

a great many of our people, both north and south, that I feel constrained to give it here.

"We think," said they, 'we are loudly called on to evince our gratitude in making our fellow-men joint heirs with us of the same inestimable blessings we now enjoy, under such restrictions and regulations as will not injure the community, and will imperceptibly enable them to relish and improve the station to which they will be advanced. Honored will that State be in the annals of mankind which shall first abolish this violation of the rights of mankind; and the memories of those will be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance who shall pass the law to restore and establish the rights of human nature in Pennsylvania."

On the first day of March, 1780, the representatives of the Keystone State of the Union, in General Assembly met, in the city of Philadelphia, close by the Congress of the United Colonies, then also in session there, passed Pennsylvania's act for the gradual abolition of human slavery. The struggle for national independence was then still undetermined. Continental currency had depreciated so much that one dollar of specie would purchase three thousand of currency. The British on the east, and the savages on the west, pressed hard upon the struggling patriots. The national government was without credit; the army and the navy were without the material needed to conduct the war to a successful ending; and all—army, navy, and people—were sadly straitened for the necessaries of life. And yet, Pennsylvania's representatives, undismayed by their surroundings, and heedful what the representatives in Congress of the slave-holding States of the nation might think of their action, gave utterance to their views of slavery, and the conclusions they had come to about it, in language so beautiful and so forcible, that justice to their memory impels me to extract the Preamble to the law they then enacted, long though it be, as I am satisfied that the great majority of the people have never seen or read it.

I. "When," say they, "we contemplate our abhorrence of that condition, to which the arms and tyranny of Great Britain were exerted to reduce us; when we look back on the variety of dangers to which we have been exposed and how miraculously our wants, in many instances, have been supplied and our deliverance wrought, when even hope and human fortitude have become unequal to the conflict, we are unavoidably led to a serious and grateful sense of the manifold blessings which we have undeservedly received from the hand of that Being from whom every good and perfect gift cometh. Impressed with these ideas, we conceive that it is our duty, and we rejoice that it is in our power, to extend a portion of that freedom to others which hath been extended to us, and release from that state of thralldom, to which we ourselves were tyrannically doomed, and from which we have now every prospect of being delivered. It is not for us to enquire why, in the creation of mankind, the inhabitants of the several parts of the earth were distinguished by a difference in feature or complexion.

"It is sufficient to know that all are the work of an Almighty hand. We find in the distribution of the human species, that the most fertile, as well as the most barren parts of the earth are inhabited by men of complexions different from ours, and from each other; from whence we may reasonably, as well as religiously, infer, that He who placed them in their various situations hath extended equally His care and protection to all, and that it becometh not us to counteract His mercies. We esteem it a peculiar blessing granted to us, that we are enabled this day to add one more step to universal civilization by removing as much as possible the sorrows of those who have lived in undeserved bondage, and from which by the

assumed authority of the kinds of Great Britain, no effectual, legal relief could be obtained. Weaned by a long course of experience, from the narrow prejudices and partialities we had imbibed, we find our hearts enlarged with kindness and benevolence toward men of all conditions and nations; and we conceive ourselves at this particular period extraordinarily called upon, by the blessings which we have received, to manifest the sincerity of our profession, and to give a substantial proof of our gratitude.

"II. And whereas, the condition of those persons, who have heretofore been denominated negro and mulatto slaves, has been attended with circumstances, which not only deprived them of the common blessings that they were by nature entitled to, but has cast them into the deepest afflictions, by an unnatural separation and sale of husband and wife from each other, and from their children, an injury, the greatness of which can only be conceived by supposing that we were in the same unhappy case. In justice, therefore, to persons so unhappily circumstanced, and who, having no prospect before them wherein they may rest their sorrows and their hopes; have no reasonable inducement to render their service to society, which they otherwise might, and also in grateful commemoration of our own happy deliverance from the state of unconditional submission to which we were doomed by the tyranny of Great Britain. Therefore be it enacted, etc."

**Pfc. Norman H. Reeves Awarded Bronze Star**

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1968

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in full recognition of the tragedies of war, we must also remember, with deepest pride and respect, those American men who are staking their lives for our freedom. We pay homage to all who dutifully accept this sacrifice, and especially to those who under the tortuous and extraordinary circumstances of battle are possessed of a quality of uncommon valor.

It is my personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to such a young man, Pfc. Norman H. Reeves, who is the product of an outstanding background in law enforcement in my hometown of Pitman, N.J., and is now serving his country with distinction in Vietnam. On March 15, 1968, Private, First Class Reeves was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for "exceptional courage and devotion to duty." The citation, in part, reads:

Pfc Reeves distinguished himself by heroism in connection with ground operations against an armed hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam on 6 Dec 1967 while assigned to Company A, 4th Battalion, 12th Infantry, 199th Light Infantry Brigade. On that date, two platoons of Company A became heavily engaged with a well entrenched Viet Cong battalion. Pfc Reeves, the platoon radio telephone operator, moved forward under intense automatic weapons fire and began relaying vital information to the company commander . . . Despite his wounds, Pfc Reeves repeatedly exposed himself to hostile fire while calmly and efficiently assisting the company commander coordinate and communicate with the various

elements involved in the battle. Pfc Reeves' exceptional courage and devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, the 199th Light Infantry Brigade and the United States Army.

By the grace of God, Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Norman H. Reeves will be returned to his family and loved ones to pursue a responsible and productive life in his chosen career with the full pride and knowledge that his contribution to freedom's cause has made it possible to survive.

**E-W Trade**  
**The Legislative Picture for East-West Trade—Address by Senator Morse Before American Management Association**

**HON. WAYNE MORSE**

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 29, 1968

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the role of the United States in world trade is of major concern to Congress. The entire area is one that demands constant, careful analysis and evaluation in the light of rapidly changing events.

Early in March, it was my pleasure to address the American Management Association, in New York City, on the subject of "The Legislative Picture for East-West Trade," and to offer some recommendations for joint action by Congress and the business community.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**THE LEGISLATIVE PICTURE FOR EAST-WEST TRADE**

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, before American Management Association, New York City, March 4, 1968)

I appreciate the invitation to speak before this top-flight group of American businessmen on "The Legislative Picture for East-West Trade."

It will be a pleasure to do so, and I would like to take advantage of the occasion to add some further comments on the general subject of trade policy, the Congress, and the business community.

It is my feeling that what is called for is a "new look" at all trade policy, including East-West Trade. I should make some explanation of the term "new look." I am not using it in the Madison Avenue sense of appearances, or how our decisions and actions should be portrayed for public consumption. What I have in mind is the active sense, meaning that the United States should be subjecting the potentials and problems of world trade a keen, rigorous, and professionally competent analysis.

About four years ago, in May 1964, the Commercial Councilor of the U.S.S.R. addressed a previous American Management Association session on East-West Trade. He reported that Russia had expanded its foreign trade 3½ times in seven years, raising its rank among trading nations from 116th place in 1938 to 5th place over the past 25 years. His expectation, however, was that the volume of foreign trade of the U.S.S.R. would grow approximately four-fold in the next 15 years. He cited his nation's membership in the International Wheat, Coffee, and Sugar

Agreements as evidence of its desire to increase its multilateral as well as bilateral trade relationships.

What was the American reaction to these initiatives? One example, was the 1963 agreement for the sale of wheat to Russia which was completed in two weeks in Canada, while the comparable agreement in the United States took two and a half months. Another was that a Japanese delegation came to Moscow and purchased a license for the continuous casing of steel in a month, after American firms had negotiated for about two years without reaching a decision. The Commercial Councilor concluded by saying there is "a generally favorable picture for the development of Soviet trade . . . with one exception . . . trade between the United States and the Soviet Union."

"To see ourselves as others see us" can be very helpful. As Robert Burns went on to say, "It would from many a blunder free us, and foolish notion."

In the years between that briefing session and this one it became clear to all that winds of change were blowing across Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia followed its decollectivization of agriculture in 1953 by a series of steps recognizing private enterprise in other segments of industry, and generally moving toward a market economy. This culminated in the 1965 reforms and their admission to the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade in 1966. In the same year, Hungary announced notable shifts toward the goal of a quasi-market economy. In 1967 the Czechoslovak government proclaimed the most daring reforms of any Eastern European country, which could have the effect of re-integrating their economy with the world market. Czech trade is three times the Eastern European average; the adoption of these reforms could thus have a considerable impact on the standard of living of their population, which accounts for what we have been reading in the newspapers this past month. In 1965, the USSR itself adopted a set of economic reforms applying to their basic industrial commodities, which one of their principal authors, Professor Y. Liberman described as follows:<sup>1</sup>

"Increasing the independence of enterprises; appraising their work by the criterion of profitability; introducing payment productive assets; raising the material incentives for personnel in ratio to the enterprise performance, out of profits . . . and establishing economically based, as opposed to arbitrarily set, prices."

In 1966, according to Professor Liberman, 704 enterprises employing more than 10% of the Soviet labor force went under this system.

In each instance, these actions came after several years of discussion and debate. It will be several years more before the results can be appraised. We know already, however, that the public announcement of these policies represented a decisive victory of pragmatism over ideology. It is likely that this will be an era of severe testing for the reformers, and that they will encounter resistance from elements of their own administrative and policy-making organizations, which make the political as well as the economic risks of these ventures substantial. We fully realize that these are internal developments, which are best left to the nations involved to work out. Our Western and American policies have only marginal effects, but they undoubtedly do have some effects.

It is apparent that these changes provide historic opportunities for the West. Regardless of what we might think of the merits of their social and economic doctrines, and their ultimate political relationship with the West, we will certainly be condemned by history if we do not use whatever influence

we possess to encourage these governments to move toward a system which exhibits a greater concern for the essential human needs of their people.

The nations of western Europe had been quicker to grasp these opportunities than have the United States. Between 1960 and 1966, their East-West trade nearly doubled. Exports from the West reached a figure of \$8.5 billion in 1966 and imports from the East rose to \$9.0 billion. This represents a yearly growth rate of 12%. Meanwhile, American exports to eastern countries fell from \$193 million to \$166 million, which is \$3 million below the level of 1938.

In July of 1965, three years of discussion resulted in an agreement between the Russians and the Fiat Company to construct an \$800 million plant in Russia, directly involved the U.S. as a supplier of approximately \$60 million of machine tools.

Undoubtedly, many people in the U.S. began to feel that the fresh winds of eastern Europe could also be trade winds for us.

In the State of the Union message in 1965, President Johnson had said:

Your government, assisted by leaders of labor and business, is now exploring ways to increase peaceful trade with the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union."

In February of that year, he appointed a "Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations with Eastern European Nations and the Soviet Union," under the chairmanship of J. Irwin Miller, Chairman of the Board of Commins Engine Company. This Committee reported to the White House on April 29, 1965, in part as follows:

"Properly conceived and wisely administered, a free trade with Eastern European nations and the Soviet Union would become a significant and useful device in the pursuit of our national security . . . and of world peace."

Assistant Secretary of State Solomon spoke before the Salesmanship Club of Dallas on October 21, 1965, and advocated expanding East-West Trade on the grounds that:

"The influence of (Western) trade and the contacts that have flowed from it . . . have had an impact on the internal liberalization of Yugoslavia."

The President's State of the Union message on January 12, 1966, recommended to the Congress that it assist the expanding trade between the U.S. and eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Pursuant to the principle of supporting national independence, and "building bridges to Eastern Europe," the President said:

"I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between East and West."

An "East-West Trade Relations Act" introduced in the Congress in May of 1966 was based on the Miller Committee recommendations. It was designed to grant the President discretionary authority to negotiate commercial agreements containing most favored nation treatment with individual communist nations, whenever he determined this was in the "national interest."<sup>2</sup> In September of 1966, President Johnson made the following statement:

"Since 1945, we have opposed communist efforts to bring about a communist-dominated world. We did so because our convictions and our interests demanded it; we shall continue to do so. But we have never sought war or the destruction of the Soviet Union; indeed, we have sought instead to increase our knowledge and our understanding of the Russian people, with whom we share a common feeling for life, a love of song and story, and a sense of the land's vast promises."

Congress did not act on the East-West Trade Relations bill, but Under Secretary of State Katzenbach, in an address before the National Association of Manufacturers on

December 9, 1966, stated that: "We intend to press for (this bill) in the Congress."

Despite these declarations, the legislation was not re-introduced in the 90th Congress, and the Congress has not acted to liberalize the restrictions it controls, which could improve the prospects of trade with the East. It should also be noted that those discussions never extended to Asian communist nations.

In understanding this posture, it is useful to refer back to the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, as you know, gives Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign nations and among the several states. Under Article II, the President has power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, to appoint Ambassadors, and generally to conduct the foreign relations of the United States.

The formation of policy on East-West trade thus falls into an area of joint responsibility, calling for action by both the executive branch and the legislative branch.

The Congress is aware of the issues. As evidence of this let me quote the remarks of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Carlson) on the Senate floor on August 31, 1967. Senator Carlson said:

Eastern European imports from the free world in 1965 were 5 times what they were in 1950. If our share of this market were equivalent to our share of the world market, our sales to that area would be about \$5 billion annually, or 5 times the 1966 level. In 1965, we supplied only 2% of the free world exports to eastern Europe, while our total share of free world exports to all destinations was 16%. . . . In 1966, the U.S. exported over \$90 million worth of wheat to Eastern Europe. Obviously, a tremendous potential market exists in the communist (nations) but we must carefully weigh the economic benefits from expanded East-West trade against the political considerations."

During the past 20 years, Congress has had many occasions to weigh these considerations. They have not been passive about the exercise of this power. Legislative enactments include:

The Export Control Act of 1949, as amended in 1965, prohibits exports of "Strategic goods."

The Mutual Defense Systems Control Act of 1961, or the "Battle Act," prohibits economic or financial aid to the USSR or any country "under its domination."

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1964, or P.L. 480, authorizes sales of agricultural commodities, but only to "friendly countries."

There are other restrictions under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and appropriations legislation relating to many government activities, including procurement of equipment under the National Defense Education Act.<sup>3</sup> By far the more serious limitation is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which forbids the extension of the Most Favored Nation treatment to any eastern European nation except Yugoslavia and Poland, which already possessed them at the time of the Act. This places goods from other Eastern countries under the tariff schedule of the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, which was the most protection level of this century.

Appropriations acts for the Export-Import Bank have served as vehicles for limiting the authority of agencies to finance, guarantee, or otherwise extend credit to any country except when the President determines that such actions would be in the "national interest."

Most recently, on February 21, 1968, the Senate approved the Conference Report on the legislation extending the life of the Export-Import Bank, containing amendments which are quite restrictive. The Senate accepted the House language, but explained that this was adequate to cover the Byrd amendment prohibiting Ex-Im financing to

Footnotes at end of article.

any nation engaged in armed conflict, or which is directly furnishing goods or supplies to a nation with which we are in armed conflict. The Mundt amendment would specifically prohibit the Bank from assisting in the construction of the Fiat automobile plant. In effect, therefore, the Bank will not be able to facilitate exports to any communist country, except Yugoslavia, for the duration of the Vietnamese conflict, and then can do so only after an affirmative determination by the President that such financing is in the "national interest."

It is apparent that there are a variety of ways in which Congress may act, either to encourage or discourage contacts and peaceful trade with eastern Europe.

The ways in which Congress has acted reflect a variety of definitions, of criteria, and of standards. There are overlapping and potentially conflicting statements of policy in the statutes, the proliferating regulations, and interpretive rulings by the Attorney General and others. A Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is presently holding hearings designed to collect the law on this subject.

My prediction is that the House Committee will not have much praise for the quality of Congressional legislation in the field of East-West trade. Such a conclusion would be a compelling reason for the fresh look at trade policy under the criteria I have suggested.

The Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, has indicated his intention to share jurisdiction of any measure on East-West trade policy which the Senate may consider. This would allow the trade questions to be appraised against the broad background of foreign policy.

As a member of this Committee, I will support the Chairman in this resolve.

I believe that this discussion demonstrates that the United States, with its democratic institutions and the provisions of its Constitution as they are, must formulate its trade relations on the widest foundation of public understanding, acceptance and support. The work of a united executive branch over many years, many members of Congress, and many committees, can be undone by a single contrary legislative enactment. Accordingly, any improvement in trade relations between the United States and eastern Europe must be bound up in the basic commitment by the American people for better relations between our nations. This involves the whole question of how the elected members of Congress see the world and how successful they are in adjusting the policies of our nation to it.

The brief history of these relations could be helpful in gaining a proper perspective.

In 1931, prior to diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, the USSR accounted for about 40 percent of the United States machine tool exports.

After recognition, which the business community in this country generally favored, there was a modest growth in trade and investment; for instance, the Ford Motor Company building an automotive plant in Gorki. We found, however, that the Most Favored Nation treatment accorded Russia was offset by the State-training methods and its command form of economy.

Nevertheless, in the 1936-39 period, trade rose to \$169 million, about 1.6% of U.S. merchandise exports.

During World War II, American exports to Russia jumped 24.3%, in support of our mutual war effort.

Following V-J Day, however, the Soviet leaders of that day chose to pursue a policy of territorial expansion by utilizing political, military and economic forces. Export controls were then invoked on strategic goods and were tightened as a result of the Berlin Blockade and the Korean military action.

In the ensuing years, the U.S. was required to respond to threats to the peace in Iran, Greece, Berlin, Malaya, the Philippines, Korea and Cuba.

I believe this explains the attitude described by the Soviet Commercial Councillor which arose out of a deep skepticism about the motives of the Russian government of that time. This period also accounts for the weight and complexity of the procedures, attitudes and politics that inhibit the United States Congress in responding buoyantly to new opportunities for East-West trade.

As the Cold War simmered down, the involvement in Vietnam heated up. I believe that you are well aware that for the past half-dozen years, my views have not corresponded with those of the Executive Branch on this subject. It is clear, from the action on the Export-Import Bank bill, that the present situation is not contributing to the betterment of trade relations between the United States, the USSR, and Eastern Europe.

Senator Fulbright has said that, in the 90th Congress, East-West trade is another casualty of the Vietnamese war. I agree with him, and I feel it is regrettable.

Now, however, let us share a hopeful moment and look beyond Vietnam. The established doctrine in the United States, as expressed in the Miller report, is that there should be expanded peaceful trade between East and West.

This is only the most recent of a series of documents reflecting the knowledgeable attitudes in the business community on this issue. The most respected business organizations, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the Committee on Economic Development have spoken. They have periodically expressed their support for eliminating unnecessary restrictions to East-West trade and expanding it consistent with our national interests.

The Policy Declaration of the United States Chamber of April 29, 1964, for instance, points out that at the White House Conference on Export Expansion in September of 1963, four of the eleven committees suggested that clarification of the policies of the Administration as to East-West trade would be most helpful. The Chamber's Policy Declarations advocating collective Western measures for peaceful trade with the East go back as far as 1953.

The May 1965 report of the Committee for Economic Development joined the cooperative efforts of research groups in the United States, Western Europe and Japan. It highlights the need for concerted action by all of the Western countries in setting the conditions for trade, with the advice of a committee of businessmen as an integral part of this process.

I regard the CED suggestions for a permanent Government-Industry Committee, attached to the OCEC for housekeeping purposes, as a highly constructive suggestion. It would be a vehicle for the kind of incisive, professional, and continuing observation of the kind I have mentioned. The CED recommends several criteria for appraising new trade opportunities with the East. They point out, as other business groups do, that governments must agree upon the ground rules under which our businessmen will operate. Trade is a part of the overall political picture, which is constantly changing. We have an obvious interest in maintaining control of items of military and strategic value and avoiding a credit race. In setting these governmental guidelines, cooperation between all of the Western allies would be the keystone. As to specific trade opportunities that arise within the framework, this report recommends an application of realism, selectivity, flexibility, and cooperation. A permanent committee could provide expert assistance

and an exchange of information among allies, and thus put the West in the best position to incorporate maximum concessions and legal safeguards into governmental agreements which permit trade to take place.

In my opinion, this report charts an appropriate course for the United States and other Western nations to follow. It also has been the doctrine among the American people that, with the Marxist economy and the 36 state trading organizations, trade will be an immensely complicated technical task, even if a political agreement is reached. The Twentieth Century Fund study of March, 1966, stated that:

"Commercial interests have had perhaps the least influence on the evolving debate. . . because there has been very little (East-West) trade. . . nor has there been any very good prospect for significant expansion of this trade."

This was ascribed to the fact that there appear to be "distinct limits, even theoretically, to what we might want to buy from them," as well as a lack of a history of reciprocal trade, a lack of complementary industries, as well as the policy and problems inherent in the dealings with a different economic system.

I am not entirely convinced by this kind of argument.

Examine for a moment the so-called Khrushchev shopping list included in the Chamber of Commerce 1964 policy statement. It contained plants and manufacturing equipment for the following: Synthetic and other textile fibers; plastics; fertilizers; construction materials; shoes; food; packaging materials; equipment; television and other consumer goods.

Our economy has shown remarkable success in meeting the basic human needs for food, housing and clothing. Ambassador Foy Kohler has said that the Soviets now lack even nylon stockings. We can only imagine how many or how few of the several thousand items that we take for granted in our supermarkets are commonly available to the Russian housewife.

The 1964 speech of the Soviet Commercial Council mentioned a poultry and egg industry which the Soviet Union would like to buy from abroad. In 1965 an automobile industry was added. In 1966, Under Secretary of State Katzenbach commented upon the amazement of spectators at a Bulgarian trade fair at which a U.S. firm was displaying a couple of dozen sets of specialized pliers. In Bulgaria, evidently, they try to do everything with one kind of pliers. Of course, this still leaves us with the problem of what eastern Europe has that we would like to buy.

Of course, there is gold, and there are strategic ores. Beyond this, Professor Harold Behrman of Harvard University, in an appraisal of East-West trade policy which appeared in the *Harvard Business Review*, pointed to the lack of knowledge and experience of most Russian businessmen as well as most American businessmen as to possibilities for trade. He suggested that there might be import-building missions from the United States. He cites the example of the Boston businessman who discovered a surplus of scientific testing equipment in a warehouse in the Soviet Union which was suitable for science experiments in American schools.

There would be wide latitude for trade missions, fairs, and exhibits of all kinds. This takes us into the "invisible export" area of travel. American travel to the USSR presently exceeds Russian travel to this country by a ratio of 18 to 1. There is the whole field of educational and cultural exchange. These possibilities are virtually untapped.

In my opinion, it is very difficult to make a rational argument against expanded trade in these kinds of peaceful goods. They are far from the borderline of any possible assistance to military capability. It is hard for

one to understand how anyone might feel that a nation of Yankee traders, with the most advanced business community in the world, would not strike a fair bargain in a trade agreement. Such a person would seem to suffer from an acute timidity which is not becoming to the citizens of the greatest economic power in the world. It seems to me that he would also suffer from a lack of logic, because if any imports are taken to add to the strength of an Eastern country, then by the same token, the payments in gold or exports (produced by resources diverted from other sources) would "weaken" these countries just as much.

It is also instructive to shine a brief light on FIAT negotiations. On May 30, 1966, Business Week magazine reported that an agreement was signed in Turin, Italy, by the Soviet auto industry minister and the President of the FIAT Corporation, calling for the manufacture of 600,000 units of the new FIAT 124, as modified for the Russian weather and roads . . . i.e., less window glass, tougher suspension, and a 1400-cubic centimeter engine instead of the standard 1200 c.c. engine. The article stated further:

"For the Soviets, it will mean quadrupling annual auto output from 200,000 to 800,000 by 1970, and a giant step toward a consumer economy . . . At the start of 1965, the USSR had less than 1 million passenger cars, one for every 235 persons, compared to one for every two persons in the United States . . . The Soviets' decision to commit nearly \$1 billion of the foreign exchange to establish an auto industry does prove . . . that government emphasis on the consumer sector is going far beyond mere words, and experience suggested that the consumer—American, Italian, or Russian—becomes more eager for goods as his standard of living rises."

The CIA intelligence report published by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the subject indicates how far the USSR has to travel in order to make up the automotive gap with the Western World. It is estimated that in Moscow there are 8 service stations and 8 garages, and in Leningrad an estimated 3 automobile service stations. The indications were that the Russians designed this program to satisfy the increasing demands of their governmental and managerial elite, who are interested in acquiring cars. The CIA estimated that by the early 1970s, perhaps half of the automobiles produced would be available for public purchase. Thus for the next decade, at least, an automobile for the average citizen was not in sight. But, it would have been a start. The Defense Department was willing to state that most of the machines to be purchased in the U.S. could be used solely for the production of a limited number of small and medium-sized cars. For instance, the heaviest iron casting to be produced would be an 85 pound cylinder-block. Other machines were engineered to produce parts of a particular dimension and specifications, which could not be readily used in heavier vehicles. Still other machines for stamping body panels, painting, and upholstery are peculiar to the automobile industry. Despite the case that was made in public for U.S. participation, the Congress recently voted to ban it in the Export-Import Bank act. Although the hot and cold wars are involved in this decision, the rejection of East-West trade, it seems to me, is also a symptom of the inability of this country to create a viable program of general trade expansion.

The New Year's Day message of the President marked the fourth time in seven years that the government announced a program for coping with the chronic deficit in the balance of payments. Such a program is of direct interest to my own state of Oregon, which is located astride the Columbia Valley, the second greatest river system in the coun-

try. Its seaboard and fertile land areas, as well as skilled people, offer a potential for production, transportation and trade that is just beginning to be developed.

An export expansion program is also vital to the nation's economic strength and I have been concerned, as all Americans should be, to see the steep decline in our merchandise export surplus over the past two years.

In 1965, we had a trade surplus of \$6.7 billion. In 1966, this was reduced to \$3.8 billion. Because of this trend, on February 1, 1967, I urged the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, to conduct an inquiry on the possibilities for developing exports of regional industries in different parts of the country over the next 10 years.

The first of these hearings was held in Portland, Oregon, in May of 1967, and further hearings were held in Mobile for the Gulf Coast, and in Milwaukee for the St. Lawrence Seaway in November and December. The fourth or South Atlantic hearing, will take place at Miami on March 14 and 15, with the final sessions here in the Port of New York on April 4 through 8.

The purpose was to identify the potentials and problems of our regional industries with export potential. We wish to see what we in the Senate can do to strengthen Federal, State, local and private organizations with programs that can be of ultimate assistance to our regional and small business communities.

It has been my belief, and the Committee's belief, that greater headway can be made on our balance of payments problems by liberating the energies of American business than by restricting them. For instance, if the export surplus in the last two years even equalled the 1965 surplus, there would have been no over-all balance of payments deficit in 1966, and only about a billion and a half deficit in 1967. If the surplus had expanded from the 1965 peak, instead of declining, we probably would have had no deficit at all for these years. In that event, there would have been no necessity to consider the restrictive proposals now before the Congress. We are looking forward to hearing from your East Coast witnesses about additional markets that could be developed for American industry. Following the final hearing in April, the Committee will file its report with the Senate and will seek legislative and other remedies which it feels will be appropriate and adequate to the challenges of world trade and its problems. We hope that our efforts will be able to have some influence on Congressional decisions on trade policy during this session.

From the evidence that we have already heard, there are serious questions about the adequacy of our past national export policies and programs. They seem to exhibit shortcomings in concept and organization, in promotional and marketing techniques, and in assuring tax and other non-tariff equality for American exporters. Perhaps most important, there seems to be a shortage of sustained leadership on all levels.

In summary, I would like to give you my thoughts about what the Congress and the business community should do about these shortcomings.

I think we should both be going full-speed ahead on sound programs of export expansion for small and medium as well as large business enterprises. But, I cannot, under the circumstances endorse a similar approach as to East-West trade. This would be too much to ask of individual businessmen or corporations during a period of conflict, when emotions are aroused. Businesses are profit-making organizations which are legally and morally responsible to their stockholders. In any judgment they are not obligated to assume a leadership role that would tend to impair their basic purposes.

Although Congress has declared itself in

opposition to expanding East-West trade in the Export-Import Bank Act for the duration of the Vietnamese war, I hope that it will soon be possible for our national legislature to proceed with clarification of our East-West trade policies, and an affirmative policy of responding to the increasing opportunities for economic, social and political liberalization in the USSR and the Eastern European countries.

Though the business community may not now have a leading role as to East-West trade. I feel that it has a vital role in formulating our general trade policy this year and could even be doing more to lay a foundation for constructive East-West trade policy in the future. I would hope that businessmen and organizations will not only support but will advocate expansionary trade policies. I hope they will go on record as favoring measures that will allow the ranks of our export traders be widened by an adequate national program which will bring the consciousness of benefits of foreign trade as well as the techniques down to the level of trade associations, chambers of commerce, regional small businesses across this country.

If we do not broaden this base, I fear that the companies which are now enjoying international trade, as well as the country, will have a severe price to pay. Policies that are in the interests of the few will not be supported, in moments of stress, by the many. And if this is true in the United States, it is probably more valid abroad.

I, therefore, urge that the members of the American Management Association take a new look at Federal, State and local government and private institutions and to bring the natural interest of our business community to a focus on these issues this year. I urge you to evaluate the state of the competence that is in being, and that is being built in these issues of private and public policy. How capable are our existing institutions of reaching out to regional industries and small companies and trade associations? Do they enjoy the confidence of their regions as being truly representative of the long-term interests of all businesses in those areas? How capable are these bodies of helping new companies to enter and develop export markets? What is the quality of their staffs? How much research do they perform and what is the quality? What capacity do these organizations have to appraise national or international issues that may be before the President and the Congress? What willingness do these organizations have to issue declarations and press releases on subjects of vital concern to our trade and financial policy? For instance, it seems to me that businessmen and business organizations could have been uniquely helpful during the FIAT negotiation and debate by speaking out on the basis of their special knowledge of machine tools and the possibilities that they could be used for objectives other than those that were stated. If situations of this kind come up in the future, I hope that the business community will be ready and willing to make a contribution.

It seems to me that what we need is competence in foreign trade matters in every region of the country. We need people who are willing and able to take the new look based on new information and new conditions and are willing to say in public what they have seen. Ideally we should have centers of research analysis and opinion across the country—in every State and in many Congressional districts. At that point, we will begin to build a solid foundation for a general expansion of U.S. trade, and a base which will support bridges to Eastern Europe as the circumstances permit. Business, with its special capabilities, should have a prominent role in developing these capabilities, and in backing up the judgments in the face of the opposition, unpopularity, and even irrationality that sometimes creeps into the discussion of large issues.

As a result of our export expansion hearings, Senator Nelson of Wisconsin and I are in touch with the educational organizations and business groups to explore how we might be able to further develop these capabilities and the links between industry, the universities and government in the field of trade.

We would be pleased to have the views of the AMA in this matter. Some of the possibilities for the interchange of information and views are illustrated by the programs of the Space Agency and the Bureau of Standards. Since 1958, N.A.S.A. has spent \$572 million on the support of research and education in the universities. It has trained 3400 graduate students and parceled out \$379 million in project grants to the schools.

The National Bureau of Standards now has sixty research associates from industry at work in the Bureau, and they plan to increase this to 150 or about 10% of their staff.

I think that when our balance of payments and economic security and rights of travel and investment are placed in question, and when our relations with a vital part of the world are in flux, we have every right to ask what the Departments concerned with trade and commerce are doing in this field. I intend that our Committee pursue to answer these questions.

It seems to me that when officials of responsible local business organizations commune with their Congressmen about what export trade and East-West trade mean to the people in their areas, and when they begin to read about these possible benefits in the local paper, then the Congress will listen and the prospects for trading and living constructively with our friends and allies all over the world will have a more realistic prospect of improvement.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 "The Soviet Economic Reform," *Foreign Affairs Magazine*, October, 1967, p. 53 & 55.
- 2 "East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966," S. 3363, introduced by Sen. Magnuson on behalf of himself and Senators Mansfield and Javits. The companion bill, H.R. 15212, was introduced in the House by Rep. Keogh.
- 3 See "The Battle Act Report, 1966; 19th Report to the Congress," Dept. of State, December 6, 1966, Chapter IV, "U.S. Restrictions on Trade and Financial Transactions with Communist Countries."

Views of an Inmate of a Penal Institution

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, in a previous issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted two columns written by Ben Maidenburg, editor and publisher of the Akron Beacon Journal. That distinguished writer told us of his experiences with an inmate of the Ohio Penitentiary in his attempt to rehabilitate him by giving him a job on that newspaper.

That we can all better understand the views of an inmate of a penal institution, Editor Maidenburg turned over the space of two of his columns to inmate Bill Graves. The columns follow:

FIRST A SIP, THEN A SLIP  
(By Ben Maidenburg)

I am happy to report that the "vote" on Mr. Bill Graves was at a ratio of 37 to 1. I asked whether the readers would like to hear more from my pen pal, currently doing time in the Ohio Pen, and received 38 letters.

The only "nay" was from a lady who was kind but firm. She felt that a convict was a convict, period—and that he should be given the business to teach him a good and lasting lesson.

So that others may know, Bill Graves and I have a deal. The Beacon Journal will pay him for his writings—but all the money will go to his 12-year-old daughter. That was at my insistence, and Bill was quite happy.

So today I have a couple of columns written by Bill. The first deals with his alcoholism. The second with some advice about house-burglary—as told by a bad burglar, name of Bill Graves.

The first column follows:

(By Bill Graves)

I was asked if an alcoholic could be lured onto the wagon by joining AA whilst he was sloughed up behind the walls. That's a toughy for a backsliding ex-member of AA to answer. But I'll rassel around with the thing—mountain-style, natch—and give it my biased opinion.

For openers I oughta say that I've been messing with the hard stuff since I was a shirt-tailed kid, and until recently figured I was an extra-heavy weekend social sipper. The last time I was shangaheed and brought here though, me an' AA got on howdying terms with each other and I learned that weekend imbibers can be alcoholic too.

Hearing something like that comes down pretty hard on a dude like me 'cause after my bouts of weekend boozing I always showed up for work. Maybe I wasn't always bright-eyed and bushy-tailed, but I made the work scene spiritless. But even so, I apparently had the markings of a true-blue alcoholic.

A little dab of soul-searching, mingled with self-pity, and I don't know what all, decided me to give the AA thing a rifle. I stumbled up AA's 12 steps, memorized the creed and got down with the traditions. That part was gravy.

The ungraved part was getting up in front of a whole bunchful of strangers and letting them know I couldn't hold my licker. That's plumb painful and oughta be classed as cruel and unusual punishment, and nobody oughta try it without having a smidgen of Dale Carnegie.

But according to those in the know, it ain't no good less the spanking-new member gets up in front of a crowd and lets 'em know publicly he's afflicted.

AA and I got along tolerable well as long as I was an inside member, I was even honored with gulling the steering committee for a spell. After several years of total teetotalling I figured I was a dead-sure cinch to make it once they turned me loose.

But the everyday grind of tripping past saloons and bars started to wear me down and I soon had myself convinced I wasn't a sure-enough, couldn't pass-a-saloon alcoholic. Forgetting that hadn't actually been my problem in the first place.

And the truth is I didn't come back for drink alone, but for what I did while juiced up on the grape. Maybe that sounds like hedging, but there's a little bitty difference there and soon as I learn it maybe I can sip social again.

I've moseyed way past the question I was gonna try to answer. No. I don't think a man can be cured of the alcoholic habit behind bars. Not by latching onto AA all by its lonesome anyway.

I reckon it helps though, and it might set a fellow to thinking about the whatfors and whyfors of where his drinking led him astray. Then he might, if he was of a mind to, ponder the phenomenon of the dry-drunk, or the mind-drunk. Whatever you wanna call it?

The natural bent of the prison alcoholic, I believe, is to indulge hisself in long spells of self-pity, depression, blues, things like that.

Walled AA might take him out of that, and maybe help him establish healthy mental habits that might linger with him outside.

The thing in a nutshell is, a prison AAer pretty near got to do it this way. The thinking way, that is. They're not saddled with the temptations that grab the outside member. Saloons and bars are almighty scarce, and a drunk is seldom seen.

In here when a guy gets a thirsty urging he don't get the heebie jeebies when he don't get a snort. I've seen many a case of the DT's and I've never heard of an AA member being called out to help a pal who's slipped by sipping again.

Now, AA plays an important part in the over-all scheme of things in a place like this. AA meetings get a guy out of his cell, maybe take him away from a pot-walloping chore, or a coal-shoveling detail. He gets a chance to meditate, too, and hear some good, down-to-earth speakers.

Then, too, it goes on record when a man joins AA and it's frowned on if, after joining the man becomes an AA dropout.

Being an outside member of Alcoholics Anonymous, now that's a bird of a different feather. That outside member is an AA because he wants to be, and he's pretty sure he needs to be. The only angle he's shooting is to stay sober, and he's got to do it where the action is powerful—amongst the saloons and bars.

The freeworld member gives us his Sundays, and some of the evenings, willingly, to help insiders and outsiders. When a helping hand is needed he lends his, because in helping others he gives himself a boost. And that, I reckon, is what AA is all about anyhow.

Now I don't mean to suggest that some inside members of AA won't be able to cut the mustard once they've shucked this place. I expect a lot of 'em will be helpful, and I wish 'em well, but I'm trying to point out the difference between "inside" and "outside" alcoholics. The circumstances ain't the same, and they never can be.

I'm a fair example. In here I was one of the rocks of AA, a real boulder-type. But outside I was something else. What I was outside was a weekend drunk. And in here I never craved a dram, which is not to say I would've turned up my nose at one if it was offered.

When the temptation of a thing is taken away, you see, an insider can give up pretty near anything—and does!

The day I can saunter into a bar, order a double hooker, sniff the bouquet, put it down unquaffed and walk away, why then I'll have it made. It would be swell if I could drink one, then walk out. But it would be even sweller if I could down two, three, or . . . See what I mean?

In here, with or without AA, my cup does not runneth over.

And here is Column No. 2 also by Graves: It's always been a rule-of-thumb thing with me that I don't usually monkey round with what another feller writes about. But tother day I latched onto a piece that shook me up some and roused my dander. This writer was strapping it on the unsuspecting public how to keep burglars off their property and outa their homes.

Which could be all to the well and good—but you don't have to read more'n a couple of the feller's Hints-to-Householders before you begin to wonder how many actual burglars he's ever had face-to-face truck with.

Take me now, without meaning to sound braggy, I can count several burglars amongst my acquaintances. Then, too, I've dabbled a bit in burglary, and I've been burgled.

With a pedigree like that going for me, or against me, I'm what you call qualified to let a little air outa that writer's balloon. The man ain't all wrong; he's got a couple of goodies that's saying a little something, and I'm gonna run 'em down to you. But first let



me clue you in on a few of his dandies that ain't gonna keep nary burglar outa your boovers and boo-frays.

Personally, I never was a good burglar, being uneasy in the dark like I am, but even a bad burglar coulda told this writer feller he was wasting his time, and yours, by suggesting you change locks when moving to a new dwelling.

Your homesick burglar don't mess with locks. He goes round 'em with a jimmy bar. Might even pry a plank plumb outa your pine door.

In my pre-burglar days and afore taking the wrong road fork, I was a tax-paying citizen. And it was as a pillar of the community, natch, when I was mistook for a loaded citizen and was beset by pro prowlers.

This feller told about how the house oughta have screen and storm windows. That was a scrumptious idea, and they worked almighty well in keeping the flies and cold out. But they didn't keep a burglar off my premises.

I bet it didn't take that nighttime rogue no more'n a minute to slit my screen, crack my glass and waltz amongst my valuables.

'Nother place, I believe, where the writer went clean outa sight was when he advised homeowners 'bout their comings and goings. Don't set no time habits, he said. I reckon he was talking 'bout if everybody come and went in a bunch at a set time.

Well, I used to stagger my leaving time and since I usually come home staggering, that part took care of itself. But 'twix my boss bawling me out for showing up staggered, and my missus hollering at me for the same reason, I'd just as lief be burgled.

Number three on the burglar no-hit parade was to get a neighbor to mind the grass, gather the leaves, hold the paper and safe-keep your cream whilst you was off on a journey.

You can't hardly beat a deal like that for getting your chores took care of, and it might trick a burglar or two, but don't count on it too heavy, I come from being gone once, and all I had left after making them kind of arrangements was a tidy front yard.

Well, now, you see how it is? Them ideas was flawed a little. They'll maybe keep the ne'er-do-wells from tippy-toeing through your petunias, but they ain't gonna hinder a top-drawer pro from invading your privacy.

Best way to do that is sit home with a scattergun in your lap, which gets mighty wearisome. The next best way is to follow the feller's two suggestions he let drop without maybe realizing how powerful they was.

One of 'em was to keep a light lit upstairs while you're out rousting around. Yes, sir, a light in the night don't do nothing for the cockles of a burglar's heart, and it'll keep most of 'em looking for gloomier pastures.

Tother suggestion was to get a dog. Now can't nobody find fault with that idea, except maybe burglars. Dogs loose on the premises are a plague to prowlers, and I don't know nary burglar who won't skedaddle if a house mongrel commences yapping.

You don't want one of them dogs that don't do no barking. That's playing dirty pool with your burglar and might get you sued. It's hard telling what the high court might say if a barkless dog was to seize a culprit without warning—or a warrant.

You got enough trouble without worrying 'bout fringing on some burglar's constitutional rights.

FOR A FATHER IN PRISON, THERE'S A TERRIBLE, NAGGING DOUBT: HOW LONG IS FOREVER?

(By Ben Maidenburg)

I keep getting letters asking why in tarnation I have "adopted" Bill Graves. Or even tried to befriend him. Bill, as you may know from reading previous columns, is down in the Ohio State Penitentiary. He was paroled last year, and then got himself boozed up, "borrowed" an automobile and immediately

found himself back in the Spring St. Hotel—which is what they call the state pen.

My correspondents think I am (a) either stupid; or (b) seeking to build for myself a halo; or (c) wasting my time with a "con" when I could be doing something for someone who was true, blue, honest and not in prison.

I might be stupid. Certainly I could lend more efforts to out-of-luckers who are not in the state calabozo. As for the halo, rest assured that the most forgiving angel would think twice before anointing one like me.

Bill Graves writes me once a week. I write him almost as often. I find him a most interesting gentleman.

I've never set eyes on him. I don't know whether he is short or tall; skinny or fat; bald or hairy. I do know he has a touch with the pen (or typewriter) that I wish I had. I do know that when he was paroled, I offered him a job—only to discover that he'd yielded to the powerful persuasion of sin. As you know, sin is easy; living the straight, and narrow is tough.

Anyway, I made a deal with Bill Graves. He would write for our Beacon Journal readers a column, periodically. We would pay for the columns—but the money would go to daughter Debbie.

Well, Debbie is in need of some money to make a trip to Washington, with a school group, and so today I'm helping her along by using this column by her dad.

The column is worth your reading—particularly it is worth the reading of anyone who might be tempted to a life of crime. It is not the criminal who suffers by incarceration, but the people around him, his family, his parents, his friends.

(By Bill Graves)

"Daddy, you don't have to send me money to make me love you. I think you know that, at least I hope you do." Those were the first words in a letter from my 12-year-old Debra. She had just received a letter and a check from Ben Maidenburg for an article he'd printed in the Beacon Journal.

Debbie then went on to say she had read a story Mr. Maidenburg did on me and thought it was super-duper, and she liked it. Then, bless her heart, she said, "I can sure use the money." I won't give you the in-betweens of the letter, but Debbie ended it by saying, "Daddy, I'll love you forever, and ever, and ever . . ."

A powerful long time is forever, but I know she means it. But how long can a dad who's in prison expect his daughter to go along with his prison habits? She knows I can't be with her now, but she knows I had the chance to be with her—and I blew it.

And I, for the life of me, can't explain to her, or to myself, why I muffed that chance.

Then, too, I wonder constantly what she tells her little friends when they ask where her daddy is. Questions like, "How come your daddy's never around, even on your birthdays?" "What does he do?"

Questions like that are hard to answer, and I'd like to know how Debbie handles 'em. Fraidy cat that I am, I'm ashamed to ask. And I wonder how long Debbie will go on putting up with her ne'er-do-well daddy? A daddy who's never grown up to accept responsibilities; a daddy who sends his undying love once a week on prison stationery. I wonder, and the wondering nearly drives me up the wall with the miseries.

Once on a visit before I made parole, Debbie looked at me, holding my hand across the visiting-room table, and said, "Daddy, when you come home I'm going to take you by the hand."

Debbie said that with all the solemnity of a grown-up 11-year-old, which she was then, and I couldn't turn away fast enough to keep her from seeing the tears flooding my eyes. She didn't want to embarrass me by mentioning the tears, but went on to say

she would be there to meet me when I got out if she had to come by herself.

She came, too, but not by herself. My mother was with her and when we walked toward the street, Debbie, true to her promise, took me by the hand. Again my eyes stung with scalding tears, but Debbie didn't notice, or pretended she didn't.

For two weeks, gloriously happy ones, my daughter and I got acquainted. We went everywhere together, the zoo, shopping, the library, movies—everywhere. Sometimes she wanted to race me to the corner, right out in the public. I didn't care, though, and we'd race.

I never won, but Debbie would wait on me and once I got there, she'd take me by the hand. As long as Debbie had me by the hand, I functioned, I lived, and I was completely happy.

I'd hurry home from work just to be with her a bit sooner. My mother told me Debbie would hang out the window looking for me till she saw me coming. But when I got there Debbie would be doing some household chore, always pretending she was surprised to see me.

But I could tell she was happy, she'd give me a kiss and tell me what we were having for supper.

The best part of all though, was around bedtime. I never felt more like busting than when Debbie would ask me to piggyback her to bed and tuck her in, giving me a moist kiss for my trouble.

You might wonder, as I do constantly, how I could get off the track and onto the path that led back here. I can't offer any bona fide excuses, just a few no-count rationalizations.

My mother was called back to West Virginia, and with no one to look after Debbie she went with her, with a promise to come back soon. She never made it 'cause ol' dad had let her down again. I got lonesome, had a bit too much, in that order, and headed toward West Virginia to see her.

I never made it, but the compulsive decision dead-ended into a 22-month stay at the penitentiary.

I don't know what I thought I was doing, and if I had the answer, I could hang out a shingle and commence practicing psychology. But I had no excuse for my actions.

Now, of course, I can see the error of my ways, because my hindsight has always run faster than my foresight. For that goofy caper, though, I have to face Debbie across the visiting table again for some time to come.

If I had it to do over, I'd go at it different. First, I'd spend a great deal of time with Debbie, maybe even get better acquainted. Enough so that she'd tell me some of her troubles and let me in on some of the things that are bugging her.

I'd take the time to listen like a full-time dad oughta do. I'd let her get me mixed up with new math; tell me about the boy who wanted to carry her school books home; tell me about her new teacher and relish a bawling out if she'd let me help with her school work and I gave her a bum answer, say, in history.

I'd be proud to let her show me off a little, and I'd like to meet her little friends. Then she wouldn't have to refer to me as "my dad, who's away."

The way it is now, my Debbie, if she has a problem, who's going to listen? Not me, I'm too busy doing time. Who's she going to talk things over with? It's a big problem, you know, when you don't have anyone to hash things over with.

I wonder too, what kind of young lady she'll grow into. I don't know. But this I DO KNOW. If she grows up straight, it will be in spite of, and not because of, me.

I needed an 11-year-old to take me by the hand and pull me up to her level. And I didn't have the sense to know it. In the