

sons". And yet, just to show you how intensely the administration clings to this discredited argument, Averell Harriman—a leading administration spokesman—said a year ago that people who oppose the balance-of-payments proposition are, in his words, "bigoted and pig-headed"—that's right, "bigoted and pig-headed" if you disagree, according to Averell Harriman.

The administration's fourth argument is—and there's no nicer word for it—pure economic harlotry. That's the argument that says we should supply the Reds because if we don't, the Reds will go elsewhere . . . which is the equivalent of saying—if you'll remember the recent articles in *Life* on the activities of the Mafia—that you might just as well play the slots because somebody else will if you don't. Furthermore, if the Communists could, in fact, get what they want elsewhere, they wouldn't be yenning so frantically to deal with us. The fact of the matter is that they *can't* get the quality, speed of delivery, service and replacement parts from anybody else; we make the best and sometimes the *only* kind of materials they need the most, and if they didn't get them from us, they couldn't get them *any* place. They would, in other words, have to make them themselves, if they could or wanted to.

Now, the administration's final argument is that our bolstering the Communists domestic economy will divert them from their emphasis on the military, which is, on its face, completely illogical. The opposite, in fact, is true: bolstering their domestic economy actually has helped them *strengthen* their military production . . . for the simple reason that every ruble they save on non-military needs—factories and chemicals and wheat and so forth—it another ruble they can spend on military needs.

Our Joint Economic Committee has reported, for instance, that Russia's industrial defense establishment has grown at a rate twice as fast as its domestic economy. A Russian economist has admitted that 30-to-40 million people are employed in that industrial defense establishment—30-to-40 per cent of all the workers in Russia—and that only 15 million or so work in other, non-agricultural jobs. It's no wonder the Reds pine so longingly for our products and our technical expertise, no wonder they're still using factories we helped them build before World War Two, and no wonder they still produce less than one-and-a-half million automobiles for a total population of over 230 million people.

Furthermore, as the C.I.A. has reported, there is absolutely no evidence that the Communists plan any change in their present policy of emphasizing military-and-political efforts to the continuing detriment of their domestic economy.

Why the United States should pull Russia's domestic chestnuts out of the fire and thereby strengthen their defense industry—especially when the Communists obviously don't care that much about the domestic scene themselves—is incomprehensible to me. But what makes it even more incomprehensible is that many of the items we've licensed for export to Russia could be used for *defense* purposes as well as non-defense. Let's just review a few examples:

. . . nearly half-a-million dollars worth of diethylene glycol, which is used for, among other things, explosives and liquid rocket propellants;

. . . more than 6-million dollars worth of chemical wood pulp, which sounds innocent enough except that it's used to make solid rocket fuels;

. . . computers and computer parts, which the Russians admit they can't duplicate;

. . . precision machine tools, in which the Reds also confess they're inept . . . jet aircraft engines . . . rifle-cleaning compounds . . . diamond drill bits—which nobody else can supply—to help produce more oil . . . chemicals of all kinds . . . and count-

less varieties of scientific instruments, including ones to measure radiation, aircraft flight performance and the quality of sophisticated optics.

The lists of such harmless little, non-strategic items run for pages and pages in government documents. The Department of Commerce was even ready to ship the Communists an instrument to improve the accuracy of Soviet missiles until South Dakota Senator Karl Mundt found out about it, last winter, and forced them to cancel the license.

Furthermore, the Department of Commerce—under constant harassment from the White House to free more items for export and to speed up the granting of applications for product shipment—removed some 400 items from the previously restricted list of trade goods, last fall . . . and did so without checking with the major intelligence organizations to determine if any of those items had strategic value. The Department said it had checked with what it called the "intelligence community", but when California Congressman Glen Lipscomb asked the intelligence agencies of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Defense Department about it, not one of them said they'd been asked for technical advice.

And that's not the only subterfuge going on. Another government report on items for export to the Communist bloc deliberately omitted a full list of types of machine tools because, said the committee which issued the report, "publication might upset normal commercial relationships". Result: nobody knew *what* was on the list until Congress got extracurricular.

This haphazard, sometimes downright secretive, approval of commerce-for-Communists takes on special meaning in view of the fact that the very Communists we're helping so much by our trade are helping *other* Communists to kill Americans. Commenting on this paradox, South Dakota Senator Karl Mundt stated last summer, "Americans are getting sick to their stomachs with an administration policy which is increasing American casualties through the supplies we send to the Communist states, which in turn are used to shoot and kill American boys . . . in Vietnam".

This continuing policy of shipping materiel and technical expertise to Communist nations has not only provoked a rash of proposed legislation in Washington, but has caused a large number of Red-trade advocates to have second thoughts about the benefits, wisdom and morality of such trade.

Russia and her satellites *are*—without the slightest reticence about it—supplying North Vietnam with hundreds of million of dollars worth of materiel to support their war effort against us, including, of course, missiles, aircraft and weapons. Russia's aid to the North Vietnamese increased 50 per cent in 1966 over 1965, rose again in 1967 and, according to the Russians, will rise sharply this year. An estimated 80 per cent of all North Vietnam's imported war materiel comes from Russia and her satellites.

There's no question—even in the minds of administration spokesmen—that our present trade with Russia and her satellites makes it easier for them to help the North Vietnamese, though the pro-trade people *do* argue that the difference isn't significant.

There's more to this argument, of course, than the mere *practical* consideration of whether our trading with Eastern Europe helps North Vietnam prolong its war against us. There also is the *moral* question. As Senator Mundt puts it, "Never before in our history have we found it conscionable to trade with the enemy in time of war." New York Congressman Paul Fino states, "There is no moral justification for giving aid to those nations who are supplying our enemies in Vietnam." And California Congressman Glen Lipscomb says, "I am utterly unable to understand how it makes any sense to help equip the Communists who are assisting ag-

gressors to kill and maim our soldiers in Vietnam."

Certainly this policy of trading with people who openly capitalize on that trade to help our enemies, is something new in American diplomacy. During the Korean War, for example, we cut our trade with Russia to virtually zero . . . and during the crisis over the Berlin Wall's construction, we deferred all applications for export to the Communist bloc. Why, then, are we doing the opposite today, particularly when there's an amazing parallel between our increase in trade to the Communists and *their* increase in trade to the North Vietnamese?

I don't know the answer to that question, and I'm not sure anybody does, but Senator Mundt smells more in it than just "immorality, inconsistency and a lack of regard for the man fighting for us." He says, "Communists are not idiots. They know that something is lacking in our American desire to conclude this war successfully when we not only ship their side of the war hundreds of different types of the supplies they need, but also encourage our American exporters to expand even greater trade with the enemy . . ." And then he raises the question that may, in fact, be the answer: "Are we really interested in ending the war successfully? Or is this conflict to be prolonged as a sort of a giant W.P.A. project to give millions of dollars in profits to those in America who are privileged to sell supplies to the enemy in time of war? What *really* are the facts behind this curious and self-defeating, war-prolonging trade policy?"

Well, there are two ways to find out "what really are the facts". The first is to stop all trade with the Communist bloc immediately and the second is to launch a saturation investigation of the entire subject.

If you agree that we should stop bolstering Communist economies, the first thing you can do is express your support for legislation now pending in Washington that would both halt our trade and initiate a thorough study of the entire subject.

Senator Karl Mundt, for example, has a bill that would slap an embargo on the export of all items to Communist countries furnishing materiel to North Vietnam. The bill—which is Number 2908—presently is idling in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. You should, therefore, write a letter to Senators George Murphy and Thomas Kuchel, asking them to see that Senate Bill 2908 gets some action . . . and you should send a carbon of your letter to Senator John Sparkman, who's chairman of the Banking & Currency Committee.

There's another piece of legislation kicking around both the House and the Senate that would bar a 50-million-dollar loan from the Export-Import Bank to Russia to help the Reds build an automobile plant. It's known generally as the Fino bill, and you should write your Congressman and the two California Senators urging them to support Fino's proposal to stop the use of Export-Import Bank funds for the benefit of the Communist.

Finally, California Congressman Glen Lipscomb has introduced a resolution—House Resolution Number 847—which calls for the establishment of a Congressional Committee to make a complete investigation of such topics as the impact of East-West trade on our national and international interests, its effect on the productivity and capability of nations aiding North Vietnam or any *potential* tinder-box, and the effectiveness of U.S. controls on exports to Communist nations. Congressman Lipscomb says, incidentally, that present Export Control rules and practices are a "farce".

The Lipscomb resolution is pending before the House Rules Committee, so you should send a carbon of your letter on House Resolution 847 to Congressman William Colmer, the Rules Chairman.

If enough people will write to their Congressmen and Senators about the whole

subject of Communist trade and specifically about these three pieces of legislation, I can promise you, you'll see some action.

But there's something else you can do, too: you can refuse to do business with companies that currently do business with Communists. After all, American business is under no obligation to trade with countries that help our enemies, even if the administration urges them to do so. In my opinion, it all boils down to a simple question of a modicum of morality versus a maximum of greed, and any company that will opt for greed doesn't *deserve* your business.

Find out, therefore, if your own company sells anything to the Communist bloc, and keep an eye open for stories in newspapers and trade magazines about other companies who seem to think a dollar is more important than winning a war. Then write those companies a letter or, if you want, send them these five commentaries . . . but in any case, hit them where they obviously will feel it the most: in their pocketbooks. If we can show American businessmen that—all questions of morality aside—it is very bad *business* to trade with Communists . . . and if we can simultaneously show Congress that it is very bad *politics* to trade with Communists . . . we can end what Senator Mundt calls this "incomprehensible, morally indefensible policy" of making it easier for our enemies to make it harder for us.

### The Late Adm. Ivan Ernest Bass

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, November 7, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday here in Washington, retired Rear Adm. Ivan Ernest Bass died.

Admiral Bass enjoyed a long career in the Navy, which he loved and to which he dedicated his life. He was a member of a outstanding south Mississippi family. His brothers and sisters are prominent in their own right in their chosen fields of business and medicine. His parents founded the Bass Pecan Nursery in Lumberton, Miss., which developed into the largest pecan nursery in the world. It is now operated by the admiral's brother, Houston, and other members of the family.

A great and patriotic man, who truly rendered yeoman service to his country, has passed into the great beyond.

The Washington Star carried the following account of the passing of this able and distinguished naval officer:

ADM. IVAN E. BASS DIES, ENGINEER FOR NAVY, 90

Retired Navy Rear Adm. Ivan E. Bass, 90, a Navy engineer for more than 50 years and a founding member of the Army-Navy Country Club, died yesterday of a heart attack at his home, 3601 Connecticut Ave. NW.

He had lived in Washington since his retirement in 1947 and worked on family genealogy, publishing two volumes.

Adm. Bass was the senior member of the Bureau of Ships' settlement review and property disposal board from 1944 to 1947.

In his long career as a naval engineer, he had been head of the machinery division of the New York and Boston Navy Yards, served as engineer officer on four battleships and served as fleet engineer of the Asiatic Fleet under Adm. Montgomery Taylor.

He held the Boston Navy Yard post during

the years of World War I, after which he came to Washington to join the Navy's board of inspection and survey. He then stayed here, except for his three years with the Asiatic fleet, from 1931 to 1934, and five years as the Navy's inspector of machinery at the Newport News (Va.) Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.

Born near Carley, Miss., Adm. Bass graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1901.

Besides being a founding member of the Army-Navy Country Club, he was a member of the Mississippi Historical Society, the Devon and Cornwall Records Society, the Mississippi and National Genealogical Societies and the New York Yacht Club.

Adm. Bass leaves his wife, Florence; two brothers, Dr. Charles C. of New Orleans, and Houston of Lumberton, Miss., and two sisters, Dr. Cora B. Pigford and Mrs. Wreath E. Hoey, both of Lumberton.

Graveside services will be at 2 p.m. tomorrow in Arlington Cemetery.

### Clear Air Success Story

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 7, 1967

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when America's air and water pollution problems are growing at a rate faster than corrective action, it is pleasing to learn of a local success story in the struggle against air pollution.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose such a story from the November 2, 1967, issue of the Detroit News. The article follows:

BUDD CLEARS AIR IN EAST SIDE FEUD

(By Richard A. Ryan)

Foundries, as a rule, do not make particularly good neighbors.

But don't try to tell that to a group of people in the Conner-Charlevoix area on Detroit's east side.

They might give you a heated argument that the Budd Co. gray iron foundry at 12141 Charlevoix is a darn good neighbor.

But it took a lot of "neighborly" actions on the part of the foundry to get into their good graces.

"The Budd people have been just wonderful," said Mrs. Frances Cipresso, 52, of 2224 Lakewood. "They've done a lot in this area."

In fact, Budd's neighbors think so much of the company that the Detroit Committee for Neighborhood Conservation and Improved Housing recently gave plant manager Robert W. Haerberlein a special award.

It cited Budd for "imagination in creating a spirit of cooperation between industry and nearby residential areas."

Everything wasn't always so pleasant.

It wasn't long ago that residents of the area were locked in battle with Budd over air pollution.

"This was probably one of the dirtiest neighborhoods in the country," said Mrs. Cipresso, president of the Jefferson-Mack Community Council.

"The soot and ash in the air ruined the paint on cars and homes, and some persons had to be given medical treatment for their eyes.

"The sidewalks and streets were always dirty and it was impossible to hang laundry outdoors. At times you couldn't even see across the street."

For three years area residents protested and pleaded for the company to do something.

Some picketed the City-County Building, demanding City Council action against the foundry.

Budd officials were well aware of the problem, however, and had been seeking ways to do something about it.

They commissioned the American Air Filter Co., of Louisville, to devise a pollution control system that would effectively serve an iron foundry.

Last February a \$1 million system was installed, which Budd officials estimate will cost them \$80,000 to \$100,000 annually to maintain.

"It's wonderful here now," Mrs. Cipresso said. "You would never know it was the same neighborhood. We have no pollution problem whatsoever."

When Budd decided to be a good neighbor, it didn't stop with pollution control.

The company also planted hundreds of cedar trees, constructed attractive fencing around open storage areas, and painted the exterior of all its buildings.

"See," said Mrs. Cipresso, "foundries can make good neighbors."

### Communists Object to Integrated Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 7, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when Communist diplomats in Washington, D.C., objected to their children being used as guinea pigs and laboratory statistics in public schools, the U.S. State Department put its foot down and said "no"—there can be no transfer by white children—even if Reds—to escape from heavily Negro schools.

So the experiment in international mixing ended. The Poles, Czechs, and Bulgarians have taken their children out of public schools and placed them in private schools just like an American. This proves that even Communist parents love their little children.

And our State Department is upset\* worrying about our image overseas. Which image? The image that everything not compulsory is now mandatory, or the image of fear that the foreigners may find out that even Communists do not like Big Brother regulations. Maybe what we need is a domestic branch of the State Department to concern itself with our image with our own people.

I ask that the news release from the November 6 U.S. News & World Report follow my remarks in the RECORD:

A RACE PROBLEM FOR THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS

WASHINGTON.—Racial violence in Washington schools has become a problem for the State Department.

Some white foreign diplomats complain that their children attending public school are being beaten and intimidated by Negro pupils. One youngster was hospitalized after a beating.

The diplomats appealed to the State Department for help in getting their children transferred out of the predominantly Negro school.

But the Department was told that a recent federal-court ruling forbids transfer by white children to escape from heavily Negro schools.