for the construction of a new future in the Middle East. With the cease-fire established, our progress must be not backward to an armistice regime which has collapsed under the weight of years and the brunt of hostility. History summons us forward to permanent peace. The peace that we envisage can only be elaborated in frank and lucid dialogue between Israel and each of the neighbouring States. We dare not be satisfied with intermediate arrangements which are neither war nor peace. Such patchwork ideas carry within themselves the seeds of future tragedy. Free from external pressures and interventions, imbued with a common love for a region which they are destined to share, the Arab and Israel nations must now transcend their conflicts in dedication to a new Mediterranean future in concert with a renaissance Europe and an Africa and Asia emerging at last to their independent role on the stage of history.

In free negotiations with each of our neighbours, we shall offer durable and just solutions redounding to our mutual advantage and honour. But surely the Arab States can no longer be permitted to recognize

June 23, 1967

Israel's existence only for the purpose of plotting its elimination. They have come face to face with us in conflict. Let them now come face to face with us in peace.

In peaceful conditions we could build a new region, with communications running from Haifa to Beirut and Damascus in the North; to Amman and beyond in the East. The opening of these blocked arteries would stimulate the life, thought and commerce in the region beyond any level otherwise conceivable. Across the Southern Negev communication between the Nile Valley and the Fertile Crescent could be resumed without any change in political jurisdiction. The Kingdom of Jordan, now cut off from its natural maritime outlet, could freely import and export its goods on the Israeli coast. On the Red Sea, co-operative action could expedite the port developments at Elath and Aqaba, which give Israel and Jordan their contact with a resurgent East Africa and a developing Asia.

And so the Middle East, lying athwart three continents, could become a busy centre of air communications, which are now impeded by boycotts and circuitous routes, Radio, telephone and postal communications which now end abruptly in mid-air would unite a divided region. The Middle East with its historic monuments and scenic beauty could attract vast movements of travellers and pilgrims if existing impediments were removed. Resources which lie across national frontiers—the minerals of the Dead Sea and the Araba—could be developed in mutual interchange of technical knowledge.

In the institutions of scientific research and higher education on both sides of the frontiers, young Israelis and Arabs could join in a mutual discourse of learning. The point is that the old prejudices must be replaced by a new comprehension and respect, born of a reciprocal dialogue in the intellectual domain. In such a Middle East, military budgets would spontaneously find a less exacting point of equilibrium. Excessive sums devoted to security could be diverted to development.

Thus, in full respect of our region's diversity, and entirely new story, never known or told before, could unfold across the Eastern Mediterranean. For the first time in history, no Mediterranean nation is in subjection. All are endowed with sovereign freedom. The challenge now is to use this freedom for creative growth. There is only one road to that end: the road of recognition, of direct contact and of true co-operation, of peaceful coexistence. And this road leads to Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, now united after its tragic division, is no longer an arena for gun emplacements and barbed wire. In our nation's long history there have been few hours more intensely moving than the hour of our reunion with the Western Wall. A people had come back to the cradle of its birth. It has renewed its link with the mystery of its origin and its continuity. How long and how deep are the memories which that reunion evokes.

For twenty years there has not been free access by men of all faiths to the shrines which they hold in unique reverence. This access now exists. Israel is resolved to give effective expression, in co-operation with the world's great religions, to the immunity and sanctity of the Holy Places.

The prospect of a negotiated peace is less remote than it may seem. Israel waged its defensive struggle in pursuit of two objectives—security and peace. Peace and security, with their juridical, territorial, economic and social implications, can only be built by the free negotiation which is the true essence of sovereign responsibility. A call to the recent combatants to negotiate the conditions of their future coexistence is surely the only constructive course which this Assembly could take.

We ask the great Powers to remove our tormented region from the scope of global rivalries; to summon its Governments to build their common future themselves; to assist the Middle East, if they will, to develop social and cultural levels worthy of its past.

We ask the developing countries to support a dynamic and forward-looking policy and not to drag the new future back into the outworn past.

To the small nations which form the bulk of the international family we offer the experience which teaches us that small communities can best secure their interests by maximal self-reliance. Nobody helps those who do not help themselves. We ask the small nations, in the solidarity of our smallness, to help us stand firm against intimidation and threat such as those by which we are now assailed.

We ask world opinion which rallied to us in our plight to accompany us faithfully in our new opportunity.

We ask the United Nations, which was prevented from offering us security in our recent peril, to respect our independent quest for the peace and security which are the Charter's higher ends. We are going to do what the Security Council decided should be done—maintain the cease-fire—and reject the course which the Security Council emphatically and wisely rejected but a few days ago. It rejected the concept of returning to the situation of belligerency out of which the crisis arose—back to the old situation.

It may seem that Israel stands alone among numerous and powerful adversaries. But we have faith in the undying forces in our nation's history which have so often given the final victory to spirit over matter, to inner truth over mere quantity.

The Middle East, tired of wars, is ripe for a new emergency of human vitality. Let the opportunity not fall again from our hands.

A NEW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most farsighted and prudent views of American foreign policy which has yet come to my attention is an address by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to the University of Wisconsin Law School Student Bar Association on May 1, 1967.

Senator NELSON, who is one of our most thoughtful foreign policy observers, has pointed out that the constantly changing world in which we live demands a foreign policy that takes account of new realities.

I ask unanimous consent that this superb statement by the junior Senator from Wisconsin be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE LAST THIRD OF THE 20TH CENTURY

(An address by Senator GAYLORD NELSON to the University of Wisconsin Law School Student Bar Association)

I want to discuss with you the kind of foreign policy which I think we must develop to deal with the problems our nation will face in the last third of the 20th century. In connection with this discussion, I will deal with the problem in Vietnam, but my real desire is to show that American foreign policy must be broad enough to deal with all the problems of the world and must not become imprisoned in one especially serious problem in one especially troubled area.

Some thoughtful commentators have said that the problem of American foreign policy is that it tends to lag behind the times. We live in a constantly changing world. We

have learned now that, content as we might be in our happy land, we cannot stem the tides of change that continue to sweep the rest of the globe. In fact, we can only assume that the changes of the future will be much more sudden and much more sweeping than the changes of the past.

The first third of the 20th century marked the emergence of the United States as a mature, industrial nation, but it was marred for us by our involvement in World War I. We were deeply distressed by that tragic war and disillusioned at the way in which we seemed to lose the peace afterward. We seemed to conclude that that war was a result of diplomatic folly and greed on the part of European powers and we all but swore we would never involve ourselves in such problems again.

This sad experience in the first third of the 20th century largely determined our foreign policy as we moved into the second third of the century. As a result of our plunge into isolationism we had no adequate policy to deal with the threats facing our nation during the rise of fascist dictatorships bent on world conquest.

The second third of the 20th century was dominated by World War II and the emergence of the United States as possibly the most powerful nation in the world and the single protector of the peace, holding its nuclear umbrella over much of the civilized world.

Convinced by the experiences leading up to World War II that we would not allow another military dictatorship to threaten world conquest, we based our foreign policy largely on the containment of the expansionist aims of Soviet communism. Regretting that we had not stood firm against fascism in Ethiopia and Nazism in the Rhineland and in Czechoslovakia, we did stand firm against Soviet communism in Greece and in Berlin, and against its Chinese communist ally in Korea as a part of the United Nations peacekeeping force.

As necessary and successful as this policy of containment was, few thinking students of world affairs think that it still provides an adequate foreign policy for the United States in the world today.

Yet our government continues to talk as though it does.

Explaining foreign policy to the man in the street is always a difficult and frustrating task. Therefore, a beleaguered official may be excused if he deals in the strong, simple terms which people understand and if he draws upon the lessons of the past which loom so large in the public's memory.

Thus, we find the Secretary of State today stating that the situation we face in Vietnam today is the same situation we faced in Greece in 1948 and in Korea in 1950. We are told that unless we stand firm against communism in South Vietnam (as we should have stood against Japanese imperialism in Manchuria and German Nazism in Europe) we will soon be facing the same communist hordes in the Philippines or in San Francisco.

It is this apparent reluctance to face the realities of a changing world which, more than anything else, has made me skeptical all along about the wisdom of our policy in Southeast Asia.

For the simple fact is that the world of 1967 is not the world of 1947. The central fact of world affairs today is not the urgent danger of Soviet expansionism or even Chinese expansionism.

The central fact of world affairs today is the utter collapse of the monolithic world communist movement and the emergence instead of hundreds of independent drives toward nationalism and self-determination in countries throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Those who are still fighting a 30-year-old battle to contain Soviet communism and its Chinese ally should know that this thrust