NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9, 1971:

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The following-named persons to be Members of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review as indicated: (New Positions)

W. W. Little, of Arizona, for the remainder of the term of five years expiring September 15, 1971.

Peter J. Bensoni, of Minnesota, for the remainder of the term of five years expiring September 15, 1972.

Robert W. McVay, of Missouri, for the remainder of the term of five years expiring September 15, 1973.

Charles E. Schwab, of New York, for the remainder of the term of five years expiring September 15, 1974.

Howard L. Hartman, of California, for the remainder of the term of five years expiring September 15, 1975.

IN THE NAVY

Hugh W. Marcy, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be a permanent ensign in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (naval enlisted scientific education program candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefore as provided by law:

Jack C. Barrs	Robert L. Holdredge
Ronald O. Beene	Robert G. Horn
Robert H. Christian	W. F. Humphries III
Jon R. Cummings	Glenn E. Love
Jerald L. Daniel	Kenneth W. Starr
David W. Duma	Paul E. Taylor
John T. Hammond	William H. Ward
Charles R. Hedden	Flake M. Wilcox

Ian M. Laird, U.S. Navy (retired), to be reappointed from the temporary disability retired list as a permanent captain in the Line of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Clyde H. McAllister (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond G. Allen	Peter D. Logen
William R. Clarke	James H. O'Callaghah
Otis H. Edge, Jr.	Franklin H. Ross

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Dennis D. Anderson	Kenneth J. Kimbrough
William N. Carter	Benedict Ligotti
Michael A. Cochran	Thomas A. Lynde
Greogory W. Gramm	Gerald F. Moore
Henry J. Deangelis	Mark W. Richards
William F. Doms	Joseph T. Rowbottom III
Bruce R. Fox	Richard A. Smith
Richard R. Gartner, Jr.	Jerry L. Stovall
Floyd W. Gedutis	William T. Theroux, Jr.
Daniel W. Haney	
Craig W. Jester	

The following candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Medical Service Corps (Allied Sciences) of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

James W. Malinoski	Robert M. Debell
Roger D. Hughes	Richard Wolf
Eric J. Mueller II	Ronald D. Porter

The following candidates selected as alternates to be permanent ensigns in the Medical Service Corps (Allied Sciences) of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

David V. Edling	Michael J. Reinig
Wesley J. Leverich	Thane S. Thurmond
John C. Lane	

HM1 Donna R. Martin to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps (Health Care Administration) of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps (Health Care Administration) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Steven L. Smith	Norman J. Barber
Larry R. Weappa	Anthony J. Peters III
Michael L. Todd	Warren Williams, Jr.
Larry D. Holman	Steven R. Hixson
Robert L. Malinky	John E. Greenan
Arvid C. Fristad	William S. Dial
Jimmie J. Mullin	John R. Hetrick
Roger D. Crabtree	Robert J. Kane
Harry E. Yost	Rodney D. Hickey
Francis J. Hughes	Arlen D. Morey
Richard B. Kurtich	Tommy M. Tomlinson
Tommy L. Ruffin	Peter F. Sheridan
Clyde E. Kunkel	Kenneth R. Shannon
Gary E. Schick	David E. Johnson
Dale O. Knee	Lemuel A. Waggoner
Jack L. Peterson	J. Ronald Thompson
John I. Huju	Donald J. Lemmerman

The following-named enlisted personnel selected as alternates to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps (Health Care Administration) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Fred G. Barina	Ronald C. Ewing
Jerry D. Penn	Robert M. Carroll
George R. Willis, Jr.	George W. K. Stewart
Robert L. Stratman	Joe M. McCaig
Richard T. Oldham	William R. Moses
James M. Keenan	Joseph M. Cosenza
Orlando J. Santore	Jose M. Silvas
Roy R. Skog, Jr.	Michael J. Maskulak
James L. Raymond	Len S. Watts
John W. Denayar	Ronald E. Bennett
Dennis C. Dunkleman	David Dittman
Thomas R. Defibaugh	

William L. Benedict (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent Ensign in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Larry B. Thompson (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent Lieutenant and a temporary Lieutenant Commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be Permanent Lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary Lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jack T. Curren	Robert D. Markowitz
Ernest G. Glass	John K. Stephan
Jack A. Hale, Jr.	Charles L. Zimliki
Gary N. Harnois	

Charles A. Vedra, U.S. Navy officer to be reverted to permanent chief warrant officer W–4 in the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Theodis Dillard, U.S. Navy, retired, to be reappointed from the temporary disability retired list as a lieutenant commander in the Line of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Gary Wayne Blair, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be a permanent ensign in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Charles J. Nelson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Botswana, to the Kingdom of Lesotho, and to the Kingdom of Swaziland.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

John Shaheen, of Illinois, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1974.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, June 9, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed: We are perplexed but not in despair.—II Corinthians 4: 8.

Almighty God, whose power is adequate for all our needs, whose wisdom makes us truly wise and whose love keeps good will alive within us, bless us in full measure as we wait upon Thee in prayer.

Give us the spirit to put into our lives the principles found in Thy Word and may they become the practices of our daily living, so we can lead our Nation in ministering to the needs of our people that no one may be forgotten, no one neglected, and no one left alone.

Grant that a new sunrise of peace and prosperity may dawn upon this planet and upon this our beloved land and upon us, as we pray in the spirit of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 575) entitled "An act to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended."

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PRECIPITATE ACTION IN VIETNAM?

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the administration has yesterday again labeled a December 31, 1971, withdrawal of American prisoners and military forces from intervention in Vietnam as "precipitate."

Webster defines "precipitate" as "to cause to move, act, proceed, and so forth, very rapidly; to urge or press on with eager haste or violence; to hurry."

On New Year's Eve 1971 it will have been 17 years and 8 months since President Nixon first advocated direct American military intervention in Indochina—April 16, 1954; 21 years since the Truman administration discarded our previous anticolonialism policy by aiding France in its war to reassert colonialism in Indochina, and 7 years since the Johnson administration escalation.

Precipitate? Not very.

WASHINGTON AREA WATER SUPPLY AND SEWAGE PROBLEM

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of the Central Atlantic Environment News comments on the lack of interest of Washington area water supply officials in using the Potomac estuary as a source of water for our metropolitan area. The account states that these officials prefer upstream storage and quotes one of them as saying it is healthier, more certain, and more esthetic than drinking treated sewage. Let me say here and now if the sanitary engineers and officials of this region are not more imaginative and innovative in solving our water supply and sewage problem than this, they are extending an invitation for the abolishment of their own semiautonomous local empires. Rather than come to grips with the cleanup operation through a cooperative effort they invite the establishment of a super agency which will put them out of business.

High-level dams on the main stem of the Potomac to wash half treated sewage down the estuary to the bay are as archaic as the "chic sales" of the Victorian era.

The citizens of this region are sophisticated enough to know that water can be recycled and that the Potomac, the Nation's river, can be cleaned up for swimming, boating, and other recreation. They are entitled to no less. This message must get through to the sanitary engineers of this region loud and clear.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE SPEAK ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM OF VIETNAMIZATION

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am in the process of polling my Indiana district. Among others, I asked two questions:

First. Do you favor or oppose President Nixon's program of "Vietnamization"? To date 84.6 percent are in favor, only 15.4 percent oppose.

Second. Do you favor or oppose publicly announcing at this time a fixed future date for total withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam? Only 23.3 percent favor announcing such a date, 76.7 percent are opposed.

Out where the people live, this is the voice of the people—pollsters and politicians might do well to remember it.

"CIVIL" WARS—UNITY OR FREEDOM

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this House has the inalienable right to speak his mind, in this Chamber and out, for whatever reasons he chooses. I commend Members who speak up with sincerity and cogency.

I commend our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) for contributing to the debate pertaining to Vietnam.

However, when the appealing rhetoric distorts the facts or misleads, other Members have an even greater responsibility to speak up to at least provide some perspective.

Now, I deplore this war, too. I may be even more disillusioned by the conduct of this war than the gentleman. I, too, am anxious to end the war as soon as possible—perhaps for more reasons than the gentleman. Tonight would not be too soon.

But I noticed on the United Press International wire service that the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) likened the war in Vietnam to the American Civil War with these exact words:

> In both conflicts, the South broke away and the North fought to reunite a country that essentially belongs to them.

The gentleman neglected, however, to make one major and critical distinction: in our Civil War, it was the South that was slave and the North that was free. In Indochina the situation is the other way around.

I am confident the gentleman would not want to convey to his audiences that unity was, or is, more important than freedom—to him or to others.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 450, congratulating San Gabriel, Calif., and her residents on the occasion of her 200th anniversary.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 450

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, is celebrating its two hundredth anniversary by a series of events commencing May 20, 1971; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, surrounds the Mission San Gabriel Archangel, founded September 8, 1771, by Father Junipera Serra, during the reign of Carlos III, King of Spain, was the fourth of twenty-one Spanish missions built along the historic El Camino Real (King's Highway) and became known as the "Queen of Missions"; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, was established by a small group of monks sent from San Diego who upon their arrival were swooped down upon by a large band of painted warriors, whereupon, according to legend, the monks unfurled their banner on which was a painting of the Madonna, and the warriors threw down their weapons, made submission, and brought gifts; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, became the place where in 1781 the Rivera Expedition from Sinaloa and Sonora, Mexico, arrived at the mission, containing the "poblabores" (settlers) for the proposed pueblo of Neustra Señora la Reina de Los Angeles, and these chosen settlers then departed from the sheltering walls of the mission on September 4 of that year to found their pueblo which is today the great city of Los Angeles; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, is the oldest settlement north of San Diego and south of San Luis Obispo and is not only the mother of the city of Los Angeles, but also of every other community in the valley that bears its name as it was the cultural and agricultural center, as well as the spiritual nucleus, that inspired the founding of other communities in this great green valley; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, has among its first American settlers, Jedediah S. Smith who led a group of trappers from the Great Salt Lake in November 1826, followed in 1841 by the first organized wagon train, captained by William Workman and John Roland; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, became, in 1852, the first township in the county of Los Angeles, which township in 1860 was composed of five hundred and eighty-six persons, and is presently situated below the Sierra Madre mountains, north of the Pacific Ocean, with the city of Arcadia to the northeast; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, at the turn of the twentieth century experienced its first growing pains as an aroused citizenry awakened from its "adobe days" to the potential of private enterprise and in 1945 voted the sum of $160,000 to acquire the beautiful San Gabriel Civic Auditorium, opened originally in 1927 to house the Mission Play and formerly known as the Mission Playhouse, which has one of the largest stages on the west coast and is the hub of cultural activities in the area and a living example of the farsightedness and dedication of the people of San Gabriel to preserve and foster cultural activities; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, where the flame of Christianity was lighted and the arts of civilization were first introduced, has grown from a small Indian settlement to a city with a population of nearly thirty thousand and has maintained its superbly beautiful mission, constructed by Indians of hand-made adobe bricks and tile which continues today as a parish church at 314 Mission Drive; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, still has adobes of the early days among which are the Purcell Adobe, 308 Mission Drive, which was built in 1768 to house the Spanish commandant and the padres while the mission was being erected; the May Place, 725 Carmelita Street, built in 1851 by J. R. Evertson, Los Angeles' first census taker; the Vigare Adobe, 616 Ramona

Street, built by a soldier of the mission guard; and La Carsa Sieja de Lopez (the old house of Lopez), 330 North Santa Anita Street, believed to be one of the mission buildings; and

Whereas the city of San Gabriel, California, has preserved its spiritual and cultural heritage and represents the embodiment of the best features of California tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby sends congratulations and greetings to the city of San Gabriel, California, and her residents on the occasion of her two hundredth anniversary and extends hope from the people of the United States that San Gabriel, California, will continue to grow and prosper and stand in the centuries to come as a symbol of American living.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1, 2, and 3, strike out all whereas clauses.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentlemen from California (Mr. WIGGINS and Mr. DANIELSON) in the support of this resolution, House Resolution 450, which pays tribute to the city of San Gabriel on having contributed in so many ways to the well-being of the San Gabriel community and persists in making San Gabriel an ideal place to live. This city which was the mother of the city of Los Angeles, and became known as the Queen of the Missions, has preserved the spiritual and cultural traditions inherited from California's earliest settlers, has proudly preserved the superbly beautiful Mission San Gabriel Archangel and the adobe buildings constructed by Indians of handmade bricks, and stands today as a landmark of the best features of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Abourezk	Flood	Metcalfe
Alexander	Foley	Obey
Arends	Ford,	Peyser
Ashbrook	Gerald R.	Railsback
Ashley	Frenzel	Rangel
Baring	Gallagher	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hagan	Runnels
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanna	Ryan
Celler	Hansen, Idaho	Sandman
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Scheuer
Clark	Hébert	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	Horton	Springer
Collier	Hosmer	Stephens
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Kee	Tiernan
Culver	Kluczynski	Ullman
Dent	Landgrebe	Ware
Dingell	Landrum	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Leggett	Wilson,
Esch	Long, La.	Charles H.
Eshleman	McCulloch	
Fisher	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971, will reach the House floor tomorrow under a closed rule. I appeared before the Rules Committee this morning in support of an open rule or in the alternative a modified rule which would give the membership an opportunity to vote on an amendment I wished to offer reducing an overgenerous increase in the quotas to be assigned the Bahamas and British Honduras. These tiny countries, with populations of 195,000 and 120,000 respectively, are being given increases of 23,173 and 18,634 tons. Eight of their much larger neighbors in Central America and the Caribbean take substantial cuts. Neither country qualifies for such preferential treatment under the criteria for assignment of foreign quotas originally laid down by the committee. Each is eligible to share in the premium prices afforded by the British Commonwealth's preferential system. While today's action by the Rules Committee precludes my offering such an amendment, I intend during the general debate to protest these increases which are so far as I can determine unexplained and unjustified. My reasons for doing so are in part set forth in my dissenting views which commence on page 48 of the report. The remarkable favoritism being extended to the Bahamas and British Honduras when compared with their neighbors is perhaps best shown in the table at the bottom of page 48. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following typographical errors which appear at pages 48 and 49 of these dissenting views and which should be corrected as follows:

On page 48 in the sentence before the table, the figure "3,173 tons" should be changed to "33,173 tons."

The following corrections should be made in the table:

The fourth column entitled "New total and prorations" in the table should be numbered "(4)" not "(5)".

The figure in the fourth column for British Honduras should be "33,173" not "T 33,137" and the figure in the fifth column for the Bahamas should be "T 23,173" not "T 23,137."

The figure in the forth column for British Honduras should be "33,173" not "33,137."

On page 49, in line four, the figure "22,173 tons" should be changed to "23,173 tons."

DANNY GOODWIN, NO. 1 DRAFTEE IN MAJOR LEAGUE FREE AGENT DRAFT

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I read in the Washington Post yesterday in the sports section that Danny Goodwin, a young man from my hometown and in fact my old high school, has been selected by the Chicago White Sox as the No. 1 draftee in the annual major league free agent draft.

Danny batted .469, .427, and .495 during his high school career, and in recognition of his abilities the school has retired his uniform—No. 6. According to White Sox manager, Chuck Tanner, he is already considered to be an excellent receiver and hopefully will soon be playing in the major leagues.

Our youngest son, Robin, has been a teammate of Danny's both on the basketball and baseball teams. We have come to know him well, and I consider him to be a very outstanding young man over and above his athletic prowess. As a measure of his character I think it is significant to note that his first consideration is an opportunity to complete his college education, for he has ambitions of following in the footsteps of his brother, Dennis, who is studying to become a dentist at Texas Southern University.

All of us in Peoria are tremendously proud that Danny Goodwin should be selected as the No. 1 draft choice this year, and we congratulate the management of the Chicago White Sox for their good judgment.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. FLORENCE DURKEE

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, one of the great ladies of central New York was honored by the La-Sertoma Club as their "Woman of the Year." No one could be more deserving than Mrs. Florence Durkee.

Mrs. Durkee, the mother of nine children and the grandmother of 31, has been a community activist all her life and

a community leader all her adult life. Her charities and civic involvements read like a litany of current events in the Cortland-Homer area. She has worked diligently for the Cortland County Historical Society, the Elizabeth Brewster House, Cortland Memorial Hospital, Women's Fellowship of the Homer Congregational Church, Council of Churches, Cortland Salvation Army, American Legion Auxiliary, the Cornell Women's Club, and others far too numerous to mention. The amazing part of this grand woman, Mr. Speaker, is that she has done all this while managing a home and serving simultaneously as President of the Durkee Bakery Co., in Cortland.

I want to take this opportunity to offer her my personal thanks for her activities, Mr. Speaker, and to remind my colleagues here in the Chamber that as long as there are Florence Durkees at work in our society, we are far from collapsing.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

MICRONESIAN CLAIMS ACT OF 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 467 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 467

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 617) to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission, and all points of order against page 4, lines 12 through 23 and page 10, lines 6 through 15 of said joint resolution are hereby waived. After general debate, which will be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution, 467 provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 617, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 617 would provide generally for three things: First, authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of hostilities of the Second World War; second, authorize the payment of noncombat claims arising after the securing of the islands and prior to July 1, 1951; and, third, establish a Micronesian Claims Commission to receive, examine, adjudicate, and render final decisions with respect to such claims.

House Resolution 467 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, followed by a reading of the joint resolution for amendments under the 5-minute rule. It further provides that after the joint resolution has been reported to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto, to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

All points of order against provisions of section 102(b), appearing on page 4 and section 104(c) on page 10 of the joint resolution are waived by House Resolution 467. The waiver is necessary because these two sections provide for the transfer of general revenue funds to and from a special "Micronesian claims fund," to be managed by the Secretary of the Interior, for payment of claims without further action of the Appropriations Committee, contrary to rule XXI, clause 4 of the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, for a period of more than two decades Micronesians have been relegated to the status of citizens without a country although living on their own land. While their own claims for wartime suffering and resultant losses have gone uncompensated, they have watched their kin in Guam and their neighbors in Asia, including the Ryukyuans, benefit from grants from the United States and reparations from Japan.

It is true that the settlement of Micronesian wartime claims has been delayed chiefly because of protracted negotiations between the United States and Japan. But an agreement between the two principal World War II combatants in the Pacific was reached on April 18, 1969, more than 2 years ago. That agreement stipulates that the two Governments will make ex gratia contributions—as opposed to legally obligated payments—of $5 million each in response to the war damage claims of the Micronesians. The U.S. contribution will be made in cash and the Japanese contribution in the form of goods and services, as requisitioned by the Micronesians. The Japanese Government insisted on this form of contribution because all of the reparation agreements it had made with Asian countries, some of which were still outstanding provided for this type of payment.

Some of the Micronesian claims arose out of damages suffered during the postwar period while the Marianas, the Marshalls and the Carolines were occupied by U.S. troops. Responsibility for these damages, therefore, cannot be shared with Japan.

Accordingly, House Joint Resolution 617 provides for a four-point program in response to the claims of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: First, to implement the agreement of April 18, 1969, between the United States and Japan by authorizing $5 million to be appropriated as the U.S. share of the total contribution of $10 million; second, to authorize the adjudication of claims of Micronesians arising during the war and those arising during the postsecure period until July 1, 1951, for losses resulting from actions attributable to uniformed personnel or civilian employees of the United States; third, to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission to settle these claims; and, fourth, to authorize an appropriation of $20 million, in addition to the $5 million ex gratia contribution, to be used by the Secretary of the Interior to make payments on claims adjudicated by the Micronesian Claims Commission.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 617 would not only provide overdue compensation to the people of the trust territory, but would also elevate them from the status of second-class world citizens. As trustee of these islands, under agreement with the United Nations, the United States has a duty to do at least this much for its Micronesian wards. I urge the adoption of the rule in order that House Joint Resolution 617 may be considered.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the gentleman on an excellent, concise, and complete statement of the legislative situation under this joint resolution.

Second, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his longtime interest. Having traveled with the gentleman from Hawaii through the Pacific countries, I know what a fine interest Congressman MATSUNAGA has in developing friendly relations with the Asian countries and their peoples.

The trusteeship of the Micronesian Islands is a responsibility of particularly the U.S. House of Representatives. It was a privilege for me to be the author and sponsor of the original resolution of Congress authorizing President Truman to take over the sole trusteeship of these Micronesian Islands, the former Japanese League of Nations mandate islands. The authorization for the U.S. trusteeship of the Micronesian Islands started in the House of Representatives, and was passed by the Republican 80th Congress, in 1947.

As a returning U.S. Navy World War II serviceman from the Pacific, I feel that it is vital to our U.S. defense to have these 3 million square miles of islands and these island peoples and to help them develop, as they are the link between Hawaii and the Philippine Islands and are a buffer to us against aggression from the mainland of Asia.

We Americans, since World War II, have done well in helping these fine

friendly Micronesian people. I hope we in Congress will continue to do so. As you know, I have said many times I have always opposed the United States waging a land war in Asia. This is a fine defense buffer region for the free world in depth between the Philippines and Hawaii. As this is a trusteeship under the Security Council, not under the General Assembly, we have the authority in the United States of the right to veto; second, we also have the right to fortify. So that the United States has a real defense interest in these islands and through these friendly people a real humanitarian interest, and legal and moral obligation to help them progress. These fine Micronesian people certainly deserve this consideration, as the gentleman has so well and adequately stated.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I commend him for the part which he played in bringing this resolution to the floor of the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 467 does provide for 1 hour of debate under an open rule for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 617, which is commonly referred to as the Micronesian Claims Act.

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has explained the rule in detail. It was necessary to waive points of order in two instances because funds are being transferred. The gentleman from Hawaii has explained the joint resolution in detail. He has put in a lot of time on this subject, and I shall save as much time as I can, Mr. Speaker.

I would merely like to mention that we are talking about $30 million, $5 million from Japan and we are going to put up $25 million. There are about 100,000 people involved, which means about $300 a person. The reason I mention that point is that last week members of the Rules Committee were trying to get a little money to fund the Congressional Research Service which would help Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in obtaining and evaluating information. We wanted to get $1.5 million for that purpose; $200,000 was agreed to by the members of the Appropriations Committee and accepted by the House.

Under this joint resolution we would spend $25 million from our Treasury, and yet we were having a hard time getting $200,000 for the Congressional Research Service. I could not help mentioning that in light of our needs in the House of Representatives.

I urge adoption of the rule. I have no requests for time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, having no requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 617) to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 617, with Mr. PIKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 617, which is the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971, has already been carefully explained in the very thoughtful statement by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), during consideration of the rule.

Mr. Chairman, during the dark days of the Second World War, some of the most fierce combat in the Pacific took place among the islands known as Micronesia. As a result of this fighting, many of the islands such as Saipan and Peleliu were virtually devastated. The Micronesians lost their homes and possessions and many lost their lives as innocent victims of war. In an effort to provide a means for paying these people for their wartime losses, the Governments of the United States and Japan engaged in long and arduous negotiations which stretched intermittently over a period of 17 years. Finally, on April 18, 1969, an Executive agreement was signed by the two Governments in which they agreed to make an ex gratia contribution of $10 million to the people of Micronesia.

The resolution before us today, House Joint Resolution 617, would implement the Executive agreement by authorizing the adjudication of wartime claims and, in addition, those claims arising during the post-secure period from actions of members of the armed services of the United States. The resolution would also establish a commission responsible for determining the validity of claims and would create a Micronesian Claims Fund.

Title I of the resolution authorizes the appropriation of $5 million to be paid into the Fund by the United States as its share of the $10 million total. Under the executive agreement, Japan is to provide $5 million worth of goods and services to the government of the Trust Territory—Micronesia. As the products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people are made available to the government of the trust territory, the equivalent of such products and services to the extent of $5 million will be transferred from funds regularly appropriated for the trust territory into the Micronesian Claims Fund. Thus there will be a total of $10 million available for the settlement of wartime claims.

The Micronesian Claims Commission, which will adjudicate the claims, will consist of five members—two of whom will be Micronesians—and will be under the direction of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. All of the claims must be filed within 1 year after the appointment of the Commissioners, and thereafter there will be a 3-year period during which the Commission is to complete its task. If all of the wartime claims exceed $10 million, the Secretary of the Interior will prorate the payments. On the other hand, if there are any funds remaining from the original $10 million after all wartime claims have been paid, the balance will be paid into the treasury of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for appropriation by the Congress of Micronesia for the welfare of the people.

Title II of House Joint Resolution 617 authorizes the Micronesian Claims Commission to consider, adjudicate, and make payments to the full satisfaction of Micronesians with claims against the United States as a result of personal injury or death or damage to or loss or destruction of private property caused by the U.S. Armed Forces, U.S. Government civilian employees, and employees of the trust territory government. These are the so-called postsecure claims which arose after the securing of the islands by U.S. Armed Forces and prior to July 1, 1951, when the Department of the Interior replaced the U.S. Navy as the administering authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The resolution authorizes $20 million for making payments on this category of claims. We have been advised by the Department of the Interior that, based on a survey of such claims, this sum should be adequate. If, however, any funds should remain after all postsecure claims are paid, they will be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Having set forth the provisions of the resolution, I think that it would be useful to give the Members a brief description of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia—and of our relationship with the area.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands encompasses more than 2,100 islands and atolls of the Caroline, Mariana, and Marshall groups.

The territory has a total population of about 102,000 and a total land area of some 700 square miles. Prior to the Second World War, the islands were administered by Japan as a League of Nations mandate. During the closing stages of the war, they came under U.S. military occupation. Since 1947 they have been administered by the United States pursuant to a trusteeship agreement with the U.N. Security Council. The agreement obligates the United States to

foster the economic, social, educational, and political advancement of the territory. The agreement also gives the United States full powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory subject to those obligations. These powers include the authority to negotiate and conclude commercial and other treaties and agreements with foreign powers for the territory.

Within the U.S. Government, the Department of the Interior has administrative responsibility for the territory. The foreign affairs responsibility of the Department of State for the territory is spelled out in a 1962 Executive order and in secretarial orders of the Department of the Interior. Administratively, the territory is divided into six districts: Truk, the Marshalls, Ponape, Palau, the Marianas, and Yap—in order of population. The territorial government is located in Saipan which is situated in the Marianas. Executive and administrative authority is vested in the High Commissioner who is appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate and is responsible to the Secretary of the Interior. Legislative authority rests with the popularly elected bicameral Congress of Micronesia which was established in 1965.

Returning to the question of the claims, I should like to clarify the difference between the two categories—that is, the wartime claims and the post-secure claims. In regard to the wartime claims, the Department of State has primary responsibility since the settlement of these claims involved negotiations with Japan and ultimately an international agreement. As for the second category, the post-secure claims, the Department of the Interior as the administering authority has primary responsibility.

In order to put these claims into perspective, I should like to give the Members a few examples of the types of losses attributable either to the period of hostilities between the United States and Japan or to actions by our Armed Forces during the post-secure period. In testimony before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, a delegation representing the Palau and Mariana Islands districts submitted the following partial listing of their losses:

Deaths	889
Cattle (Marianas)	1,302
Boats (Palau)	893
Buildings:	
Masonry and hardwood	389
Wooden	3,517
Farm	191
Coconut trees (bearing)	176,924
Crops & trees other than coconut (acres)	2,200

Of course, these claims do not include those of the other four island districts. To a modern industrial society such as ours, these losses may seem insignificant. However, to a subsistence economy such as that of the Micronesians, a coconut tree, for example, is a staple of life. The destruction of these trees had a disastrous effect on their major product, copra.

Before deferring to my colleagues, I would like to speak to the issue which has arisen concerning the Japanese ex gratia contribution. Why did the United States agree to the provision in the Executive agreement which stipulates that Japan's share be in the form of goods and services? While our negotiators would have preferred that the Japanese also pay in cash, Japan insisted on this arrangement because all of the reparations agreements it had made with Asian countries provide for payment in kind. In view of the fact that payments were still outstanding on some of those agreements, Japan argued that its relations with these recipients might be complicated if it were to pay its share in cash. In any event, these goods and services are already supplied and performed by Japan and paid for out of appropriations for the trust territory. According to the Department of the Interior, these goods and services include infrastructure projects—airport dredging, sewage, et cetera—inter-island vessels, drydocking and maintenance, and vehicles for the Government motor pool.

In closing, I should like to emphasize that the paramount reason for adopting this resolution is to do justice to the Micronesians. Their claims have been pending far too long. They have remained uncompensated for a quarter of a century during which time they have seen their kin in Guam and their neighbors in Asia benefit from grants from the United States and reparations from Japan.

Beyond doing justice to these innocent people, the enactment of this resolution also would promote the interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the departmental spokesmen and the Micronesian citizens who testified on this resolution all supports its passage. The Committee on Foreign Affairs approved it by a nearly unanimous vote of 21 to 2. Based on this strong support and the need for the resolution's adoption, I respectfully urge that the House pass House Joint Resolution 617.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement, because these people in Micronesia were the victims of the World War II Pacific campaigns. The U.S. forces used these islands as a means to get to the Philippines and Japan by island hopping. The answer to it is that these people, being friendly to the United States and under U.S. trusteeship, should be kept friendly. These islands constitute a buffer zone of 3 million square miles between the Philippines and Hawaii so that there will be no new Pearl Harbor. The amount that the American people have spent on these people so far, has been appreciable in helping their development, but they are a people scattered over 3 million square miles of ocean, so they do have great difficulties and need assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman this question: As this is the only Security Council trusteeship, of which the United States is trustee alone, rather than the four allied powers, Britain, France, the U.S.S.R., and the United States—arrangement which has caused so much trouble in Europe—does this not have a real bearing likewise on the U.S. defense of our west coast and the Hawaiian Islands as well as Alaska?

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman makes a very good point. These islands occupy a very central part of the Pacific Ocean, and it is certainly useful if not important to the United States to have access to these islands in order to have better observation and presence in that part of the Pacific.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 617.

This resolution which has been explained in some detail by the gentleman from Hawaii and the gentleman from Minnesota, it has received the careful consideration of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of which the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is chairman.

In my opinion this legislation is long overdue. The negotiations leading up to this legislation covered a period of 17 years, and were at an impasse until June 1966.

As noted in the committee report, the Department of the Interior presented Congress with proposed legislation on April 2, 1970. The legislation was introduced on April 9, 1970, by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER), who was then the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

Hearings were held last year by the subcommittee, but no further action was taken. This was due primarily to a difference of opinion within the executive branch regarding the advisability of combining both wartime and postsecure claims in one legislative package. Since then, the differences have been resolved. On January 26, 1971, the executive branch submitted new draft legislation that included both wartime and post-secure claims.

This resolution would authorize an appropriation of $5 million to be used to pay claims to citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during World War II. Also, it would authorize $20 million for claims arising after the securing of the various islands and prior to July 1, 1951.

The claims would be handled by a five-man Micronesian Claims Commission, which would be established by this resolution. The Commission would wind up its affairs not later than 3 years after the expiration of the time for filing claims.

This legislation implements the executive agreement of April 18, 1969. I would like to comment upon the agreement because it has been subjected to criticism

on the basis that the $5 million contribution of Japan for wartime claims is in goods and services, whereas our contribution is in cash.

This agreement, like most agreements, was a compromise. The negotiations were exceedingly difficult.

Among the points in dispute in the negotiations were Japanese counterclaims resulting from the repatriation of some 100,000 Japanese nationals to Japan after World War II. Many of these people left behind houses, land, and personal property.

Also, Japan insisted that its contributions to Micronesia should be in goods and services instead of cash, because its reparations agreements with Asian countries provide for payment in kind.

In the compromise agreement, Japan agreed to waive its claims against Micronesia, and the United States agreed that Japan could pay its contribution to Micronesia in the form of goods and services.

Without this agreement and the legislation we are considering today, there would be no arrangement for Japan to pay any claims.

Through passage of House Joint Resolution 617, we will implement the executive agreement of April 18, 1969, and fulfill an obligation to the people of Micronesia.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I notice on page 7 of the report that the bill creates a commission that will determine individual claims or the amount to be paid. It also provides that two members of the Commission shall be appointed from citizens of the trust territories and three shall be from the staff of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

It would seem to me that two natives of the trust territory, if they agreed to any amount that is unreasonable, would only have to get one of the other three people on the Commission to agree with them. One American citizen and two foreigners, therefore, can draw on the Treasury of the United States.

What is the purpose of having natives, noncitizens of this country, if I am correct in this, to sit on this Commission?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I think the gentleman emphasizes a point that was brought out during the course of the consideration in committee of this joint resolution.

The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) felt that there ought to be more than two Micronesians on the Commission, because they are primarily concerned and they should be the ones who should help determine what are valid claims which could be satisfied from the funds made available under this authorization.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am concerned about the Federal taxpayers paying this when two out of the five members of the Commission and not U.S. citizens and are not Federal taxpayers. Am I correct in this assumption? Are they noncitizens of this country?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct. This is a trusteeship that the United States has over Micronesia.

But I might say that there will be no opportunity or possibility that there will be any exorbitant claims paid under this arrangement.

Mr. SCOTT. I would assure the gentleman that I am going to ask for a rollcall vote, and will oppose the legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I certainly see no reason why there should not be a rollcall vote, but I would suggest to the gentleman that there is quite obviously no justification for the argument that because of the two Micronesian members on the Commission that the Commission will operate improperly in deciding upon the validity of the claims. In fact, they will only be concerned with the validity and the legality of paying the claims. So, I would say that that argument has no basis or exceptional merit.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman from New Jersey not agree that when we are discussing control of the pursestrings of the Federal Government that those pursestrings ought to be held by American citizens?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am suggesting to the gentleman that if we make the money available that we will be doing it under circumstances and conditions through a commission that will be closely regulated, and they will not be paying any exorbitant claims.

We are making a determination to allow this responsibility to be placed in a source which is appropriate; namely, this five-man Commission. This has been done on many other occasions. I can see no raid being made on the Federal Treasury, if we determine that the amount is reasonable, and that the claims should be decided through specific procedures.

It is going to be an arduous job to discover who has claims, what the nature of the claim is, and how much should be paid to individual claimants.

But I might say that I see no possibility of abuse of this privilege by this proposal.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will yield further, I have oftentimes taken exception to some of the measures that are passed by this body by a majority vote of this House that, in my opinion, waste taxpayers' funds.

But the membership of the House are representatives of the people and whether I agree with the majority vote or not, it is at least decided by American representatives. But what I am concerned about is that people who are not taxpayers of this country, who are not citizens of this country, should have control—even though it is to a limited extent. I think this is sufficient justification for my opposition to the measure.

I can see where we can authorize a certain amount today, and perhaps next year when this Commission is established and is in operation, it may be that the measure will be back here with a request that this amount be increased because the Claims Commission has found that the amount we have authorized to be appropriated is not sufficient. So I can see where it is very important that we have American citizens sitting on this Claims Commission.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman from Virginia that the Micronesians will not be in control of the commission. There will be two of them out of the five, which does not give them control.

As representatives of the American people we must also keep in mind that it is our national obligation that we are talking about. It is about time we discharged our obligation to these people, who have suffered severe damage through no fault of their own, through wartime damage involving both this country and Japan. We are trying to pay long overdue compensation to these people.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, of course I appreciate the views of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who is a member of the committee. Reasonable men can differ. Nevertheless, I think this obligation is one that should be assumed by Japan. Japan was the aggressor nation.

I would say that when we are having as much difficulty as we are having these days with Japanese imports coming into our country in such large quantities, in direct competition to American industries, we should not have Japan paying in services and goods while cash is being paid by our Government.

To me this is something which is entirely unjustified. I cannot support this measure, and these are some of the reasons why I will vote against it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virgina (Mr. SCOTT) has made quite clear his opposition to the proposal. My response to the gentleman would be that even though he may feel the executive agreement is not an ideal thing, and that he may think that Japan should be paying the whole share, the fact is that there is no possibility we will get Japan to pay the whole bill.

We do owe an obligation to these people. The Japanese also are willing to make a substantial contribution in implicit recognition of their obligation to these people. This is an ex gratia payment on the part of both countries, and if we do not act now we will not be able to provide anything to the Micronesians.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we should remember that we should provide something, and provide it now.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement because he has stated very plainly the reasons that this agreement that has already been made and should be fulfilled. The question is whether the United States will now live up to the agreement upon which the Micronesians are depending.

I might add further, we really have a sense not only of responsibility under the trusteeship, but a feeling of gratitude toward these people because it was the friendliness of these islanders to our U.S. servicemen in the Pacific who moved in and were taking these islands from Japan, that saved many, many American lives in World War II. Having

been one of the ones who served on a U.S. carrier in the Pacific, I can say to you that it was the very friendliness of these people who were under Japanese domination that hurt them and saved American lives. The Micronesian peoples wanted U.S. forces to come. They were friendly to our U.S. men and they received us well and helped us on our way out to the Philippines and the other islands. So these were special helpful experiences for the U.S. Army troops, Air Force, and the U.S. Navy and Marines that were warmly welcomed. This assistance of the Micronesian peoples was badly needed. We in Congress and the American people should never forget what these native peoples did in World War II that helped our U.S. forces in the Pacific.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has consumed 13 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 617.

May I first pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements and the Members of his committee for their prompt and early action on this most important matter.

It may seem incredible to the people of this country that we would still be in the Congress of the United States today handling World War II damage claims—but that is exactly the purpose of this piece of legislation. The U.S. is currently serving as trustee of some 2,000 islands in the Pacific which stretch across an expanse of ocean as large as our own continent.

Prior to World War II these islands were by the League of Nations under mandate to Japan. These islands, as you all know, were the staging areas of many fierce battles during World War II, and the inhabitants of these islands suffered the loss and destruction of their property both during the war as well as during the time that the U.S. occupied them.

It is now more than 25 years since World War II ended, and yet after over a quarter of a century, we have yet to establish the means for considering the claims of the Micronesians for war inflicted damages to their homes and stores and farms and other properties.

House Joint Resolution 617 will authorize the establishment of the Micronesian Claims Commission which would be responsible for considering both the claims for the period of the war as well as for the postwar period up until July 1, 1951, for which this bill authorizes $5 million to be paid into the Micronesian claims fund as has been previously agreed to by executive agreement of April 18, 1969.

This grant would be over and above the regular funds appropriated by the Congress to administer the trust territory itself.

Japan, as you heard explained, has entered into an agreement to contribute $5 million in goods and services, so that there will be a total of $10 million available to pay these claims for damages.

If this exceeds the amount finally awarded by the Commission, the surplus will revert to the Micronesian budget to be spent by the Congress of Micronesia.

If the amount is less than the claims awards, the $10 million will be prorated among the claimants.

In addition, this bill authorizes $20 million to handle the post-secure claims caused by the destruction of houses and property after the U.S. gained control over the islands.

This amount is also to be over and above the trust territory budget for its administration. It will not, however, be placed in the claims fund but will be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior according to the Commission's decisions, and if there is a surplus in this appropriation, it will revert back to the U.S. Treasury.

The Interior Department has conducted a very comprehensive survey as to the damage claims and reports that there are some 1,232 claims that have been filed thus far, representing some $18.4 million in damages. While the figure in the bill is $20 million, it is felt that for reasons of the remoteness of some areas and opportunity afforded under the legislation to give extensive and wide information to all of the residents of the Trust Territories, that very likely there will be the $20 million worth of claims filed.

Over the last few years there has been considerable activity concerning the political status of the Trust Territory, and I submit that this is the essential reason for the importance of this legislation, apart from the specific nature of the claims themselves, and that this discussion, therefore, weighs heavily upon our future role as trustee in this important area of the Pacific.

The failure to date of the U.S. to compensate the Micronesians for their losses during World War II is taken by many of them today as proof that we cannot be relied upon to meet our moral, if not the legal responsibilities. This long delay has given rise to many doubts as to a continuance of our future relationship.

Some of the Micronesians involved in our political discussions question the continuance of our relationship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Hawaii has expired.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Hawaii I additional minute.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman.

So it is obviously an interest that extends beyond the immediate problem of compensating the people of the trust territories for their war claims. The negotiations between our country and Micronesia are at a very critical stage, and there is much to be lost if we delay again the resolution of these long-overdue payments. Our lack of action has been a source of anger and frustration among the Micronesians, who resent our failure to live up to these promises.

Therefore, there is an urgent necessity about this business at hand. The adoption of this legislation is a necessary step in the fulfillment of our responsibilities under the trusteeship agreement. This issue of war claims is of particular importance to the Micronesian people as they review their future relations with us.

Therefore, I urge the members of this committee to give their unequivocal support to House Joint Resolution 617.

(Mr. MEEDS, at the request of Mrs. MINK, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, for over 25 years now, the United States has administered the 2,173 specks of land lying in 3,000,000 square miles of ocean west of Hawaii. These islands are known as Micronesia. During this quarter century, the innocent people of Micronesia have gone uncompensated for the damage they suffered at the hands of Japan and the United States during World War II. But, in the meantime, war damages have been paid to their relatives on Guam, and to individuals in the Philippines who have no tie with the United States at all.

In 1968, I personally visited Micronesia with the Interior Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs. I have seen the bomb holes, the rusting remains of landing craft on the beaches and foundations of what formerly were substantial houses.

In the intervening 3 years, many Micronesians have visisted my office. The concern upper most in their minds has been the war claims. The issue is a festering one in Micronesia, which can go unattended no longer.

The claims are divided into two categories—those arising before the islands were secured by U.S. forces from Japan, presecure claims; and those arising after the United States was in control, postsecure claims. On April 18, 1969, the United States and Japan, after many years of negotiation, agreed to contribute, ex gratia, $5 million each for the satisfaction of presecure claims.

The agreement may be worded in terms of gift, and Japan may be technically responsible for the presecure damage, but make no mistake about it, we have a substantial responsibility and interest in seeing that the claims are paid, and paid now.

Our responsibility is derived from the fact that we administer Micronesia under an agreement with the United Nations and represent the territory in international affairs.

Our national interest is derived from the fact that Micronesia is a strategic trust territory placed between the United States and the powers of Asia. It is questionable whether we need the islands for military bases, but it is important to deny their use to other powers for military purposes.

The future political status of Micronesia is presently in limbo. We have negotiators seeking a closer relationship with the Micronesian people, similar to the commonwealth status of Puerto Rico. With these negotiations at a crucial stage it is important that we not prolong payment of just war claims any longer.

In addition to the presecure claims, the bill authorizes payment of postsecure claims in the amount of $20 million. These are solely the responsibility of the

United States. A Micronesian Claims Commission, under the aegis of the Foreign Claims Commission would determine the validity of all claims. The Foreign Claims Commission is known for its efficiency and from past experience can be expected to see that the job is completed within the 3-year statutory time limit.

Mr. Chairman, as the administering authority in Micronesia, the United States has a moral responsibility to see recompense paid. Micronesians suffered damage in World War II solely because they resided on the stepping stones between the United States and Japan. They were not at fault nor otherwise involved.

Bombs fell and the islands were strafed in the mid-1940's. Those Micronesians who actually lost a house, an arm or leg, or a relative, are fast approaching old age. If these people are to enjoy the benefits of the compensation due, we must act now.

I am pleased that this House is taking affirmative steps to resolve the outstanding Micronesian War Claims, and confident that our action here today will help lay to rest a major impediment to future good relations between the American and Micronesian people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a Member commenting on the pending joint resolution spoke of the substantial contributions already made by the United States to the area in question, and I waited in vain to hear him tell the House the extent of the "substantial contributions" already made.

Another speaker referred to the U.S. forces having gone into this area in World War II as though those U.S. forces were the only ones there, that they caused and were responsible for all the damage.

Then another Member spoke of the repatriation of the Japanese, asserting the Japanese have already expended money to repatriate their people.

Of course, it was the Japanese who violated the League of Nations mandate and went in and fortified some of these islands in preparation for World War II.

Who is responsible for the Japanese being there? Who is responsible for their repatriation? Of course it is the Japanese who are responsible for Japanese being in these islands.

This bill provides, as has previously been stated, for a $5 million ex gratia cash payment on the part of the United States. That means a payment as a favor—a handout. It provides for $5 million in goods and services from the Japanese, and another $20 million from the taxpayers of the United States to liquidate what is called post-secure claims.

The Japanese are responsible for all the damage that occurred and ought to have to pay by way of war reparations every dollar of the claims that are justified.

Moreover, I do not know what kind of a precedent this is going to set with respect to the turning over of Okinawa to the Japanese. Are we to be confronted with another multimillion-dollar payment to the Okinawans because the Japanese have been put to some expense to repatriate the Japanese who were on Okinawa? What kind of a precedent are we setting here?

I say again that I am opposed to this joint resolution, because the Japanese ought to pay every dollar of this by way of war reparations.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I can tell the gentleman one kind of a precedent we are setting. We are setting up a Claims Commission which will be here, if the country exists, in the year 2571. We have a War Claims Commission from World War I still going on. We can bet this one will, too.

So far as giving these people a dime is concerned, I am against it. If anybody owes it to them it is the Japanese. They did this to them; we did not.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his statement. If they have a dollar coming it is from the Japanese.

We were not on those islands of our own volition. We went there to dislodge the Japanese, who were the aggressors.

We ought to get some thanks from somebody for having liberated those people on those islands, for having freed them. They are free people today.

As I stand here today and see this kind of deal presented to the American people I cannot help but wonder who won World War II in the Pacific?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman in the well what these claims are for. What destruction did we cause in the Pacific? Were there big manufacturing establishments or something of that nature that we destroyed?

Mr. GROSS. I will leave it to some Member who is sponsoring this measure, some Member who is in favor of it, to answer that question. I can only say that I doubt there was any heavy industry destroyed.

Mr. CARTER. I was in those islands, and I saw none of the great areas that were damaged or destroyed to the extent of $20 million.

Again I want to agree with the distinguished gentleman in the well that it seems to me the Japanese caused all this conflict and they are the ones who are liable for it.

We would be accepting the blame for the war which they brought upon us in their dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right, and I thank the gentleman, from Kentucky for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. All I want to say in conclusion is that I have no doubt as to what is going to happen. This resolution will be approved. I never saw a Congress more free with the money of the taxpayers of this country than this first session of the 92d Congress.

Despite the fact that this Government has a $10 billion deficit in its international balance of payments there is no concern about spewing out another $25 million anywhere in the world.

Make no mistake, this is another foreign aid handout that this country cannot afford. How is it proposed to stop the staggering outflow of American dollars and end or even diminish the deficit in the balance of international payments if this sort of expenditure is to be approved? If $25 million cannot be saved here how in heaven's name is it proposed to restore any semblance of sanity in the Government's financial affairs at home and abroad? And remember that this $25 million will be added to the $60 million that is being handed out this year to these natives.

How many cities of this Nation of 90,000 population will have $85 million to spend this year or the next?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I notice in the report it is indicated the committee has been assured by the Interior Department there will be no pay in excess of GS–15 for this Commission. Is there a deadline for this Commission to do its work, and is there a binding limitation on the pay of the Commissioners?

Mr. GROSS. I suggest the gentleman ask the sponsors of this measure. They wrote it. They are supporting it. Even though there is a termination date for the Commission, I have never seen or heard of one being disbanded when it was promised it would be. Whether needed or not these Commissions go on for years.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reiterate the opposition I voted in committee to House Joint Resolution 167. We are giving Japan a relatively free ride in Micronesia with regard to the damages visited on the trust territories as a result of Japanese action. What has not been mentioned thus far is the fact that we already contribute some $60 million to $75 million a year toward the upkeep of these islands. It seems incredible to me that the Japanese can meet its obligations in the form of goods and services when the U.S. Government must contribute $5 million in cash. In my opinion this arrangement which results from an Executive agreement concluded by the United States and Japan, is unfair to the American people. Japan, whose gross national product ranks near the top among the developed nations of the world, should also pay its share of these claims in cash. Therefore, at the opportune time I propose to offer an amendment to change the contribution of the Japanese from one of services and products to cash.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the original bill

that was sent to the Congress by the administration provided only for the $5 million U.S. contribution in wartime claims and for the establishment of the Mirconesian Claims Commission. The Department of State a that time felt that the joinder of the wartime and post secure claims would impede the settlement of the former while the Department of the Interior felt that the joinder of these two types of claims would help assuage the Micronesians and felt the sum in agreement with the Japanese was both inadequate and tardy. Differences were resolved in an executive communication of January 26, 1971, in which the administration submitted a draft bill including both wartime and post secure claims authorizations. That was the bill that was then subsequently introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) on behalf of the administration and supported by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. Chairman, this is an administration bill. I hope very much that it will receive the approval of the House today.

I can understand the irritation of the gentleman from Iowa. I have read carefully his dissenting views and heard his testimony before the Committee on Rules. However, I think we have to consider this measure in the context of some very current events. I heard on the radio as I came to work this morning a report that today the final agreements were signed in connection with the transfer of our reliquishment of sovereignty over the islands of Okinawa. We are retiring to that extent from this very important and strategic base in the Pacific. So I think there are some very overriding strategic considerations that are involved in this case. It is in the overall interests of the United States to approve this particular settlement and to implement it with the legislation that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs so overwhelmingly recommended.

Therefore, I repeat that I hope this bill will be adopted.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for 20 years now this matter has been perplexing the Congress of the United States and especially those committees having jurisdiction over this area. This legislation brings it to a head and I hope disposes of it once and for all.

This legislation and the benefits that are provided by it should in no wise be confused with any of the so-called administrative costs that we have funded in the Micronesian trust territory up to the present time. Those expenditures have been made through the Department of the Interior. That Department's jurisdiction has been from authorizations originating in the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. Such expenditures have to do with our everyday housekeeping in an endeavor to build up the economy, the educational, social, and political values as well as the friendly relationship between the people of the Micronesian islands and the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is in order and it will have to be taken care of sooner or later. There is no question about that.

Each one of us can have his own ideas as to the equities which are involved insofar as the Japanese are concerned, or as to whether or not Japan should pay in goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the money benefits. I think it is in order and I think it is long overdue.

Apparently, we are presently physically in this area for an entirely different reason than we are in Okinawa, Japan or the Philippines. Do not let anyone have the wrong idea as to our being in Micronesia. Do not let anyone have the wrong idea that we should not by some means or other keep these people friendly to the United States of America. We need them and they need us. Any contribution that we make in this way is proper.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this joint resolution is in order and I support the legislation wholeheartedly.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado could tell us since the war how much we have paid for the upkeep of Micronesia?

Mr. ASPINALL. We have not paid anything for the settlement of war claims in Micronesia. We have attempted to discharge our responsibilities over a mandated area under our jurisdiction. We have endeavored to build up the economy so that one of these days they can be a part of the United States of America.

We authorized in the beginning $4 million a year and then we authorized up to $20 million annually, and such moneys were for the purpose of the building of schools, public buildings, highways and ports for the purpose of bringing these people into our economy as nearly as possible.

We are endeavoring through this legislation to see to it that our relationship with Micronesia is permanent and that no longer will they have the same kind of political control that they had under the Germans, the Spanish and the Japanese. We hope that they will be part of the United States of America.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, to rephrase my question, "in discharging our responsibilities would it be safe to assume that we have spent about $1 billion?"

Mr. ASPINALL. No, we have not spent any $1 billion. I think I would be safe in assuming that we have not spent over $200 million, certainly not $1 billion and not a cent which we have spent has gone for the purposes of this particular legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which has bipartisan support. The leadership on our side of the aisle is for the bill and supports it. This bill is the result of negotiations which began in 1952 shortly after the treaty with Japan.

I think one could probably in hindsight say that our people in the State Department made a mistake in the fact that they did not seek to secure proper provisions in our treaty with Japan in order to see that these claims were paid by the Japanese. However, that was not done.

Immediately thereafter the Micronesian reparations questions came up for solution. The Japanese were less than enthusiastic about doing anything. In fact, they made certain counter claims as a result of the fact that certain Japanese who were in Micronesia were repatriated, having to leave their business and property in Micronesia.

However, negotiations were continued and in 1966 there was a compromise. This compromise is brought to the floor of the House in the form of this joint resolution today.

It is true that the compromise costs the U.S. Treasury $5 million and it is also true that there is a Claims Commission set up which is authorized to hear claims for damages resulting from U.S. actions during the war, as well as post-secure claims.

So, possibly, the whole matter will cost $25 million to the taxpayers of the United States.

Weighing the cost to the taxpayers against the realities of the situation. I think we should observe that the individual Micronesians who lost their property have waited for 25 years for someone to do something about their claims.

Mr. Chairman, these are not wealthy people. They are poor people. Many of them have waited to reestablish their economic lives until these claims are settled.

It has been the policy of the Japanese to make reparations payments for their activities in World War II by turning over goods and services rather than cash, and they insist in this instance on continuing that pattern.

If it were not for the agreement finally made, I think it is safe to say the Japanese would not be paying anything to Micronesia, in any form.

So you can look at this agreement in two ways. You can look at it as costing the United States a possible $25 million, or you can look at it as costing the United States $25 million when it would have cost $30 million if the Japanese had not finally agreed to furnish $5 million in goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, this is possibly not the way you and I would have solved this problem. Nevertheless, in my opinion the equities are in favor of this resolution. If it passes, the individual Micronesians may go on an reestablish their private economic lives. I think this is not only in their interests, but in the interests of the United States and the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know very much about this bill, and I was not present on the day the bill came

out of the committee, but I have heard a good bit on the floor, and the more I hear the more I am convinced that we ought to forget this legislation.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) says that we have spent $200 million out in Micronesia. I am told by one of the committee members that there are 90,000 people out there. This is about $20,000 a head.

Now, you talk about the priorities, and you talk about ghettos, and you talk about poverty. I will tell you one thing, if we could spend $20,000 a head for all the poor people of this country, I think we would cure poverty in a big hurry.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman's mathematics may have slipped a little. It would come out to $2,000 a head.

Mr. HAYS. $2,000 a head, yes. I am sorry. That is right. It is $2,000 a head. I carried one too many zeroes over there when I was dividing that in my head.

But let me say this to you. The other reason I am opposed to this thing is that you can bet your bottom dollar that if we hooked up with the Japanese in this deal, and they are putting in $5 million worth of goods and services, and we are putting up $5 million in cash, that they will soak up our $5 million in cash when they send the people down there to provide the services.

Here is another thought, and that is that you cannot export anything from the United States into Japan except raw materials. You look out here on the highway, and you see one of those Toyota cars, or a Corona, or whatever make it happens to be. You see them running up and down our streets, and the maximum amount they paid to get that car into the United States is $50.

Do you know what the minimum cost is for importing a U.S.-built car into Japan? It is $450. As a consequence, there is no competition over there. It is a closed market.

Another thing, these Japanese are the ones who caused the damage over there, and they are the ones that should pay the bill. We have put in $200 million, and now they are going to put in $5 million worth of goods and services. Is that not great? Such generosity overwhelms me.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. The gentleman quoted some figures, about $200 million being sent over there by the United States, but it should be understood that we are going to give them another $60 million this year, as well.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; we will give and give and give.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into any arguing contest with my friend, but I do wish to have this picture clear so far as the contributions of the United States to which the gentleman has referred. We have paid nothing to the claimants who will be benefited under this bill. What we have given—and I am sorry that I have used the word "given"—what we have appropriated, has been money used to take care of our own administrative responsibilities under the United Nations mandate.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. ASPINALL. And to set up schools.

Mr. HAYS. Presumably, this benefited Micronesia; did it not?

Mr. ASPINALL. If it did not benefit Micronesia, then I am sorry to tell my friend, if it did not benefit Micronesia, as it should have, it was because of poor administration on our part. But it also benefits us to a certain extent because it is the United States which is defending on the rebuilding of this area and giving it something other than an existence furthered through conquest and maintained by a subsistence existence. I see no way in the world, that sooner or later we are going to have to take care of the equities of this claim.

Mr. HAYS. I have had a good deal of experience through the years with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Whenever you take care of the Micronesian situation, you can bet your bottom dollar that they will dig up somebody else to have some claims because if there are not any claims, then there is no reason to have the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. You know they ran out of claims some while back and you know what they did? They dug up some Bulgarian claims. How in the world we ever got mixed up in paying anybody in Bulgaria, I do no know. But they figured it out.

This is just another move on the part of the War Claims Settlement Commission to perpetuate that bureaucracy which long since ought to have been laid in the shed.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this bill should be defeated. I say we have spent enough money in the Micronesia area, if you come right down to it, and at the price it is costing us, it would be better to sink the place than to spend any more money.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a question was raised about the life of this commission created in this bill. The commission that is created will last only for 3 years, and then it will go out of business.

The parent commission, of course, has been in business for many years and probably will continue. But this bill only gives them authority to act with respect to those claims for a period of 3 years.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Actually, what is going to happen, though, is that the War Claims Settlement Commission would really be a 3-year commission; is that not a fact?

Mr. FRASER. There are five commissioners, three from the staff and two are Micronesians—for a 3-year period.

Mr. HAYS. This really then—and, in fact, I do not wish to get into semantics and argue semantics with the gentleman—is not the effect of this that then the War Claims Settlement Commission will be in business for 3 more years?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, in other words, 3 more years.

I do not argue on the gentleman's point. There are other Members who have served as members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission itself. I am sure the gentleman has expressed himself very forcefully in the past that perhaps something ought to be done with respect to this commission, but I am just pointing out here, that they are the source for the appointment of the special claims commission and its life will only be for a 3-year period.

Mr. HAYS. And after that they will probably dig up some Vietnamese claims and I promise you, they will be back.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the other point I want to make is that the payments to the commissioners could not exceed a figure of $22,000 and $24,000 which is the amount payable at a GS–15 level and is the maximum that the commissioners could be paid.

The only other point I would like to make is that this involves an area as large as the United States itself. It is in the central part of the Pacific and if we should fail to accept our responsibility by enacting this bill, it will clearly exacerbate our relations with Micronesia and it would seem to me to be pennywise and pound foolish to jeopardize the kind of relationships we need to maintain with the people of this mandated territory.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Minnesota know of any effective way to cause Japan to pay any more than she will pay under the arrangement which is called for in this bill?

Mr. FRASER. There simply is none.

The Japanese for a long time, I think, have been prepared to do nothing. The only kind of leverage I think you can put on the Japanese would be to involve this issue in a major contest over a trade policy or in other relationships have nothing to do with this problem.

I think that all that would do would make it pretty difficult for a very important ally.

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will yield further, the practical situation is that unless we pass this joint resolution, first, the Micronesians will have to wait even longer than the 25 years which has elapsed since World War II for reimbursement and second, any further negotiations would probably result in about the same settlements we have now, if there is any settlement at all.

Mr. FRASER. I would only estimate that if we do not accept this agreement arrived at by the executive branch, we are likely to end up with no contribution at all.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota, the

chairman of the subcommittee, and the Republican member handling the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), for their leadership in bringing this joint resolution to the floor, and I express the hope that it receives strong support from this body.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me that as to those Members who have spoken about the problem with Japan, if we should turn our backs on Micronesia at this time and fail to recognize the legitimacy of their claims, would we not indeed be playing right into the hands of the Japanese, and the Japanese would probably like nothing better than to see us forsake and antagonize the people of this area?

Mr. FRASER. I do not wish to impute that motive to the people of Japan at this time. I think they are a very important ally of the United States. We have a mutual defense treaty with them. The beneficiaries of this agreement are not the Japanese. They are the Micronesians. The gentleman is quite right about that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is a joint resolution that I am especially interested in. I believe I have earned my right to be especially interested. We fellows who served in World War II in the Pacific are very grateful to every one of these Micronesians for the friendly welcome and assistance they gave voluntarily when these islands were being taken by our various troops—Marines, the Navy, the Army—on their campaigns westward across the far Pacific to the Philippine Islands. Unless these Micronesian people had been friendly, if they had been friendly to Japan instead of to us, many of us would have lost our lives, and we U.S. Pacific servicemen are deeply grateful.

I remember the last night I was on the carrier *Makin Island*, in January 1945, just before I came back here in 1945, having been elected to Congress from the U.S. Navy in the Pacific. The officers on our carrier got together and said, "JIMMIE FULTON, if there is one thing you do when you go back, you make sure that no new generation of Americans has to take these islands. Make sure that no new generation has to fight all over to do the job again." What tragic losses of fine U.S. servicemen were necessary for this purpose in World War II.

Here are 2,000 islands, over 3 million square miles, a buffer between the Philippines and Hawaii that will prevent another Pearl Harbor, and some Members are questioning $5 million that Congress should not give, but should let Japan do it. If Congress throws these people down and refuses to compensate for war damage, and occupation damage, by saying, "We will not give a penny," by defeating this bill today, and Japan goes through with her part of the bargain, $5 million worth of services, the United States will discover that Congress has made a tremendous mistake. The United States needs this area for our basic future security. We Congressmen know that we must have U.S. defense in depth. This gives us defense in depth. It was my resolution in 1947 that originally approved the U.S. takeover of these islands under a U.N. Security Council trusteeship, the only trusteeship of the United Nations which gives the trustee the power to fortify, and my purpose was U.S. future security.

The United States can fortify and is watching over these islands for our own defense. These fine Micronesian people have been wonderful friends, and in return for their World War II help, and continued friendship, we owe a legal and moral obligation to defend them, to help them progress and raise their standard of living—yes, and to have their continued cooperattion and participation as advancing peoples in the free world community.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, in concluding the debate, I would like to state that we should surely not forget these people or consider the measure merely another gimmick. We have an obligation to the Micronesians, and in spite of how we might feel about our relationship with Japan, and whether or not Japan should be making or has made reparations to this country for wartime activities, we have obligations.

Some Members have said today that the Japanese were responsible for all the damages that would be recognized in payments due under this joint resolution.

That of course is not the truth. Americans caused damage both in the securing of the islands and in the use of the islands in the so-called post secure period.

True; it may be that the damage was caused by the United States, because of action taken against us by Japan. Perhaps we could have claimed reparations both for damage caused by us in Micronesia and for other damage inflicted on the United States.

The basic fact that remains and that we should not forget is that there are obligations, moral and legal, the United States owes to the Micronesians which we need to remedy. We need to act now. The amounts are not large. There will be no substantial drain on the taxpayers.

I would suggest we have no way in which we could turn the whole bill over to Japan and expect any relief for the Micronesians. The thing for us to do is to face up to the facts, to accept the fact that the Japanese are making a substantial contribution, that the goods and services which are to be provided by Japan will be transmuted into cash, and will be added to the cash provided by the United States for the benefit of Micronesians.

So a great deal is at stake in this resolution. I believe it is high time we acted to meet our obligations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARCHER. Has the Defense Department taken any position on the importance of our relationship with Micronesia as respects the security of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sure no one would question the fact that the Micronesia Islands are of strategic importance. I do not happen to remember specific Defense Department witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee.

Mr. ARCHER. Specifically has the Defense Department taken a position on the importance of this legislation with respect to the security of the United States?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe this legislation affects the security of the United States. This legislation, however, certainly affects reasonable relationships with the Micronesians, and that has an important bearing on the United States. I believe it would be an exaggeration to say our own security is involved in whether or not we meet these obligations to Micronesia.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to say, in response to the last inquiry, in the hearings held a year ago Admiral Lemos of the U.S. Navy did testify with respect to the strategic importance of the islands to the United States. While we did not call him in the hearings this year, but the testimony is in the hearings for last year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, these islands were occupied by Japan between World War I and World War II. They were in the possession of Japan when World War II was commenced.

We took these islands away from Japan step by step as we went through the Pacific. We paid a very dear price to get them. I was there. Many Members here were there and participated in those campaigns.

At the end of World War II these islands were in the possession of the U.S. Navy. They were turned over to the United Nations, and the United Nations entered into a trust agreement whereby the United States assumed responsibility for the administration of the trust territory.

We agreed to provide economic development, to provide educational aid, to provide health aid and other needed assistance to the trust territory of the Pacific.

I have attended meetings on three occasions at the United Nations in New York, when we were questioned in regard to our stewardship of the trust territory. The delegates from Russia, France, and other nations asked very critical questions as to what we were doing.

I have also visited these islands. Our failure to pay war damage claims is a very tender point.

Japan would like to get the islands back. They have one advantage, because a lot of people there are descendants of the Japanese who occupied the land.

The people there are inherently friendly to the United States. I believe it is clearly in our interest to show these people we are more friendly to them than are the Japanese. We cannot afford to let Japan take these islands back. It is

to our strategic advantage, it is to our military advantage, it is to our advantage in all respects to retain a friendly relationship with these islands.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Would the gentleman in the well tell us how much the Japanese have paid the Micronesians since the war, while we have contributed to the upkeep, to the health and welfare of the Micronesians?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe our payments have been under our trust responsibility, under the United Nations. I do not believe the Japanese Government has had that responsibility.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might say to the gentleman, it was the United States which had possession of the islands at the end of World War II. It was the United States which wanted to keep them. It was the United States which entered into the trust arrangement with the United Nations to keep them, and to be responsible for their economic development, educational development, and health development. We have an additional responsibility to that which Japan has.

Mr. WOLFF. But the Japanese have paid nothing since the war to the Micronesians. Is that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Of course, our U.S. trusteeship is the sole trusteeship. It is not a divided trusteeship under the Security Council with the right to veto. Thank heavens the United States had the sense to take over these former Japanese mandated islands as the sole trustee instead of a four power geographic division as in Europe. I agree with you thoroughly. We fellows who were in the Pacific in World War II, who helped to take these islands know that every U.S. serviceman living today who served in the Pacific, wants these islands held by the United States so that no new generation will have to retake them. We want these people to succeed and progress. My hope is that some day they will want to become a new State of the United States—think of it, covering 3 million square miles, as large as the whole continental United States 48 States, and containing 102,000 friendly people, with 2,000 beautiful islands.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 617

To authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of the Second World War, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission.

Whereas certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, formerly under League of Nations mandate to Japan, suffered from the hostilities of the Second World War; and

Whereas the United States, while not liable for wartime damages suffered by the Micronesians, has responsibility for the welfare of the Micronesian people as the administering authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

Whereas the Governments of Japan and the United States entered into an agreement on April 18, 1969, to contribute ex gratia the equivalent of $10,000,000 to the Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in view of the suffering caused by the hostilities of the Second World War, each Government contributing the equivalent of $5,000,000, Japan's contribution to take the form of products and services; and

Whereas payment of these ex gratia contributions to certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will meet a longstanding Micronesian grievance and will promote the welfare of the Micronesian people; and

Whereas certain Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands claim to have suffered damage to or loss or destruction of property, personal injury, or death caused by military and civilian employees of the United States Government and arising out of accidents or incidents between the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by the United States Armed Forces and July 1, 1951, and within an area under the control of the United States at the time of the accident or incident; and

Whereas the United States is desirous of making an equitable settlement of these claims by way of a monetary contribution: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this resolution may be cited as the "Micronesian Claims Act of 1971".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) It is the purpose of this title that, with respect to war claims, the United States should make an ex gratia contribution of $5,000,000 matching an equivalent contribution of the Government of Japan, to Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who are determined by the Micronesian Claims Commission to be meritorious claimants, in particular amounts to be awarded by the Micronesian Claims Commission, and that the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary", or his designee, shall pay to said Micronesian claimants as soon as possible following his receipt of the final report of the Micronesian Claims Commission on the claims allowed, such amounts as are finally certified pursuant to section 104 of this title.

(b) A "Micronesian inhabitant of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" is defined for the purposes of this joint resolution as a person who:

(1) became a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on July 18, 1947, and who remains a citizen as of the date of filing a claim; or

(2) if then living, would have been eligible for citizenship on July 18, 1947; or

(3) is the successor, heir, or assignee of a person eligible under paragraph (1) or (2) and who is a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as of the date of filing a claim.

SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands $5,000,000, in addition to the normal budgetary expenditures for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and in addition to the appropriations authorized by section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, to be paid into a "Micronesian Claims Fund". The Secretary is hereby authorized to create and manage said Micronesian Claims Fund.

(b) Funds approximating $5,000,000 appropriated to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for supplies or capital improvements in accordance with the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, shall be paid into a Micronesian Claims Fund as the products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people in the amount of one billion eight hundred million yen (currently computed at $5,000,000) are provided by Japan pursuant to article I of the "Agreement between the United States of America and Japan", signed April 18, 1969. These funds, together with the sum authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) of this section, shall constitute the whole of the Micronesian Claims Fund.

SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established a Micronesian Claims Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission", such Commission to be under the control and direction of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Commission shall be composed of five members, who shall be appointed, in consultation with the Secretary, by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, one of whom he shall designate as Chairman. Two members shall be selected from a list of Micronesian citizens nominated by the congress of Micronesia. Any vacancy that may occur in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. The members of the Commission shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. No Commissioner shall hold other public office or engage in any other employment during the period of his service on the Commission, except as an employee of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission shall receive compensation and allowances as determined by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by application of the rules and regulations which apply to officers and employees of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but in no event shall traveling and other expenses incurred in connection with their duties as members, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof, exceed that prescribed in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code. The term of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (e) of this section for winding up the affairs of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, appoint and fix the compensation and allowances of such oceffirs, attorneys, and employees of the Commission as may be reasonably necessary for its proper functioning, which employees shall be in addition to those who may be assigned by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The compensation and allowances of employees appointed pursuant to this section shall be within the rules and regulations which apply to officers and employees of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, but in no event to exceed the amount of allowances prescribed in subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code. In addition, the Commission, with the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Commission, may make such expenditures as may be reasonably necessary to carry out its proper functioning. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government of the United States or the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, with or without reimbursement, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government of the United States or

the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, utilize, with or without reimbursement, the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary for carrying out its functions. As expeditiously as possible and, in any event, within three months of its appointment, the Commission shall give public notice in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be given in such manner as the Commission shall prescribe: *Provided*, That the final date for the filing of claims shall not be more than one year after the appointment of the full membership of the Commission. The Commission shall give extensive publicity in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the provisions of this Act and shall make every effort to advise promptly all persons who may be entitled to file claims under the provisions of this Act administered by the Commission of their rights under such provisions, and to assist them in the preparation and filing of their claims. A majority of the membership of the Commission shall be necessary to transact business: *Provided, however*, That an affirmative vote of at least three members shall be required for the promulgation of rules and regulations, and for the final adjudication of any claim.

(c) The Commission shall wind up its affairs as expeditiously as possible and in any event not later than three years after the expiration of the time for filing claims under this Act.

SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall have authority to receive, examine, adjudicate, and render final decisions, in accordance with the laws of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and international law, with respect to (1) claims of the Micronesian inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered loss of life, physical injury, and property damage directly resulting from the hostilities between the Government of Japan and the United States between December 7, 1941, and the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by United States Armed Forces, and (2) those claims arising as postwar claims between the dates of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by United States Armed Forces and July 1, 1951. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full amount of such claim shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives, with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or revise its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed with respect to such claim. When all claims have been adjudicated, the Commission shall certify them to the Secretary for payment. The claims covered by title I of this Act shall be paid from the Micronesian Claims Fund except that, as to claims based on death, up to $1,000 shall be paid immediately upon adjudication, and the claims covered by title II of this Act shall be paid by the Secretary from the funds appropriated for such purpose.

(b) No later than six months after its organization, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall make a report, through the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to the Congress of the United States concerning its operations under this Act. The Commission shall, upon winding up its work, certify to the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Secretary, and to the Congress of the United States the following:

(1) A list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part, together with the amount of each claim and, the amount awarded thereon.

(2) A list of all claims disallowed.

(3) A copy of the decision rendered in each case.

(c) In the event that funds remain in the Micronesian Claims Fund after all allowable and adjudicated claims are paid, such remaining funds shall be transferred from the Micronesian Claims Fund to the Treasury of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for appropriation by the Congress of Micronesia for the welfare of the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In the event that the allowable and adjudicated claims covered by title I of the Act exceed a total of $10,000,000, the Secretary shall make pro rata payments.

(d) No payment shall be made on an award of the Commission unless the claimant shall first execute a full release to the United States and Japan in respect to any alleged liability of the United States or Japan, or both, arising before the date of the securing of the various islands of Micronesia by the United States Armed Forces.

SEC. 105. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the operation and administrative expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to the extent needed to cover activity connected with this Act, and of the Commission in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 106. The agreement for the payment of the Micronesian claims covered by title I of this Act having been reached by negotiators of the Governments of the United States and Japan, and since personnel to be appointed by the Secretary or the Commission will be available to assist the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands insofar as may be necessary in filing all claims covered by either title I or title II of this Act, no remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant, or any association of claimants, in connection with any claim or claims covered by either title I or title II shall exceed, in total, 1 per centum of the amount paid on such claim or claims, pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Fees already paid for such services shall be deducted from the amount authorized by this Act. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations by the final settlement of meritorious postwar claims, the Micronesian Claims Commission is, pursuant to authority granted in section 104(a) of title I, authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of all claims by Micronesian inhabitants against the United States or the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on account of personal injury or death or damage to or loss or destruction of private property, both real and personal, of Micronesian inhabitants of the former Japanese mandated islands, now the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations, including claims for taking or for use or retention of such property where no payments or inadequate payments have been made for such taking, use, or retention when such damage, loss, or destruction was caused by the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or individual members thereof, including military personnel and United States Government civilian employees, and including employees of the Trust Territory government acting within the scope of their employment: *Provided*, That only those claims shall be considered by the Commission which are presented in writing as provided for in section 103 (d) of title I of this Act and the accident or incident out of which the claim arose occurred prior to July 1, 1951, within the islands which now comprise the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and within an area under the control of the United States at the time of the accident or incident; *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such Commission and any such payments made by the Secretary under the authority of title I or title II shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary and not subject to review.

SEC. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the amount of $20,000,000, in addition to the normal budgetary expenditures for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and in addition to the appropriation authorized by section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, to be expended by the Secretary for the purposes of making payments to the extent authorized by this title of this Act.

SEC. 203. Any funds appropriated for the purposes of this title which remain after the settlement of claims under the provisions of this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FRASER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there have been a few statements made here that ought to be cleared up.

In the first place, as I understand it, these islands are a trust territory which we have in trust from the United Nations. If that is true, we cannot fortify them or use them in any way militarily.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. All right. You are the one I am talking to, so I yield to you.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It was my resolution that took the islands over and put them in trusteeship under the Security Council and not under the General Assembly.

Mr. HAYS. That does not make any difference.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We have the specific right to fortify them, and we have the veto. I can assure you of that because it was my resolution that did it.

Mr. HAYS. I understand from hearing you talk that you took the islands and had them given to us to keep. But that is neither here nor there.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. HAYS. Whether you took them singlehandedly or not I do not care. If you did, that is all very well. The point

I am making is that the gentleman said in so many words it would prevent another Pearl Harbor. It will not do any such thing. It is an absolutely specious argument. The fact is that whether we have these islands and pay this amount or $60 million a year would not prevent a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor or any place else. So, I think that argument can be discounted.

Now, the next argument that I heard is that we have to keep these people friendly. They are pretty expensive friends, I would say.

I am told that we are spending $60 million this year in improvements out there and yet we have to give them another $5 million besides in order to keep them friendly. I do not know, but that has been the argument we have been using around here for a long time. But, frankly, if the price of friendship has gone up that much I feel like getting a little hostile myself. I think the price is pretty high for the results we are getting.

Mr. Chairman, the essential thing that irks me about this joint resolution, although I might vote for it but I am not sure—is the manner in which we let the Japanese get off the hook. I hate to see the Japanese get off the hook as they will if this joint resolution is finally adopted. However, this lets them off the hook once and for all for zero dollars—$5 million in goods and services notwithstanding. I suppose they will put the price tag on both goods and services and if I know anything about the Japanese we might get about $350,000 worth of goods and services for the price of $5 million.

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

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. If we had to write the Japanese treaty over—and I am sure the gentleman and I would not do it in the way it was done—does the gentleman know any way whereby we could make Japan pay any more than this?

Mr. HAYS. I do not think we can make them pay any more, but I do not like letting them get off the hook. Let the Micronesians get mad at them. They will get mad at us if we put up this $5 million and another $50 million this year. Maybe, we ought to let them get mad and be done with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We "loaned" the Japanese approximately $1.8 billion after World War II, and that was settled a few years ago for some $480 million. Included in that settlement was the earmarking of a substantial amount of the $400 million to teach the Japanese how to market their products.

Mr. HAYS. I can say to the gentleman from Iowa that some have talked about our great allies and our treaty of alliance with Japan. Well, I can tell the gentleman that I have not been out there but once, and I think I know a lot more about NATO and its operations than I do about the Japanese, but I got the distinct impression that they are allies of ours as long at it is to their financial interest to do so and that they would do to us if they thought they could get by with it what they did to us 25 years ago, what they did back in 1941.

I can say with reference to the Japanese friendship that you will have a hard time selling it to me.

What are they doing to us in trade? They are dumping products into this country which they will not sell at the same price to their own people. Yet they are selling them to our manufacturers to put our people out of jobs and that does not indicate to me that you hang your hat on them with very much assurance except that you will lose your hat.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: Page 3, line 4, after the word "equivalent" add word "cash"

On page 4, lines 16–17, after word "fund" delete "as products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people in."

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, the purposes of this amendment are simple. It is to be substitute cash for the Japanese contribution of services and equipment. No one can tell us how an appraisal or an estimate is to be made of the value of the services that are contributed.

We have heard that we have already contributed some $200 million to the Micronesians for the support services which we have incurred as a result of our trusteeship. We are giving them additionally about $60 million to $75 million a year to further this effort in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Japanese economy is strong enough for them to be able to support their contribution in cash as well as goods.

Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the general purposes of this resolution, but I am opposed to the fact that we have to bear the complete cash burden of the reparations.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) and to point out that the yen in world commerce is stronger than the U.S. dollar. What in the world are we doing here today permitting the Japanese to put up their share of the so-called ex gratia payment in goods and services, while we put up cash? American labor can produce transistor radios and other products as well as the Japanese, and we have unemployed in this country.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York provides that the Japanese must put up cash the same as we do. I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I would assume that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is adopted, that this would mean that we would throw out the agreement that we have negotiated with the Japanese, and we would have to renegotiate this from the start?

Mr. WOLFF. It would obviously have to be renegotiated.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, is it the intention of the gentleman from New York to punish the Japanese in some way, or is it to assist the Micronesians and give them something of greater value?

Mr. WOLFF. It is not to punish the Japanese, it is to see to it that the Japanese do however, bear their full share of the burden.

Mr. FRASER. Is that in the interest of the Micronesians?

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, I think it is in the interest of the Micronesians.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman have any intent from any spokesman for the Micronesian people that they would prefer to have this whole agreement thrown back into limbo, and wait another maybe 20 years, so as to have the dubious advantage of having the possibility of getting cash at some time in the future?

Does the gentleman from New York have any ideas on that?

Mr. WOLFF. No, but can the gentleman from Minnesota say as far as the goods and services are concerned, who determines the values of the goods and services rendered.

Mr. FRASER. I cannot. But the point is that this agreement has been negotiated over many years. The Micronesians have waited 25 years to file their lawful claims. In my judgment these people should not have to wait any longer. I think the effort which the gentleman makes in their behalf is one that I do not believe they want.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be good enough to explain just briefly what his amendment proposes to do?

Mr. WOLFF. The amendment proposes that the Japanese contribution be made in cash rather than in goods and services.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) for the simple reason that at least if this bill passes we will be assured that the Japanese will pay an equal amount with us.

The gentleman from Iowa made the point about the Japanese yen in the international monetary circles. And I said earlier that you can bet your bottom dollar that if the Japanese get to make their share in goods and services that this will be at cut-rate prices, and instead of being worth $5 million, it will

be a lot less, more likely about $1.5 million worth.

So this would be something for the Micronesians, in answer to the gentleman's question about who is going to decide the value of these goods and services. You know who is going to determine it, if this goes through. It will be the Japanese, and you can bet that the value will be pretty low.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman, he says his amendment provides that the Japanese shall pay cash. Is that the end of it? Suppose they do not pay in cash? Then what happens under the gentleman's proposal?

Mr. WOLFF. As a result of this I imagine we will have to renegotiate with the Japanese. What we have here is an Executive agreement.

By the way, the word "treaty" has been bandied around here, there is no treaty. This is an Executive agreement.

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not at all unfriendly with the gentleman's amendment. It is just that I am trying to find out what we are voting on. I cannot understand how we can determine what the Japanese are going to do if we determine what we will not do.

Mr. WOLFF. The purpose of the resolution is to facilitate the agreement that was made, and we can either vote it up or we can vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WOLFF was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the committee report correctly, on page 5 it says that this particular executive agreement was entered into after long and arduous negotiations which extended over a period of 17 years between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States.

So, in other words, what the gentleman from New York is suggesting that we do by adopting here his amendment is to kick overboard this executive agreement and throw it out.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. And it would be requiring them to enter into a long series of protracted negotiations.

Mr. WOLFF. I do not think our negotiators did a very good job.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has described his amendment as one that, "would facilitate the executive agreement which has been made"—but he also says he seeks to provide that the proposed Japanese contribution shall be paid in cash. Well, on the face of it, the language changes and the resolution would not accomplish that objective.

In his description of his amendment, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from New York indicated he really was trying to torpedo the executive agreement and not to facilitate anything.

I would point out that on page 4, as an example of the limitations of the language on line 16 and 17, it would make a non sequitur. It says nothing about what kind of contribution would be made by the Japanese because that language was stricken out. Yet the executive agreement says the contribution shall be made in services or in kind.

So, even if we wanted to say that we thought the Japanese ought to be making a cash contribution, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would not accomplish that objective.

I would stress the fact that we should not be so agitated about what we feel about the state of relations between Japan and the United States that we forget our obligations to the Micronesians, which is the purpose of this resolution.

The best we could hope to get so far as the Japanese are concerned and as a result of 17 years of discussions is a contribution of $5 million in goods and in kind. So I would hope we would accept the committee language—because it would provide a concrete contribution from this country and also a concrete contribution from Japan.

I admit that the contribution from Japan will not be in cash, but the goods will be transmuted into cash and the cash will then be made available to the Micronesians themselves.

This is not a question of the Micronesians getting some dollars from the United States and television sets from the Japanese. The kind—the materials that will be supplied by the Japanese will be changed into cash and it will then be made available to the Micronesians.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. Does the gentleman from New Jersey agree with me that the people who will suffer if the amendment is adopted will be the Micronesians? There seems to be a feeling on the floor that we can punish the Japanese in some way for the fact that they caused the war damage. This is not likely to be the situation because I would imagine if this amendment succeeds, the agreement with Japan will be abrogated, so the Japanese will ultimately be helped because they will probably pay nothing, either in cash or in goods and services. The Micronesians will suffer because after 17 years of negotiation, they still will have come up with nothing.

Further, is it not true that the claimants are individual Micronesians, not a governmental unit? We have put $200 million into Micronesia, it is true, but this has not reimbursed those individuals who have lost whatever property they had as a result of the actions of the Japanese and the Americans.

Are those not the facts?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct. Perhaps we ought not to be much concerned about the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York because it would not accomplish his objective, if his objective is to torpedo the agreement. The language changes proposed would not accomplish that purpose, in my opinion. I would say further, if it did accomplish that, then that would not be the course we should follow.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman to say that the Japanese were going to furnish goods and services in kind and that somehow or other it was going to be transmuted into cash; is that right? Did I understand you to say that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct in his understanding.

Mr. HAYS. How is that going to come about? Who is going to pay the cash? Are we going to pay another $5 million to turn this stuff into cash?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am afraid the gentleman is asking an absurd question.

Mr. HAYS. No, I am not asking an absurd question. Several Members would like to know how this is going to happen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course, the United States is not going to be providing an additional $5 million.

Mr. HAYS. How are you going to change services into cash?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The contribution is to be provided in the form of major products. The services will not be transmuted into cash but the goods will be.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. The point is that the administering authority already purchases goods and services in the ordinary course of administration, and this would be in effect a letter of credit for an additional $5 million. Since we are able to use that letter of credit, we can transfer the equivalent amount.

Mr. HAYS. This will be our cash, will it not?

Mr. FRASER. It doesn't make any difference. The net amount we have to put up will not be increased.

Mr. HAYS. Why should we treat goods and services differently?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 617 would authorize the payment of $25 million for claims, according to what I have read, although by specific agreement the United States would pay $5 million, to be matched by $5 million in goods and services by Japan.

In what way have we really damaged the area in question? That point has not

been brought out, as to how we have damaged this particular area. Let us consider the subject a little bit. Did the people have great industries or great plantations in this area that we destroyed? Already we have spent $200 million in this area for administration, the construction of roads, schools, hospitals and so on. This year I believe we mean to spend $60 million more. The area is in far better condition than it was prior to World War II.

Several of us have been in the Pacific area, and I happen to have been one. I have been on many of these islands. Many of them are barren. Many of them are covered by government installations, such as missile sites. It seems to me that the $200 million, or $260 million which we have spent, will be sufficient.

Again, in giving money away constantly from time to time, from one country to another all over the world, how many friends have we really gained? How much friendship have we gained by giving money? By giving money to the Micronesians, is it going to buy their friendship? Can friendship be bought?

I have always heard that "loan oft loses both itself and friend." As far as foreign aid is concerned in this case, it is my feeling that we will lose both our money and our friends, as we have in the case of Chile down in South America. We have given millions of dollars to Chile, and just this past year it became the first Socialist country in this area.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman first that I have listened to him and I agree with what the gentleman is saying, but I would point out that they do not say we are going to gain the friendship of these people if we pay, but that we are going to lose it if we do not pay. That is a sort of negative thing. If we have not gained it by the payment of $260 million, I do not know that $5 million worth of cut-rate Japanese junk is going to do it either. So we might as well let it go down the drain.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, the Trust Territories occupy a very strategic position for the United States.

Mr. CARTER. I am sorry but I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. I said, of course the Trust Territories occupy a very substantial strategic purpose for the United States. In the event we would develop opposition to our presence in a foreign area, where the U.S. forces are now, this is probably one area we would consider for our future defenses. I would go along in questioning the reparations of $5 million for war claims. But as far as postwar damages are concerned, I do know that some of the buildings in this area were leveled by occupying forces and not through hostile fire. Some of these claims I think would be justified, I could not tell you how much, but I know there are some out there that could be justified, and it has been a sore point for our country in seeking to establish good relations.

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield further to the gentleman. I would be glad to have the gentleman take his own time.

Considering all the money we have spent on this, I think we should, for economy's sake, vote against this resolution.

You know, "old Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard to get her poor dog a bone. When she got there, the cupboard was bare, and the poor dog had none." Our own people will be further burdened by taxes.

Here in the United States today we have come to that point. We are hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in debt. It is time for us to start saving money.

I would ask the Members of this Committee to vote against this resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to reply briefly to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky. I would tend to agree with him that perhaps there has been too much talk here about buying friendship or paying something to avoid ill will. I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that over the long pull one does not buy friendship.

Essentially what we are talking about here is not friendship but justice. These are claims for damages that were incurred as a result of our action. The larger part of the money, the $20 million, is for damages which occurred after we took the islands.

If the $20 million is not properly owing to individuals who lost farms, who lost crops, who lost buildings as a result of the United States' actions, the money will not be paid.

We are not voting to automatically contribute $20 million to these people. We are voting an authorization that those claims which are found to be justified, which result from our actions, should be paid. That is a simple matter of justice, Mr. Chairman. It has been justice delayed for 25 years. It is a blot on our record that we have taken so long to bring about justice.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I believe the gentleman has stated very clearly what we are asking for is justice. The amendment which is before the Committee now is for justice, that the Japanese pay for their just share of the damages.

Mr. BINGHAM. As the debate has brought out, the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, would kill this agreement. We would have to go back to negotiate. It would perhaps take another 20 years. There is no assurance whatsoever that the Japanese would pay any amount in cash or would pay any amount in goods and services.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me that the term "ex gratia" means there is no international legal obligation on the part of Japan or the United States to pay the first $10 million?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. This comes about entirely through painstaking negotiation over a period of some 19 years, that we finally cracked through and made this arrangement which will now allow this whole matter to go forward, and that if we knock that out the whole agreement will fall through and we cannot do what the gentleman so ardently asks for, justice to the Micronesian people?

Mr. BINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Kentucky asked a question as to what damage we have done to the islands or to the Micronesian people.

During World War II, of course, those islands were occupied by the Japanese, who were our enemies. We bombed the islands week after week, month after month, destroying homes, destroying businesses, destroying towns, destroying streets, and destroying villages.

Then as soon as the war ended we went in and took possession of the islands, and we moved the Japanese people out, and we moved other people out. In taking possession we did considerable damage.

The gentleman from Kentucky says he is opposed to foreign aid. I, too, have voted against much foreign aid.

Here we have a special obligation.

In the first place, the damage was caused by the United States in our own military interests.

In the second place, we have a special contractual obligation which gives us a special obligation, which we do not have with respect to others.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, as a point of personal privilege, since the gentleman mentioned my name, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield first to the gentleman from Arizona, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. RHODES. I just wanted to repeat a very important point which the gentleman from New York made. These claims are to be paid to individuals. They are not paid to the Micronesian Government or to the Micronesian economy. This is money which will go to satisfy claims of the people who have lost their property or whose property has been destroyed because of war and its aftermath.

The fact that $260 million may have gone into Micronesia since World War II is completely beside the point, because the individual who has suffered there still has not been repaid.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) when he talked of

the destruction of streets in the Pacific, I was in the Pacific a considerable length of time and I would like to know where those streets were. I did not see them when I was around the islands. And I did not see any industries there, either.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that I was in those islands and I saw streets there. They do not come up to our standards, but they do have streets there and homes, too.

Mr. CARTER. Where are they?

Mr. TAYLOR. These are homes that they live in. They may be humble, but to the individuals in them they are very important. These are in Saipan and Truk.

Mr. CARTER. Saipan, of course, is not in this.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely want to say that Saipan is a part of the Trust Territory and is definitely included in this agreement.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I felt that we could legislate and make the Japanese pay in cash, I would be for it. Obviously we cannot. There is no way that I know of simply by amending this bill that we can do it. All we do is to kill the thrust of the present agreement, while we cannot get the Japanese to do anything. The Congress cannot negotiate the agreement. While many of my colleagues here feel that they can do better in 17 years of negotiation than our own negotiators, I believe they obtained the best agreement they could under the circumstances.

The best we could come up with in our negotiations was for a payment of $5 million in cash on our side and $5 million in goods and services on the part of the Japanese, with no admission on either side that there was any legal liability involved with respect to war damage.

It is unfortunate it took us 17 years to reach this kind of an agreement, and that there is some dissatisfaction here with the terms of the agreement. The issue today however is the honor and character of the United States and not the character or the attitude of the Japanese people or the Japanese Government. The fact is the resolution has to do with damages to the Micronesian people and our relations with them.

The United States had the opportunity and the right not to take those islands. The United States had the opportunity and the right to refuse the trust mandate under the United Nations, but, as a matter of fact, we were willing and happy to take it because it was in our national interest to do so. That is the reason why we have administered the trust territories and that is the reason why we have made available funds in the last 20 years for their education and for other purposes chartered under the mandate to the United States.

However, those payments have nothing to do with the war claims, which are the subject matter of this legislation. The agreement and this resolution do not admit a legal responsibility. That is the reason why it is referred to as an ex gratia payment. We got the Japanese to go along with it on that theory for $5 million. I think we got off light.

It would be a horrendous mistake at this juncture in history after 17 years to tell the Micronesian people that as far as the United States is concerned that we will not implement the agreement because the Congress does not like what the Japanese are doing.

I do not want to adversely affect or change the high character and honor of my country because of what the Japanese are or are not doing with respect to their responsibilities.

As to the Micronesian claims for damages, the United States has negotiated the best agreement it was possible to get. The Japanese finally concurred to share in the responsibility.

The pending amendment would have the opposite effect than that which the proponents advocate. Its net result would be an abrogation of the agreement by the United States in an effort to place a new condition on the Japanese Government.

This would be no basis for renegotiation and therefore the war claims to the Micronesians would not be paid. Japan would pay nothing and the United States would be blamed for backing down.

Thus the amendment of the gentleman from New York would be doubly destructive. It should be voted down.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak with some hesitation after the very fine remarks that have been made on this subject, but I feel obligated, as one who served in the Pacific, to say what I feel should be said about this situation.

Arguments have been raised that we do not like some of the things the Japanese are doing, but there is clearly no chance of changing that by amending this resolution, so it does not make any sense to talk about that to any great extent.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of conversation here about the $250 million or $260 million which has been spent under the trust arrangement. That money, Mr. Chairman, has been spent in our own interest. We are happy to have that trust arrangement. Is it not better that we have that trust responsibility than the Japanese or some other power have it? That is why we have expended that money there, whether militarily or otherwise.

Let us not run down that $250 million expenditure. Perhaps we could have done and can do a better or cheaper job, but that lies within the efficiency of our Nation's administration of the territory.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of conversation about the Claims Committee which has been in existence since World War I. This was a horrendous revelation to me, the fact that we have a Claims Commission which has been in existence since World War I. But, that is hardly the fault of the people in the Pacific and it is hardly the fault of many Members of this Congress. I do not know whose fault it is. But it certainly is not the fault of the fine people over there.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to echo what my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) said about the moral obligation. The United States of America should never back off from its moral obligations. We have a moral obligation to those individual people whose property we destroyed and we cannot say instead that: "we paved your streets and built your schools and so forth." This is our obligation to those people who as individuals had their coconut groves, who had their homes and other appurtenances destroyed during the war. We cannot forget about the moral obligation to the individuals who were hurt because of us. The amount of money involved is not a very great amount.

I hope this afternoon that we will not be so picayune as to put a roadblock in the path of what is best for the United States of America and not be so picayune and destructive because of any attitude toward the Japanese or the Claims Commission. They are not involved in this issue of our national responsibility to these claimants.

Mr. Chairman, these Micronesians are simple people who raise papayas and coconuts, and who extended a helping hand to us—to me, along with a great number of other Americans. I, along with a great number of other Americans, am alive because of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to ask someone for what the $260 million has been expended?

Mr. WHITE. As I understand it, when we took over the trusteeship just after World War II——

Mr. GROSS. Just tell me for what it has been expended. Several Members are bleeding from every pore, claiming these people have not been taken care of. Yet with a population of around 90,000, the sum of $260 million has been spent upon them, and I would like to know for what.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there were four obligations of the United States when we took over the trusteeship.

Mr. GROSS. I still want to know what the money has been spent for.

Mr. WHITE. In order to fulfill our obligations under our trust agreement.

Mr. GROSS. What was the money actually spent for?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Iowa asks what the money was spent for. It was spent for rebuilding public buildings destroyed in the war, for schools and for hospitals. It was spent for highways and supporting services which were necessary. It was spent also and to a great extent for administration by citizens of the United States of America who were sent over there to take care of these responsibilities. This is what this money was spent for.

Mr. GROSS. Were the administrators pretty well paid?

Mr. ASPINALL. They were pretty well paid and are fairly well paid at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. So, the administrators have gobbled up what might otherwise have been money designed to replace the coconut trees and a few other things?

Mr. ASPINALL. Not very much for coconut trees. Some of it was spent for agricultural purposes trying to help replace the resources largely destroyed by the war. Not a dime of this money you refer to was spent for the purposes which this legislation now pending before us is designed to serve.

Mr. GROSS. Ninety thousand people have gotten $260 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, over a period of 24 years.

Mr. GROSS. Plus probably some more money from somewhere that has not yet surfaced. However, I will accept the figure of $260 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. Insofar as I know the figure is not over $260 million.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to comment upon the statement which was made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) about being picayunish and picayunish attacks being made upon the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I did not mean to attack it in any way. I was perplexed as to how you could not settle the claims for a war that happened 30 years ago and you go on and on and on in trying to settle those claims.

I am pointing out that when one is set up for this purpose that I will give you my word of honor that they will come up with another one somewhere because that well-paid bureaucracy is going to stay in business.

Mr. GROSS. We will probably have to repatriate the Japanese from Okinawa when we turn that island over to the Japanese. They will confront us with a nice, fat bill one way or another.

Mr. HAYS. I do not believe we paid the French for the towns we bombed there when we invaded across the channel in World War II, but if we have not, then this sure sets a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. After we handed over billions of dollars to the French they kicked us out of that country. As a matter of fact, they still owe us a substantial debt from World War I.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Iowa is exactly right. And when we pay these people this $5 million, and whatever else they can get us for out there, they will then kick us out of there.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are getting a little far afield from this 3 million square mile area situated between the Philippines and Hawaii, and containing some 100,000 people on some 2,000 scattered islands—these islands are the stationary defense carriers of the Pacific. The United States has these islands under a sole trusteeship under the United Nations Security Council, with the right of veto, and with the right to fortify them. Note this is the only United Nations Security Council trusteeship, not a trusteeship under the U.N. General Assembly. So I say hold on to these strategic islands and help the fine Micronesian people to progress which is the duty the United States assumed in taking the trusteeship in 1947. Do not give them up for $5 million, do not turn them over to some other nation on the basis that that other nation would assume the trusteeship, but would not assist these fine people as the United States has done.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No; I am sorry that I am unable to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, as my time is limited and I do want to emphasize certain points.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot hold a candle to the gentleman from Pennsylvania when it comes to speaking at the microphone.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Iowa is a good debater and successful when it comes to getting mike time. Am I to continue to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania continues to be recognized.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question here is whether or not the United States will fulfill its duties under the trusteeship which the United States assumed as a legal and moral duty when the United States took over the trusteeship under agreement with the United Nations approved by President Truman, and authorized by the U.S. Congress. Now, this is one area where the United States is the sole trustee. The United States does not have a four-power trusteeship, and the United States did not have that in Japan, nor do we have it here. I think General MacArthur was exactly right when he said the United States should act in the Pacific individually.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his point of order.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the colloquy that has just developed, and in view of the refusal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield, do not the Rules of the House limit every Member of the House to 5 minutes, until the rules are abrogated, for the purpose of amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman has stated the general rules of debate in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Has not the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), already spoken 5 minutes on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in the opinion of the Chair the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) has not heretofore had 5 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Prior to this?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would further have to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the gentleman's point of order is not timely taken at this point. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) has already been recognized. The Chair will further state that if the Chair erred in recognizing the gentleman from Pennsylvania twice that it was the Chair's error. But the Chair believes that is not the case.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Louisiana would like for me to yield—could I have the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana? If the gentleman would like for me to yield, I will yield him the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment——

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania still has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. All right. As the gentleman from Louisiana does not seem to wish me to yield to him, I will go ahead with my 2 minutes.

The question of the Trust Islands of the Pacific, is vital to the United States and to our defense in depth in the Pacific. If and when the United States leaves the mainland of Asia, we need these island defenses as a buffer zone to prevent a future Pearl Harbor. This basic decision should not be made on a minor point, on a $5 million criticism and on the question of Japan supplying goods and services rather than cash. The United States made the agreement with Japan to supply $5 million by each country. Japan is a friendly country and I believe the Japanese people will live up to their word, and perform their part of the negotiated agreement in good faith.

When we think of the friendship of the Micronesian people—thank Heaven in World War II when our U.S. military forces and our combat forces progressed from island to island through there, everyone of those natives on those islands were friendly, and there were no guerrilla attacks, or fighting during occupation by U.S. forces. Think of the thousands of lives that were saved by the cooperation in World War II in the Pacific campaigns, and the friendly welcome of these five Micronesian island peoples.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLFF) there were—ayes 46, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this proposed resolution. How many of my colleagues remember the words of the great American who said, "This day shall live in infamy."

How many Members can remember the names of the islands in the Pacific where we lost thousands of American boys?

I found out from reading that I did not know what or where Micronesia was—when I heard the word "Micronesia" this morning, I thought it was some kind of a microscope.

From what I have heard here this afternoon, they tell me we have spent 260

million American dollars already in Micronesia.

Since there are 90,000 inhabitants in Micronesia, my grade school arithmetic tells me that that amounts to about $3,000 for each Micronesian. That is not bad hay.

I have found out since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives that whenever we want to do anything for our American Indians or for the people on welfare in this country and for other people in this Nation, Members rise up from both political parties and fight it. Yet, when we want to give millions of dollars away to somebody else—to people we have never even heard of—we all have bleeding hearts.

I say it is time we have bleeding hearts for our American taxpayers and for our citizens. This morning I attended a brief session given by the Ambassador of Japan.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, asked the Japanese Ambassador a very stimulating question, when the Ambassador was telling us how Japan has economically revived and prospered the postwar world period and how they are driving the steelworkers of my congressional district out of their jobs by dumping steel in America. Dr. HALL said, "Who won the last war?" The Ambassador gave a sick grin. He said, "Well, we bombed their old steel mills and we had to build them some new ones and now their steel mills are better than ours."

Mr. Chairman, the time has come that we had better start thinking of Americans. I say before giving these millions of dollars away that we ought to start to be giving something to the poor and to the downtrodden and the sick in our country rather than giving it away to somebody else.

So far as I am concerned, as one Member of this House, I am taking a very cautious look at these giveaway programs to people that we never even heard of.

We ought to be giving something to Americans first rather than having a giveaway program like this for people we know nothing about.

As I read this resolution, most of this money will go to the Japanese businessmen, and people who were illegally in Micronesia in the first place. Who started the war? Who bombed Pearl Harbor? Do not people who start wars have some responsibility in bearing the cost? We paid the cost in lives and money. We are still paying for it. I think it is about time that we changed the system. I am against this joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair (Mr. PIKE) Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 617) to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages arising out of the hostilities of World War II, to provide for the payment of noncombat claims occurring prior to July 1, 1951, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission, pursuant to House Resolution 467, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 617) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: Page 3, line 4. After the word equivalent insert the word "cash".

On page 4, lines 16 and 17 after the word "fund" delete "as products of Japan and the services of the Japanese people in"

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RHODES. Will the Chair state whether or not the motion to recommit is identical with the so-called Wolff amendment, which was defeated?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of the details of the amendment.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 215, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—166

Abbitt	Brooks	Collins, Tex.
Abernethy	Brotzman	Colmer
Addabbo	Broyhill, Va.	Cotter
Anderson, Calif.	Burke, Fla.	Crane
Andrews, Ala.	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Archer	Burlison, Mo.	Danielson
Ashbrook	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Ga.
Baker	Byron	Davis, S.C.
Barrett	Carney	de la Garza
Betts	Carter	Delaney
Bevill	Casey, Tex.	Dennis
Biaggi	Chappell	Derwinski
Biester	Clancy	Devine
Blackburn	Clausen, Don H.	Dickinson
Blanton	Clawson, Del	Dorn
Bow	Cleveland	Dow
Brinkley	Collins, Ill.	Dowdy
Dulski	Kemp	Rousselot
Duncan	King	Roy
Edwards, Ala.	Landgrebe	Ruth
Eilberg	Latta	St Germain
Fisher	Lennon	Sandman
Flowers	McCollister	Satterfield
Flynt	McDonald, Mich.	Saylor
Fountain	McKevitt	Scherle
Frey	McKinney	Schmitz
Fuqua	McMillan	Schneebeli
Galifianakis	Macdonald, Mass.	Scott
Gaydos	Madden	Shoup
Gettys	Mann	Sikes
Goldwater	Martin	Skubitz
Goodling	Mathis, Ga.	Slack
Grasso	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Gray	Mazzoli	Snyder
Griffin	Miller, Ohio	Spence
Griffiths	Minshall	Staggers
Gross	Mizell	Stuckey
Haley	Montgomery	Sullivan
Hall	Natcher	Talcott
Hammer-schmidt	Nichols	Terry
Harsha	Nix	Thompson, Ga.
Hastings	O'Konski	Vander Jagt
Hays	Pettis	Vanik
Heckler, Mass.	Powell	Veysey
Henderson	Pryor, Ark.	Waggonner
Hull	Pucinski	Waldie
Hungate	Quillen	Wampler
Hunt	Randall	Whitehurst
Hutchinson	Rarick	Williams
Ichord	Reuss	Winn
Johnson, Pa.	Roberts	Wolff
Jonas	Robinson, Va.	Wylie
Jones, N.C.	Roe	Wyman
Jones, Tenn.	Rogers	Yatron
Keating		Young, Fla.
		Zion

NAYS—215

Abourezk	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Abzug	Fulton, Pa.	Mollohan
Adams	Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan
Anderson, Ill.	Gallagher	Moorhead
Andrews, N. Dak.	Garmatz	Morgan
Annunzio	Giaimo	Morse
Ashley	Gibbons	Mosher
Aspin	Gonzalez	Moss
Aspinall	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Begich	Grover	Myers
Belcher	Gubser	Nedzi
Bell	Gude	Nelsen
Bennett	Halpern	Obey
Bergland	Hamilton	O'Hara
Bingham	Hanley	O'Neill
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Boland	Harvey	Patman
Bolling	Hathaway	Patten
Brademas	Hawkins	Pelly
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Pepper
Bray	Helstoski	Perkins
Brown, Mich.	Hicks, Mass.	Pickle
Buchanan	Hicks, Wash.	Pike
Burke, Mass.	Hillis	Pirnie
Burton	Holifield	Poage
Cabell	Horton	Podell
Caffery	Howard	Poff
Camp	Jacobs	Preyer, N.C.
Cederberg	Jarman	Price, Ill.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Tex.
Conable	Jones, Ala.	Purcell
Conte	Karth	Quie
Corman	Kastenmeier	Reid, Ill.
Coughlin	Kazen	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Kee	Rhodes
Davis, Wis.	Koch	Riegle
Dellenback	Kyros	Robison, N.Y.
Dellums	Lent	Rodino
Denholm	Link	Roncalio
Diggs	Lloyd	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.
Donohue	Lujan	Rosenthal
Drinan	McClory	Rostenkowski
du Pont	McCloskey	Roush
Dwyer	McClure	Roybal
Eckhardt	McCormack	Ruppe
Edmondson	McDade	Ryan
Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Sarbanes
Erlenborn	McFall	Scheuer
Esch	McKay	Schwengel
Evans, Colo.	Mahon	Sebelius
Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.	Seiberling
Fascell	Matsunaga	Shipley
Findley	Meeds	Shriver
Fish	Melcher	Sisk
Flood	Metcalfe	Smith, Iowa
Foley	Michel	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, William D.	Miller, Calif.	Stafford
Forsythe	Mills, Ark.	Stanton, J. William
Fraser	Mills, Md.	Stanton, James V.
	Minish	
	Mink	

Steed	Thone	Wilson, Charles H.
Steele	Udall	Wright
Steiger, Ariz.	Ullman	Wyatt
Steiger, Wis.	Van Deerlin	Wydler
Stratton	Vigorito	Yates
Stubblefield	Watts	Young, Tex.
Taylor	Whalen	Zablocki
Teague, Calif.	Whalley	Zwach
Teague, Tex.	White	
Thompson, N.J.	Widnall	
Thomson, Wis.	Wiggins	

NOT VOTING—52

Alexander	Dent	Long, La.
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	McCulloch
Arends	Eshleman	Mailliard
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Mikva
Broomfield	Frenzel	Peyser
Blatnik	Hagan	Railsback
Broomfield	Hanna	Rangel
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Rees
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrington	Runnels
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Springer
Carey, N.Y.	Hogan	Stephens
Celler	Hosmer	Stokes
Chisholm	Keith	Symington
Clark	Kluczynski	Tiernan
Clay	Kuykendall	Ware
Collier	Kyl	Whitten
Conyers	Landrum	Wilson, Bob
Culver	Leggett	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.

Mr. Hagan for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Eshleman for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Ware for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Culver against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Mikva with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Frenzel.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Rangel with Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Conyers.

Messrs. ROONEY of New York, JAMES V. STANTON, NEDZI, KOCH, WIDNALL, and LENT changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 225; nays 158, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—225

Abourezk	Giaimo	O'Hara
Abzug	Gibbons	O'Neill
Adams	Gonzalez	Patman
Addabbo	Gray	Pepper
Anderson, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Andrews, N. Dak.	Grover	Pickle
Annunzio	Gubser	Pike
Ashley	Gude	Poage
Aspin	Halpern	Podell
Aspinall	Hamilton	Poff
Badillo	Hanley	Preyer, N.C.
Begich	Harvey	Price, Ill.
Belcher	Hathaway	Price, Tex.
Bell	Hawkins	Purcell
Bennett	Hechler, W. Va.	Quie
Bergland	Helstoski	Quillen
Biaggi	Hicks, Mass.	Reid, Ill.
Bingham	Hicks, Wash.	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hillis	Reuss
Boggs	Holifield	Rhodes
Boland	Horton	Riegle
Bolling	Howard	Robison, N.Y.
Brademas	Jacobs	Rodino
Brasco	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
Bray	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brooks	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Brotzman	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Brown, Mich.	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, Va.	Kee	Roybal
Buchanan	Keith	Ruppe
Burke, Mass.	Koch	Ryan
Burton	Kyros	St Germain
Cabell	Lent	Sarbanes
Caffery	Link	Scheuer
Camp	Lloyd	Schwengel
Cederberg	Lujan	Sebelius
Clausen, Don H.	McClory	Seiberling
Conable	McCloskey	Shriver
Conte	McClure	Sisk
Corman	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Coughlin	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald, Mich.	Stafford
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Stanton, J. William
Davis, Wis.	McFall	Stanton, James V.
de la Garza	McKay	Steed
Delaney	McKevitt	Steele
Dellenback	McKinney	Steiger, Ariz.
Dellums	Macdonald, Mass.	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Madden	Stokes
Donohue	Mahon	Stratton
Dow	Mathias, Calif.	Stubblefield
Drinan	Matsunaga	Taylor
du Pont	Mayne	Teague, Calif.
Dwyer	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Eckhardt	Melcher	Thompson, N.J.
Edmondson	Metcalfe	Thomson, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Thone
Erlenborn	Mills, Ark.	Udall
Esch	Mills, Md.	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Van Deerlin
Evins, Tenn.	Mink	Vigorito
Fascell	Mitchell	Wampler
Findley	Mollohan	Whalen
Fish	Monagan	Whalley
Flood	Moorhead	White
Foley	Morgan	Widnall
Ford, William D.	Morse	Wilson, Bob
Forsythe	Mosher	Wilson, Charles H.
Fraser	Moss	Wyatt
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Wydler
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates
Gallagher	Myers	Young, Tex.
Garmatz	Nedzi	Zablocki
	Nelsen	Zwach
	Obey	

NAYS—158

Abbitt	Carney	Devine
Abernethy	Carter	Dickinson
Andrews, Ala.	Casey, Tex.	Dingell
Archer	Chamberlain	Dorn
Ashbrook	Chappell	Dowdy
Baker	Clancy	Downing
Barrett	Clawson, Del	Dulski
Betts	Cleveland	Duncan
Bevill	Collins, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.
Biester	Collins, Tex.	Eilberg
Blackburn	Colmer	Fisher
Blanton	Cotter	Flowers
Bow	Crane	Flynt
Brinkley	Daniel, Va.	Fountain
Burke, Fla.	Danielson	Frey
Burleson, Tex.	Davis, S.C.	Fulton, Tenn.
Burlison, Mo.	Denholm	Fuqua
Byrne, Pa.	Dennis	Galifianakis
Byron	Derwinski	Gaydos
Gettys	Long, Md.	Satterfield
Goldwater	McCollister	Saylor
Goodling	McMillan	Scherle
Grasso	Mann	Schmitz
Griffin	Martin	Schneebeli
Griffiths	Mathis, Ga.	Scott
Gross	Mazzoli	Shipley
Haley	Michel	Shoup
Hall	Miller, Ohio	Sikes
Hammer-schmidt	Minshall	Skubitz
Harsha	Mizell	Slack
Hastings	Montgomery	Smith, Calif.
Hays	Natcher	Snyder
Heckler, Mass.	Nichols	Spence
Henderson	Nix	Staggers
Hogan	O'Konski	Stuckey
Hull	Passman	Sullivan
Hungate	Patten	Terry
Hunt	Pelly	Thompson, Ga.
Hutchinson	Pirnie	Vander Jagt
Ichord	Powell	Vanik
Jarman	Pryor, Ark.	Veysey
Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski	Waggonner
Jonas	Randall	Watts
Jones, N.C.	Rarick	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Roberts	Wiggins
Keating	Robinson, Va.	Williams
Kemp	Roe	Winn
King	Rogers	Wolff
Kuykendall	Roush	Wylie
Landgrebe	Rousselot	Wyman
Latta	Roy	Yatron
Lennon	Ruth	Young, Fla.
	Sandman	Zion

NOT VOTING—50

Alexander	Dent	McCulloch
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Mailliard
Arends	Eshleman	Mikva
Baring	Ford, Gerald R.	Peyser
Broomfield	Frenzel	Railsback
Brown, Ohio	Hagan	Rangel
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanna	Rees
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Runnels
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Springer
Celler	Harrington	Stephens
Chisholm	Hébert	Symington
Clark	Hosmer	Talcott
Clay	Kluczynski	Tiernan
Collier	Kyl	Waldie
Conyers	Landrum	Ware
Culver	Leggett	Whitten
	Long, La.	Wright

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Hagan against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Mikva with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Rangel.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Frenzel.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ware.

Mr. SIKES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent on rollcall No. 124, adoption of the rule to accompany the bill H.R. 8293, Coffee Agreement Act Extension. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" and ask that the RECORD so indicate.

THE CONCORDE AND TU–144

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the June 4 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) expressed the wish that I should go to Paris to visit the air show where the supersonic Concorde and the Russian TU–144 are on display. The gentleman was most polite, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that he would have preferred I go some other place, but, nevertheless, he suggested Paris. For the gentleman's information, I saw the Concorde in Toulouse last year and I know that the aircraft can fly. The press has been reporting that for more than a year.

The fact that the aircraft can fly, Mr. Speaker, does not automatically make it a viable, commercial plane. One day after the gentleman's speech, the Washington Post printed an interview with Najeeb Halaby, the president of Pan American Airlines. Pan Am, as the gentleman from Washington knows, is considered to be Concorde's most important potential customer. The article said that Halaby had "voiced grave doubts about the economics of the Anglo-French Concorde." Halaby said:

> The existing design for 120 first class seats only could never become a mass carrier . . . nor was it socially acceptable. Don't let's kid ourselves. Concorde makes a lot of noise.

The article says doubts about the Concorde are also troubling United Air Lines which has options to buy six.

Halaby also said that his airline may wait for at least 6 months after BOAC and Air France had operated it before deciding to buy the Concorde.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Washington is a little premature with his "I told you so." Yes, the Concorde has flown, but there still is no rush by those who have options to buy it to exercise their rights. And nobody seems very anxious to fly or buy the TU–144.

PELLY SUPPORTS AMENDMENT TO INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against House Resolution 465, the rule which made in order consideration of H.R. 8298 to continue until September 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968. I voted no on the rule, because I oppose any extension of any new or existing agreements with Latin American nations that by unilateral action claim 200-mile sovereignty beyond territorial limits established or recognized by international law.

Mr. Speaker, since the early 19th century, the freedom of the open sea has been universally recognized subject to special arrangements made by treaties or resulting from custom.

In 1951, in the Anglo-Norwegian fisheries case, the International Court of Justice held against extension of a Coastal States sovereignty beyond the recognized territorial sea.

Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 8293 is considered by the House, I am hopeful an amendment can be adopted to deal with the issue. The biggest exporter of coffee to the United States, as I understand, is Brazil. Brazilian naval units according to the press have been sent to enforce the claim of a 200-mile sovereignty along its 4,500-mile long coast which historically has been good shrimp-fishing waters for our fishing fleet.

There can be no doubt that Brazil has been encouraged to claim a 200-mile limit because of the attitude of the U.S. Department of State which has had no plan to resist similar claims of other Latin American countries or policy other than to pay the illegal fines of seized American fishing vessels and wait until an international convention in 1973 hopefully will resolve the dispute.

Actually, our policy has encouraged these seizures and the State Department has even ignored the Fishermen's Protection Act and refused to reduce allocation of U.S. foreign assistance to offset the fines imposed on our fishermen as provided by law.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when Congress must deal firmly with the controversy.

Meanwhile, I am drafting a proposed amendment to the International Coffee Agreement and have discussed with other Members of the House offering it at the appropriate time.

WHO SPEAKS FOR HANOI?

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the burst of news in this morning's paper regarding our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia provides much food for thought.

Mr. Clark Clifford, a close adviser of President Johnson during the time when the war in Southeast Asia was escalated and a Secretary of Defense during that period, states with conviction that our prisoners would be returned within 30 days of the date of the joint announcement of Hanoi and Washington of a December 31 withdrawal date.

In the same story my colleague from California, the Honorable ROBERT LEGGETT reports on a meeting he held in Paris with Nguyen Van Tien, the No. 2 man of the Vietcong delegation, on May 31. According to the report, Van Tien said a list of POW's would be released before the withdrawal date arrived.

It is interesting to note that immediately prior to May 31, the Honorable WILLIAM DICKINSON, who is well known as a leader in focusing world public opinion on North Vietnamese duplicity and inhumanity with respect to prisoners of war, tried for 3 full working days to secure an appointment with the North Vietnamese delegation to Paris. Our Embassy informed the Vietcong delegation that Congressman DICKINSON carried a petition signed by more than 125 Members of Congress and wished to discuss the prisoner-of-war problem. Mr. DICKINSON sent a telegram and phoned repeatedly. On Saturday, May 29, 2 days before Mr. LEGGETT was granted an appointment, the U.S. Embassy was told that the Vietcong representative was "too busy" to see Mr. DICKINSON anytime during the week beginning May 31.

Still another story by Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post quotes Hanoi's chief negotiator Xuan Thuy as saying that the question of prisoners "will" be settled if a withdrawal date is set even if the Thieu and Ky government is still in power. Note the use of the positive word "will."

There are several interesting points about these statements. First, is their timing. They are made at a time when public pressure for establishing a withdrawal date by legislation is at a peak and shortly before those measures will be considered. Second, it is interesting to note that all of these seeming concessions on the part of Hanoi are made on an unofficial basis to persons actively engaged in the movement to legislatively establish a withdrawal date. It is noteworthy that none of these proposals are offered to our negotiators in Paris and none are offered to persons who have demonstrated their distrust for the words of Hanoi and suspicion of its deeds.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the question as to whether or not Hanoi is more interested in talking to the American people than to the American Government and whether or not she is using well meaning Americans to promote by legislation what should be the subject of negotiation. Who speaks for Hanoi?

NEW APPROACHES URGED BY ITT CHIEF TO TIP BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the international monetary crisis which has captured a great deal of the world's attention during the past few weeks is due, in large part, to the U.S. deficit in its balance of payments. With more money flowing out of this country than coming in, the European money market finds itself with an overflow of U.S. currency—commonly called Eurodollars. Economic experts throughout the world have, and are continuing to give this problem their closest attention. The ultimate answer, of course, is to achieve a better balance in the flow of U.S. dollars. There are no simple solutions to this end involving, as it does, world trade problems, national and international monetary policies, and national interests.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention, however, to a practical step toward a solution which was suggested

by one of the Nation's leading businessmen recently. Harold S. Geneen, chairman and president of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., offered some sage advice while addressing his company's annual stockholders' meeting held May 12, in my home city, San Diego. As head of one of the world's most active multinational corporations, Mr. Geneen is in a unique position to view the problem and recommend solutions. For example, ITT operates in 70 countries, employing 400,000 employees—210,000 of them overseas. This deep involvement with international commerce provides an advantageous platform from which to view the current situation.

Mr. Geneen suggests a three-pronged attack designed to reverse the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit which has extended for most of the past 12 years. Pointing out that, if left unchecked, this tide of currency could lead to protective tariffs, further isolationism, and higher costs to the consumer, he proposed a program for encouraging investment of overseas capital in securities of U.S. companies and the establishment of plants in this country by foreign manufacturers. This, along with a stimulation of the American export market, he said, would help use up the pool of U.S. surplus dollars abroad and, at the same time, build more jobs in this country.

I believe these suggestions are worth serious consideration and would, if adopted and seriously pursued by the Congress and the proper Government agencies, lead to a correction of the balance-of-payments deficit and a strengthening of our own economy.

I insert Mr. Geneen's speech in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY H. S. GENEEN AT 51ST ANNUAL MEETING OF ITT STOCKHOLDERS

On behalf of your Officers and Board of Directors, I am happy to welcome you to the 51st Annual Meeting of ITT stockholders. This marks the beginning of the second half-century of your company's existence, and the start of a *new* decade for your present management.

Our meeting here in San Diego today reflects a policy adopted over the past ten years of bringing our Annual Meetings to as many parts of the country as possible. This gives us a chance to meet and speak to our shareholders throughout the country, and to hear the thoughts of as many as possible on the affairs of your Company.

I might add that we are here today not only because California is the home of more than 21,000 ITT stockholders, but also because ITT has roots deep in many West Coast communities. Some 32 of our principal companies operate in California, eight of them represented right here in San Diego.

Currently, our annual sales in your state are running about $600 million—a volume which we would expect to increase as we grow with California.

The Golden State, as it is called, has been a good home for ITT—and I think it can be said ITT has been responsive in its contribution to the growth of California. With that in mind, I'd like to talk with you for a moment about what your Company's performance during the past year has meant—not only to ITT stockholders—but also to San Diego and the people of California and, indeed, to people everywhere in the more than 900 "hometowns" in the U.S.—like San Diego—that are ITT—and in fact what it has meant to the more than 1,100 hometowns ITT has outside the U.S.—or over 2,000 hometowns in all that really are ITT.

1970 BEST YEAR IN I.T.T. HISTORY

From the Annual Report, I'm sure you have already noted that 1970 was the most successful year in our Company's fifty-year history. To mention just a few highlights that we recorded in 1970:

Consolidated sales and revenues of $6.4 billion—up 12%;

Consolidated net income of $353 million—up 21%; and

Earnings per common share of $3.17—up 20%.

To sum it up, at the end of 1970 we have completed 46 consecutive quarters in which every quarter was better than the corresponding period of the year before—better in sales, better in net income, and better in earnings per share. It was also the 7th consecutive year in which we showed an increase of the dividend on our common stock.

After an economic year like 1970 proved to be, we are fortunate to be able to make a statement like that.

But this was not all "fortune"—

This performance was accomplished despite a general slow-down in business and a falling-off of profits in the U.S. economy that adversely affected many other companies. Because of your Company's countertrend in such a year of test, I felt fully justified in pointing out in the Annual Report that 1970 was a year "in which our long-developing management in depth had an opportunity to display its capabilities and controls under adverse conditions . . . In addition, our policy of diversified activities carried on in various important economies around the world helped make us resistant to the cyclical pressures of any given area."

I think the results of 1970 speak well for the long intensive management dedication to performance for these past 11 years, and also for the long term policy of diversification followed since 1959, and also for the future it now represents for ITT.

As you will see from the Report, this performance has resulted in ITT continuing to be held in high regard by financial analysts and the institutional investors. Banks and other fiduciaries, as a group, continue to be the largest holders of ITT common stock—holding now more than 45%. And the nation's two major stock and bond rating agencies recently improved the rating on our bonds to an "A rating" during 1970.

In other words, 1970 can be considered an outstanding year in comparison to the general economic problems, and the acceptance of our performance in 1970 can be construed as a strong vote of confidence from the financial community based on our continuing performance.

COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITIES NOTED

I am also gratified that we continue to receive strong support from *other* kinds of communities besides the so-called "financial community"—that is, the "real life communities" where we live—the towns and cities in which our various companies of ITT are located worldwide and whose people benefited in 1970 from our *continued success* and *stable employment* no less than our stockholders and the investment community.

These "hometown" communities of our ITT companies, incidentally, range in size in the United States from big cities like New York, Chicago and Los Angeles to smaller ones like San Fernando, California with its population of 16,000, and Berkeley Springs, West Virginia, with a population of 1,138. And, of course, even here today in San Diego which is home to several of our operations. Since we are in San Diego *today* and since there has been some discussion in the press in the past year of the effects of a large company like ITT on a local community, I would like to comment on this point for a moment.

When a large multinational company such as ITT enters into a community, it brings with it all the skills and awareness of competitive standards worldwide that one needs to insure future growth and success in this increasingly competitive world. Now, this represents a *broad addition* to a local community's strength, stability, and even access to new worldwide opportunities for its products. And this is true for everyone of the 2,000 hometowns ITT has. It is not always realized that a good community in turn helps the company—and we are very appreciative of this—for a good company needs "good roots" just as a good community does—and this is worldwide.

In contrast, there have been many examples of communities whose strength and future were weakened when business moved on because the *local* ownership sometimes failed to realize what was needed to remain competitive in this world. I grew up in New England and I have a vivid memory of some whole communities that are still retarded from the passing on of their industry.

And so there is much to be said for the nature and for the strength that a large diversified company brings to a community and we in turn are glad, for example, to be here today in San Diego—for it is here and in our *more than 2,000* other "hometowns" that we really make our contribution.

Moreover, we believe that our Company responsibility *does* extend beyond this. We have a sense of the needed contribution to the *national* interest. But both our "home town" and "national" contributions are alike in *one* respect. They *both* must be based upon the one real economic test of business if they are to be stable. That is, the business, wherever it is, must employ the resources of capital and manpower at its disposal in the most up-to-date, effective and efficient way possible. In this manner it will contribute to local stability of employment and growth, and also to the necessary future strength of the entire country in the world competitive period that lies ahead of us.

For example, this past weekend has seen some of the effects of the long unbalanced international currency flows—due to the long continued unfavorable balance of payments drain which has now extended for the U.S. for most of twelve years.

In one sense the floating unofficial revaluations upward of foreign currencies versus the U.S. dollar announced on the weekend will make our exports in dollars more competitive—and presumably help this same future balance of payments. This could be true if it were not for the continued increased wage settlements at 10%–15% which add costs to our U.S. manufacturers that are not matched abroad. And if we do not solve this problem promptly in this area—other solutions must be sought.

ON GETTING OUR DOLLARS BACK

There is one solution that we can point to. Since there is a large excess—and still growing—of U.S. dollars abroad from this continuing balance of payments deficit—why not encourage the foreign holders of these dollars to use them in the U.S.?

For example—why not buy our goods—which incidentally makes jobs.

Or for example—invest in our companies, which puts this capital to work—and makes jobs.

Or finally—why not make direct investments that are more permanent than either of those other alternatives—direct investments in businesses in the U.S. and run them with U.S. management and employees. This will keep jobs here—and eventually build more of them.

This would be a great step towards reconciling these conflicting tides of currencies—

which, if unchecked, can only lead to protective tariffs—further isolations—and inevitably higher and higher costs in our economy—for all consumers—and less world competitive ability for U.S. industry—and more weekends like the last one.

Is this suggestion practical? Let me point out that your company—ITT—is the foremost world example of the constructive ability of a multi-national company properly guided to do exactly that.

We operate and manufacture in 70 countries worldwide—and we do our own best in the countries where we operate—and we market to the individual needs and requirements of the consumers in each of those countries.

And jobs? Let me tell you about jobs. We create jobs—everyone of the ITT companies in their foreign "hometowns" has grown in competitiveness and employment.

Have we taken any jobs away? Let me answer directly—of the 210,000 jobs we have overseas, only 264 are filled by Americans. No, we have created jobs—not taken them away.

And I am suggesting that the investment in the U.S. dollars held overseas can have the same benefits as ITT has created.

And solve presently insoluble problems—and ease these growing world tensions.

ITT with 396,000 employees is a working model that proves that it can be done.

I feel further that the Company's continuing record, now for 11 years, shows that we are meeting these obligations to our 2,000 hometowns and to society through our economic performance.

But now let me turn to a further thought. Your company and all companies are constantly besieged today for other things that people suggest we should do. The world is changing—and as a company we must be responsive to the *real* needs of that change. But let me talk for a moment about what we should *not do* if we are to properly carry on these real responsibilities to our *"hometowns," as well* as to our stockholders and to the nation's future.

Meeting the challenge of change is—and has always been—one of the principal tests of business. And this is not just change in business and industrial technology, but also the social change and the changes in the environment in which business must operate.

Two years ago in our Annual Report, we said: "1970 begins not only a new decade but a new era. Suddenly, new problems and ideas are matters of public concern: Environmental Pollution. Ecology. Social Ambience. Public Accountability. Involvement."

While the emphasis on these matters is new, business has always *had* this responsibility. ITT has always *actively responded* to these social and environmental problems. Our record in this respect is *in part* detailed in the Annual Report for 1970 and in prior years. I will not review it now. But I do not hesitate to restate our Company's pledge to do *more* of what is necessary—and *what* is possible—and *what* is reasonable—with *equal vigor* in the future.

But I *do* want to emphasize, however, that business—*including ITT*—has first to meet its primary responsibility both to society and to the solution of our employment and social problems, by performing *well* its first basic purpose, which is the efficient use of our host nation's resources.

If we do this, we have then provided the basis for steady employment in a growing world competitive environment—and in turn for family development, for education, for increased leisure and for the orderly development and transition of our society under our laws unbeseiged by insoluble economic problems. From this flow of products comes employment—employment through world exports, and importantly these taxes which are sent to the governments which in turn have the responsibility to allocate these funds to cope with *many* of these social problems.

TAX-PAYING ON THE GRAND SCALE

Last year, for example, ITT paid some $195 million in income taxes, both here and abroad. But that is only the tip of the tax iceberg. If you add all the other taxes we paid last year, your corporation alone contributed more than *half a billion dollars* to governments around the world—national, federal, state and local—to support the requirements of our world's evolving *administrative* and *social needs*.

This flow is highly essential to their continuance.

This *too* is our contribution *as a business* to society—and again in a sense this is our *primary assignment* under our social system— and it *too* must spring from our economic performance as a Company.

And there is the *over two billion dollars* we paid in *wages* to our *employees* worldwide—and the purchases they made—and the taxes they paid—and the *continuance* of that employment—that *too* is our assignment—and it too must rest in the final analysis *on the competitive day to day economic performance of this company*.

We live in a world of relentless economics. We cannot argue with this fact, nor with the fact that if our products are not efficient, and well valued, even *you* will buy from other companies—and in fact, *even from other countries*.

I note a number of motorcycles on the highways here in California—I wonder if you realize that 93% of the motorcycles sold in the U.S. today now come from abroad? This is relentless economics *in practice*.

So you as an individual and consumer apparently operate by the laws of economics too—just as we must. And so does the rest of the world—as we saw this weekend. And so must our government.

If, for example, these taxes must support the 3 million employees in our Federal Government in the U.S., they too must earn their share of these economics and be aware of the value they seek and the "costs" that they add to *our* costs.

The fact that we in business are among the few that ever get "measured" and because of this are often pressed to raise the issues of uneconomic "trade-offs" does not change the relentless lessons of economics and the toll of unemployment *if we fail*—so this too is our obligation—to be sure that we remain economically sound and to point out proposed unsound economics—even when it's conflicting.

No society can remain economically efficient and pay *twice for one objective*. Since more than 50% of every business profit dollar is turned over to Governments for many of these purposes of change, we can help supplement these effects with purposeful planning, but we cannot expect business to pay *once* through the Government and *again* from its own remaining resources to accomplish *the one task*. That is not only *uneconomic*—it is wasteful.

WHO PAYS FOR POLLUTION?

ITT is committed, for example, over the next 10 years to spend over $100 million on the problem of pollution in the U.S. alone. We welcome such action where it is practical in relation to world competitive costs—and where the requirements are in practical relation to the objective achieved.

But we also realize that sooner or later, the *consumer himself* must face and pay for these increasing costs, and they will come from an increasing myriad of sources. We feel that in insisting on practical solutions, we are safeguarding the consumers' interests as well as those of our employees and all those who depend upon our company.

When Henry Ford perfected mass production of the automobile, no one was concerned then about exhaust fumes. No one could have seen that in 1970 we would have 90 million automobiles in the country. The need for the automobiles has created a serious problem which *must* be solved. But this does not make Henry Ford a culprit in history for having invented the automobile—we are grateful for the progress it made possible. Times change—but sometimes the emphasis gets misplaced.

But, I would hope that in playing our respective roles in this era of change there will be some trust and good faith—between business and its partners in Government. I am sure that everyone realizes that the nation's resources are not unlimited—and our ability to compete economically is a *shared responsibility*.

As an example your Company, which began as two small Caribbean Telephone Companies 50 years ago, has become today one of our country's greatest assets on the international scene. I believe *this year* we are now 8th in the Fortune 500. Our ability to compete effectively in overseas markets is a great *national* resource.

During these recent years, the United States has seen the emergence of powerful competitors both in Europe and Japan. We now are seeing an increased tendency to build tariff walls around various markets—and to revalue the dollar downward.

As a broadly based, diversified international company, ITT has to meet these challenges—and go where we need to go to compete in these markets.

The decade of the 70s ahead is going to require the best business abilities that we have to offer if we are to maintain any leadership. But leadership will be increasingly contested by other nations. We are going to have a difficult enough contest on our hands without being penalized by the referee.

I have said we believe that a strong continuing defense of the free enterprise system—backed by *positive* performance—is the best contribution we can make to the well being of the people in all those communities—in some 70 countries—where we are in our "hometowns" and where we have been made welcome.

In support of that commitment, let me close by pointing out that, just as last year was the best in your Company's history, so too was the first quarter of 1971, which I would now like to report briefly on.

In terms of worldwide sales and earnings, it was the best of any comparable quarter in our history. This takes us now through the *47th* consecutive quarter in which our sales, net income, and earnings per share were increased over the same period of the preceding year.

Total sales and revenues of ITT and its worldwide subsidiaries for the first quarter rose to $1.54 billion—an increase of 12% over the first three months of last year. Consolidated net income of $74.2 million was up 12%, and earnings per common share of 66¢ were also up 12%.

There has been some definite improvement in the United States economy during the past three months. The European economy continues strong, although indicating some possible slackening in the latter part of the year.

So in view of what was accomplished in face of adverse economic conditions in 1970 we would predict that our sales and earnings will follow our usual growth trends for the balance of 1971.

In concluding these remarks, I would like to express my appreciation for your being with us today. Your presence as stockholders is an indication of your confidence in the Company—and I can assure you we intend to make every effort to make this an equally good year ahead.

Thank you.

THE SO-CALLED NEW ERA OF PING-PONG DIPLOMACY WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested time this afternoon to discuss, along with a number of my colleagues, my alarm and theirs over the mounting crescendo of publicity which has been given the so-called new era of ping-pong diplomacy with Communist China.

In his campaign for the Presidency, President Nixon repeatedly assured Americans that there would be change in our policy of opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. This has been the bedrock of our Asian policy for a quarter of a century. Trial balloons are being flown all over Washington to the effect that a new day is dawning and, all suddenly because of a ping-pong game, this Nation is going to give in to the Communists on this vital point and abstain from opposing its admission into the U.N.

The left-wing of world politics is ecstatic, of course. The so-called China experts in the United States are beside themselves with joy. It is time, I say, that we look before we leap into bed with the Reds.

I am one of those people, Mr. Speaker, who still believes that a Communist is a Communist and, for this reason, I do not swallow for one second the current propaganda that all is sweetness and light in Peking and that we should jump with joy over the possibility of having them in the U.N.

The admission question has been very much with us for two decades; even longer if we are to consider the years of planning that preceded the formation of the U.N. In all these years, no one has more clearly stated the case against the admission of Communist China than the late Adlai Stevenson when he was Ambassador to the U.N.:

> Let those members who advocate Peiping's admission seek to exert upon its rulers whatever benign influence they can in the hope of persuading them to accept the standards of the community of nations. Let those rulers respond to these appeals; let them give up trying to impose their demands on this Organization; let them cease their aggression, direct and indirect, and their threats of aggression; let them show respect for the rights of others; let them recognize and accept the independence and diversity of culture and institutions among their neighbors.

When Communist China has done these things which are required of other nations, then and only then, would it be appropriate to discuss their admission.

With dogged persistence, the left continues to work for the admission of the Communists, subscribing, apparently, to the dogma of China "expert," John K. Fairbank, who once said that he would favor the admission of the Communists, "even if they said they would dynamite the place."

On May 1 of this year, Chinese Communists chanted at least six new slogans in the streets of Peking during their May Day celebration. The first to catch my attention was this one:

> Peoples of the world, unite to crush American aggressors and their running dogs!

This, mind you, just 2 weeks after the celebrated ping-pong game. There are a number of others that were featured that day which should be read and understood by those who insist that there is a genuine thaw in the manic behavior of the Chinese Communists. These are good examples:

> Support the American people against the American government's aggressive policy.

This, it seems to me, the liberal left has obligingly done in recent weeks:

> Support the Indochinese people against American aggression.

My comment is the same:

> Resolutely oppose American imperialistic support for Israeli aggression against the Arab countries.

I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, as perhaps others have, that this theme is being sounded in the American press and along the university lecture circuit for the first time.

I am not alone in my fear that we are on the verge of selling the valiant Republic of China on Taiwan down the river. They have been the one, true, unswerving ally we have had in all of Asia and they deserve better than this. Others are beginning to speak out on this ping-pong diplomacy. These are a few:

Vice President Agnew: "Thus when his opinion was sought by Nixon in the National Security Council the other day about playing diplomatic ping-pong with Communist China, he said he was against it. He thought it would be a cheap propaganda victory for Peking and said so. . . . He thinks the Chinese Communists are a menace and he's not about to change this opinion for a couple of ping-pong games and a few tentative smiles." *James Reston.* Evening Star, April 21, 1971.

Harry Reasoner: "I think Agnew has the germ of an idea in worrying about our new China policy. He's wrong if what he is objecting to is the visit of the athletes and the reporting that indicates China is not a living hell. But if he means that it is unwise after 20 years of simplistic detestation of everything Chinese, to switch abruptly and uncritically to an equally simplistic lyricism about everything Chinese, he's right, for a change."

Rep. John Schmitz: "From the noises emanating from the mass media one would think the Chinese Communists had released the American servicemen whom they hold, or perhaps granted some type of limited freedom to the subjects over whom they hold sway, or perhaps even stopped developing the intercontinental missiles which pose such a grave threat to population centers in the United States by 1975."

Chicago Daily News: "This small beginning does not and should not signal a grand rush to climb in bed with the rulers of the People's Republic. Nor does it mean that the United States should do an about-face in the United Nations and abandon Nationalist China while welcoming the People's Republic. The issues that divide the United States and Red China still far outweigh any that would tend to bring them together."

Richmond News-Leader: "Red China's new attitude may be part of a plot to extinguish Taiwan. Chairman Mao may have concluded that if he adopts a friendly stance toward the United States, those American leaders who are urging Red China's admission to the United Nations will be encouraged to persist. Perhaps he is convinced, too, that the American people, fatigued by the war in Vietnam, are so eager for peace that they would willingly trade Taiwan's freedom for Peking's friendship."

Australian Prime Minister William McMahon: Reaffirmed April 15 that recognition of Taiwan would continue to be the main feature of Australia's China policy. He said Nationalist China must remain a member of the United Nations—and warned others who sympathize with Taiwan to rally support before the U.N. session next September.

John Chancellor: "Whether or not that is true, Agnew has raised some worthwhile questions. The Chinese are, in fact, still the main supplier of food and small arms to the North Vietnamese.

"It is an illustration of the crazy world in which we live, that Mr. Nixon can keep troops on patrol in Vietnam, where they are shot at with Chinese guns and ammunition, and at the same time talk about the normalization of relations with the people who make and supply the weapons and the bullets.

New York Daily News: "All this does not mean that Mao Tse-tung has changed his spots. He and his regime still are branded as aggressors by the United Nations. Communists the world over still are bent on ruining the United States sooner or later."

San Diego Union: "Nor can the U.S. government and the American people afford to forget that the emissaries Red China is sending to world capitals—and would send to the United Nations—are not ping-pong players. They are representatives of a regime that bases its claim of sovereignty on terrroism, violence and oppression, a regime that has declared itself opposed to the very existence of the United States of America."

Newark News: "But the ultimate test of whether Peking desires decent relations with the United States would be if it were to close down its Maoist-inspired schools for insurrectionists, terrorists, and political saboteurs."

Lt. Gen. V. H. Krulak, USMC, ret: "Dialog with China? There is no argument there. Certainly, we must have it and, if it were definitely in our selfish national interest to do so we would be justified in dealing with the cut-throats this very day.

"But it is not in our selfish national interest. There is no pressure whatever on us to dignify them or help perpetuate them. There is no pressure whatever on us to demoralize the opposition to Mao inside China."

Chalmers M. Roberts: "Senate GOP leader Hugh Scott (Pa.) was more cautious. He called the change one small step for Ping-Pong, but not yet a giant step for international relations."

William F. Buckley, Jr.: "The communist government of China stands condemned by the United Nations for having waged an aggressive war in Korea. All right, that was 20 years ago. Since then, China's principal wars have been against her own people, and estimates vary widely, but I have not seen one that put as less than 10 million people slaughtered in the course of giving flesh to the thoughts of Chairman Mao."

Ralph de Toledano: "To recognize Red China is to allow a new cancer to grow on the body of America, to give strength and sustenance to the fire-bombers and cop-killers. To admit Red China to the United Nations is to proclaim that its charter, already tattered, is less than a scrap of paper. It rewards belligerence and military aggression and it punishes a member, Nationalist China, whose only crime is that she has abided by the international laws prescribed by the U.N."

Crosby S. Noyes "The essence of that responsibility, as it has been seen by a succes-

sion of American governments since 1949, has been to contain the expansion of militant communism throughout Asia.

"The threat was no pipe-dream of overstimulated American cold warriors. With the single exception of Pakistan, every country on China's borders has felt the pressure of Chinese expansionism and so have many others which are not immediate neighbors. Except for the intervention of American power, it is quite certain that the map of Asia would look very different today than it does."

Richard Wilson: ". . . . there is no doubt at all of what Peking propagandists have in mind.

"It is a simple pitch over the heads of the Nixon administration to exploit 'mounting sentiment' among the people of the United States 'for correct assessment of China' as we face defeat in Asia.

"Peking could quite conceivably get by smiles and friendly gestures from a gullible 'American people' what it has not been able to get from four succeeding presidential administrations—a rapid and complete exit from a strong sphere of influence in Eastern Asia and the Western Pacific. If Peking could convince the American public of its good intentions in the let-down from the Vietnam War, no American government might find it politically possible to sustain the strong Asian policy of the past anywhere in the Western Pacific."

Human Events: "As one observer put it: 'The Administration is making a big mistake. It would be one thing to warm up relations with Red China if we were dealing from strength in Southeast Asia. But we're not. The United States is withdrawing from South Viet Nam—and the President is under huge pressure to pull out more rapidly. Even important leaders in his own party are pushing him this way.

" 'We are also drastically reducing our presence in South Korea. At the very time we are leaving and our success in South Viet Nam remains so uncertain, we are playing up to Peking. In Asian eyes, this must look like softness on our part.

" 'The result can only enhance Red China's prestige and power. It will increase the vulnerability of those states near Red China and cause great uncertainty among our allies about America's future role in Southeast Asia.' "

Smith Hempstone: "It is a pity no editor thought to ask Mr. Nixon if he would make the progress of the thaw between Peking and Washington conditional on the immediate release of Communist China's American prisoners, two of whom have been rotting in Mao's jails for nearly nineteen years. For if the President of the United States does not care about the fate of these men, who are in prison because of their service to this country, nobody else will."

Senator Peter Dominick: "I think we ought to keep in mind, as far as Red China is concerned, that they have not only been recently sporadically, but in the past almost daily, attacking Taiwan; that they have overrun Tibet; that they did invade India; and that they have been doing a lot of supplying of the North Vietnamese who in turn have invaded three other countries in eastern Asia.

"And the result of that, as far as I'm concerned, is that until they stop trying to move their boundaries out all the time that we ought to say, look fellows, we don't think that you belong because you're not abiding by the Charter of the U.N."

Tenzi ng Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, who lives in exile in India, on Feb. 10, 1971, in the *N.Y. Times:* "The Chinese have launched a veritable reign of terror. Tibetans of all classes are beaten, humiliated, tortured or killed on such flimsy, trumped-up charges as: harboring subversive designs against the regime, possessing religious objects or collaborating and helping 'reactionary elements'."

I received recently from former Congressman Walter H. Judd, chairman of the Committee of 1 Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the U.N., a dissertation which answers the seven most obvious questions that come up during any discussion of the admission question and I would like to review these with you:

1. The admission of Red China to the United Nations is "inevitable". The U.S. should change its policy of opposition to avoid a humiliating diplomatic defeat this fall.

Such predictions have been made before.

In 1953, after the Panmunjon agreement, it was declared "inevitable" that Peking would be admitted into the U.N. the following year. But when North Korea and Red China refused to release American POW's taken in the Korean War, as promised in the Panmunjom agreements, the U.N. members voted 43–11 against admission, with 11 abstentions.

In 1958, the "inevitability" argument was again advanced and appeared to be having some effect on the U.N. But Mao's behavior in the ludicrous Great Leap Forward, and the invasion of Tibet was too much, and the vote in 1959 was 44–28 against admission, with 9 abstentions.

Then, for two years, a well-planned propaganda campaign on behalf of admission was built up to a climax in 1965, resulting in a 47–47 tie, with 20 abstentions. Just as now there was a chorus of agitation that admission was "inevitable" in 1966. But Mao started the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", and its excesses demonstrated all too vividly why Peking is not qualified for membership. In the fall of 1966, the General Assembly once again voted against the admission of Peking 57–46, with 17 abstentions.

Until the Mao regime changes its attitudes and behavior toward free governments (as contrasted with its obvious efforts to turn "people", including the American people, against their own government), there is no possible justification for the United States weakening its position on this matter. And, if the U.S. does not weaken its position, it is by no means "inevitable" that the cause of freedom and peace in the world will be given such a near-fatal set-back as admission of Peking would represent.

2. The U.N. is an international organziation based on the principle of universality, and every nation should be represented.

This is simply not true. The U.N. was never intended to be a "universal" organization. It was intended to be a union of peace-loving nations to poll their resources against international lawlessness from whatever source. Article 4 of its Charter provides for expulsion from membership. Why would there be a provision for expulsion if all nations were to be members, no matter what their conduct?

Article 2, clauses 3 and 4, read:

"All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations."

Clearly, Communist China, with its invasion of South Korea, Tibet, India, its sponsorship of the attempted *coup d'etat* in Indonesia, its declared policy of encouraging "wars of national liberation" around the world, does not qualify as a "peace-loving state"—the requirement specified in the U.N. Charter.

The "universality" argument distintegrates completely when you consider that for two decades, the Soviet Union has blocked admission of West Germany. Why isn't there a nation-wide campaign to seat West Germany? It qualifies.

3. The Chinese Communist regime is firmly established on the mainland and there is no evidence that it will soon be overthrown. To continue denying Peking a seat in the United Nations is "unrealistic". It is a futile effort to ignore 700 million people and deny them a voice in the world organization.

The devastating "Cultural Revolution" is barely two years old. Its total effects on the people and the country are yet to be measured. A military dictatorship under the direction of Lin Piao today controls mainland China. An increasingly frail Mao will be 78 in December. In November, 1970, more Chinese attempted to escape to freedom in Hong Kong than East Germans have ever tried to go over or under the Berlin Wall since it was erected in 1961. The Chinese Communist Party is so uncertain of its power that it submitted the draft of its new constitution to only 170 members of the Central Committee. It hasn't been able to decide on a new President since unseating Lin Shao-chi in November, 1968.

To admit Mao's regime would truly be to ignore the 700 million Chinese people and deny them the representation in the U.N. to which they are entitled under a government of their own choosing and representing their own interests, not a self-appointed, self-perpetuating tyranny that represents no one but itself.

4. Without Communist China's participation, world disarmament is meaningless. International agreement on the control of nuclear arms must include Peking and its growing arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, Peking has repeatedly declared that it will not take part in any nuclear disarmament talks, inside or outside the U.N. It denounced the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and vowed to continue its nuclear tests in the atmosphere under all circumstances. In 1968, it not only spurned an invitation from the U.N. to endorse the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, but denounced the pact after it had been signed by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. This spring, it refused to be a party to the nuclear sea-bed treaty.

5. How can we deal with Red China if it is not in the U.N.?

The same way we deal with West Germany, Spain, Switzerland, etc. which are not members. The only thing necessary for normal relations is that a government be willing to act as a responsible member of civilized international society. Red China has thus far refused that role. What incentive would there be for Peking to change its conduct once it has already been given the benefits of membership?

6. Just as Stalin's "iron curtain" belligerence was succeeded by the present Soviet policy of "peaceful coexistence", so will Mao Tse-tung's hard line be followed by a more mellow and less hostile policy toward the United States and the Free World. If the U.S. offers the bait of membership in the U.N. (and even diplomatic recognition), the new generation of Chinese Communist leaders will be encouraged to be more conciliatory and consistent with the peace-keeping principles of the U.N.

Leaving aside the question of just how "peaceful" is the Soviet version of "peaceful coexistent" (wide military and economic support of Egypt, Cuba, North Vietnam—every trouble spot in the world today), the record is clear that Peking, until April, 1971, rejected every overture of the United States to improve relations between the two nations.

Between 1958 and 1971, four American presidents suggested everything from an exchange of journalists to a gift of wheat to limited trade to tourism, only to be ignored or rebuffed in every instance. It was the Chinese Communists who abruptly cancelled,

in February, 1970, the talks between us and them that had been going on since 1955. It is the Chinese Communists who have publicly declared that until the U.S. recognizes their sovereignty over the island of Taiwan, where the Republic of China is located, there is no point in even discussing diplomatic relations.

As for Peking's so-called "ping-pong diplomacy", even the New York Times, a longtime advocate of admission, reported from Washington on April 18 that "few Asian specialists here believe that much progress has been made on the central questions that divide the two governments."

Those central questions include: (a) The sovereignty of the Republic of China on the island of Taiwan; (b) the Vietnam War in which Peking supplies nearly all of the small arms and ammunition to North Vietnam; (c) Communist China's encouragement of "wars of national liberation" in Southeast Asia, Africa and even the United States; (d) Communist China's willingness to abide by the Charter of the United Nations and that organization's designation of Red China as the "aggressor" in the Korean War; (e) The release of American prisoners in mainland China, at least two of whom have been held since 1952.

7. A working relationship with Peking will give the U.S. added leverage in dealing with the Soviet Union. Moscow's fear of encirclement is deep-rooted and the prospect of improved communications between Peking and Washington will move the Soviets toward a reduction of tensions with the West.

Power politics is a dangerous and risky business, particularly when a free country like the U.S. is pitted against two Communist countries. It is about as safe as getting involved in a quarrel between a man and his wife. We must remember that the Soviet Union and Red China are both Communist, both avowedly dedicated to world communization. Their essential disagreement with each other is not whether but how they can communize the world. For all the disputes over boundary lines, ideological purity and the rest, the facts are that these two Communist nations have been working together against the U.S. in the Vietnam war. They concluded a new trade agreement which increases Soviet assistance to Peking. They have abandoned much of the hostile rhetoric which filled the air during the Cultural Revolution. We must not be so vain as to think that Moscow and Peking do not fully understand our attempt at power politics and will disregard the wedge we are trying to drive between them.

Has Communist China earned a place in the United Nations?

The Miami Herald summed it up in a recent editorial:

"Over much of a generation Peking has carried on a propaganda campaign, particularly in Africa and parts of Asia, against the United States. The Maoist wing of the Communist Party has been ardently engaged in subversion in Latin America and elsewhere.

"In short, as a putative friend mainland China still talks and acts like a sworn enemy.

"A constructive relationship with the world community requires the world good citizenship which Peking has yet to demonstrate by word and deed. Until it does, there will be no reason to thrust reputability upon it."

A number of my colleagues also wish to address the House this afternoon on this subject and I do not want to take all the time allotted, but I do want to make this observation.

The terror of the recent "cultural revolution" in China, the intervention of Peking in North Vietnam, the support of extremist revolution in Africa and Latin America, and the unremitting paranoia of the Communist Chinese do not suggest to me that the Government there is in any way a "peace loving" Nation with which we should exchange ambassadors or support in their bid for membership in the U.N.

Recognition of Peking by Paris and London has not led to any improvement whatsoever in political and/or trade relations. Instead, it has led to barbaric assaults on British and French diplomats and civilians.

We simply must not turn our back on our friends in Asia and the rest of the world when we, through five Presidents, have stated over and over and over again that we would not support or allow Peking to enter the U.N. Is our word as a nation valueless? Has anything happened, and I accent the word anything, to make a sensible person believe that, all of a sudden, China is a friendly, peace-loving nation that admits it was wrong in slaughtering tens of millions of its own people, wrong when it attacked neighbor after neighbor, wrong when it fostered subversive campaign after subversive campaign?

No, Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed except that, for reasons known only to them, it is now expedient for the Communist Chinese to relax their hatred for us, at least publicly. There is nothing here for us to gain and everything for us to lose.

I do not trust the Communist Chinese and I question the full sanity of anyone who can look at the record of the past 25 years and say otherwise.

This is not the time to relax our vigilance and I hope the administration will find its trial balloons shot full of holes by the logic of the arguments we will present this afternoon.

As a part of my statement, I would like to make a part of the RECORD, several editorials which have appeared in the Nation's press recently, and then I will yield to my colleagues.

The editorials follow:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Apr. 28, 1971]

PING-PONG AND HARI-KIRI

It's terribly touching to note that after all these years the American public is being given a chance to reconsider its evil thoughts about the wonderful regime in Red China. Report after report in the media describes the awesome accomplishments of Chairman Mao and company, who, the nation is told, have created a comfortable but not lavish workers' paradise. Objectivity distinguishes these glowing reports—distinguishes them by its absence.

Take, for example, a recent article in the New York Times by correspondent Tillman Durdin. Handpicked by the Red Chinese, Durdin is the first full-time foreign correspondent for an American newspaper to be granted a visa since the 1950s; Durdin obviously wishes to return the compliment by filing stories such as his recent report on a workers' housing complex outside Shanghai. Without a qualm, Durdin proclaims that "the complex facilities" satisfy all ordinary needs and "make it unnecessary for residents to seek facilities elsewhere." Imagine that: The complex sounds just like another type of community that satisfies "all ordinary needs"–a prison. Such thoughts, of course, do not hamper Durdin's idyllic descriptions.

And consider his portrait of the complex's nursery. Durdin describes being "entertained" (his word) by 5-year-olds singing. "We unite and struggle in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; people join to defeat the U.S. aggressors and their running dogs." Charming little tykes, and they come by it honestly. The children in the complex are "cared for" in the nursery from the time they are a few months old until they are six, some seeing their parents at night, some seeing them only on weekends. One struggles to find a worthy parallel for such an upbringing—the Hitler Youth comes closest, though perhaps George Orwell's fictional world of "1984" would be more appropriate.

Indeed, as Durdin and his comrades in the media go on and on in their santification of Red China, one increasingly wonders whether 1984 has come before its time. American journalists are re-writing history in the manner of Orwell's Ministry of Truth, and going one step further in re-writing the present. If the nation accepts their world view, it may find that one day, instead of playing ping-pong with the Red Chinese, it will be playing hari-kiri by itself.

[From the Sacramento, Calif. Union, Apr. 30, 1971]

RED CHINA'S STRATEGY: PING-PONG DIPLOMACY BIDS FOR PEKING SEAT IN THE U.N.

It becomes increasingly clear that Communist China's dramatic invitation to the American table-tennis team was not an indication that the Peking government has changed its attitude toward the United States of America.

The first objective of the regime of Mao Tse-tung is membership in the United Nations. This is reflected in the selective, strategic issuance of table-tennis invitations.

Of the six nations invited thus far, only Nigeria already was Peking's ally in voting at the United Nations to seat Red China.

Appraisal of the significance of the Communist Chinese "ping-pong diplomacy" has been typical.

The world, particularly the Western-oriented world has tended to react as if this single informal gesture were a 180-degree reversal of the Red Chinese leadership in its 25-year history of bitter, militant hostility.

The discussion already has leap-frogged over basic principles to the mechanics of a "two-China policy" at the United Nations—of the Security Council role of each or either China, of the substantial charter changes that would be involved, of the voting procedures, and other similar actions that would have to precede a two-China decision.

The optimism is based on nothing more substantial than a few smiles from the Chinese upon a few American citizens who enjoy table tennis. This falls far short of proof that Communist China has changed its official policy.

Peking leadership still is conducting its anti-American propaganda campaign.

The Warsaw talks have not resumed.

No American businessman has an order for goods in hand, and supplies continue to pour through Mainland China to North Vietnam.

Nothing that Communist China has said or done indicates that it has altered its often repeated goal—the destruction of the United States.

Nor as a matter of fact, has Communist China applied for membership in the United Nations, which the charter stipulates is an essential prerequisite. If it did apply, no member could honestly conclude that Mainland China is a "peace-loving nation"—also a prerequisite for membership.

Certainly, the efforts of the Nixon Administration to establish dialogue with the people of Communist China must be applauded and supported.

It is conceivable that trade, travel and cultural exchanges can build a bridge of discussion between the people of the United States and those of Communist China.

It is, however, naive to assume that today's leadership of Communist China has, in any way, changed its hostility to the United

States—or that Peking is interested in world peace.

It is dynamite to give such a regime a powerful new weapon in the form of United Nations membership—particularly since this would likely mean that East Germany, North Korea and North Vietnam would be knocking at the doors of the world today.

It would be the height of irresponsibility to seat the present hostile leadership of Red China in the world association of nations at the expense of Nationalist China, which is peace-loving and an asset to the Western World.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, April 18, 1971]

LET US REMEMBER!

Chou En-lai is still in business.

He can soft sell green walnuts to Arkansas razorbacks and they'll swear to buying corn on the cob.

George Weller, an old China hand, recalled for the Chicago Daily News how Chou En-lai snatched Manchuria from Chiang Kai-shek in 1946.

Chou applied the same artfulness to Gen. George C. Marshall, dispatched to Peking to "unify" China, that we've seen applied to the U.S. table tennis team.

First about Chou's appearance.

Weller remembers Chou as a handsome man who always spoke in a low, casual manner, not unlike another great bluffer, Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus.

Next about Chou's methods.

Reports Weller:

Gently Chou convinced Marshall that although he, himself, trusted the Americans, there were other, more skeptical Communist Party leaders up in the bare mountains of Yenan who considered them imperialists. The U.S. Marines were then occupying the line from Peking to the sea, including the great port of Tsingtao, where hundreds of tons of U.S. arms were waiting for Chiang Kai-shek, who was to occupy Manchuria in conformity with the peace treaties.

The way for America to win the Chinese Communists entirely, Chou persuaded Marshall, was simply to pull out the Marines and prove their good faith, Marshall was left, like President Lyndon B. Johnson, with an empty bag.

Chou cleared the way for his Red army to swing south after accepting Manchuria from the Russians . . . and North China out of the Americans.

One of Chou's defter tricks was in convincing the Americans that the Japanese Communist Party's leaders, refugees in Yenan, ought to be flown back to their mother country. It was supposed to be another demonstration of "good faith." The American command in China obeyed, helpfully planting rebellion inside its own occupation.

"In those days there was no doctrinaire maoism. Mao Tse-tung was simply a Buddha-like figure in the caves of Yenan. He had none of Chou's skills at loosening American cautions.

Chou reminds us of President Sukarno of Indonesia who inserted quotes from Thomas Paine, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson in his speeches to illiterate farmers so that western newsmen, who heard the quotes spoken in English, knew he was sincere and dedicated and trustworthy even though Sukarno eventually tried to sell out to the Communists, Chinese brand.

The United States is so hungry for good news of any kind that Chou was a ready market.

We're so ready to be sold only a few remember that Mao Tse-tung asserted:

Power grows from the muzzle of a gun.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 7, 1971]

EXPECTATIONS REGARDING CHINA

Marshall Green, the assistant secretary of state for Asian affairs, warned the other day that we should expect mainland China to continue pursuing some policies that could prove troublesome if not downright dangerous to various American friends and interests. His implicit point, of course, is a perfectly sensible one: any thaw in Sino-American relations that might develop in the foreseeable future would be most unlikely to affect fundamental national policies in either country, and these policies in many cases are in conflict.

There is nothing startling in this appraisal, only a realistic recognition of the way things work. One can certainly hope for a continuing expansion of contacts between the United States and China, for an improvement in knowledge and understanding for a lessening of suspicion and fear. But even under the best of circumstances there are limits to what can be accomplished. In the end, the two countries will continue to go their own ways, and at times their courses could come very close to collision.

Our experience with the Soviet Union makes the point. We have had formal diplomatic relations since 1933. Long before that, newsmen, scholars, traders were going back and forth. All these formal and informal contacts have had negligible influence on basic policies and goals.

The Russians remain formidable and dangerous antagonists—indeed, they have grown more dangerous as time has gone on—and they more often than not see the furtherance of their interests coming from the erosion of ours. We can talk with the Russians, we can negotiate with them, but very seldom can we rightly expect a coincidence of views or interests.

So with the Chinese. China sees itself as the legitimately dominant force in Asia, and a great world power besides. It wants international recognition of that role and it will seek it with deeds and symbols alike. It will go on building and testing nuclear weapons and the systems for delivering them. It will try to expand its political influence in neighboring countries and elsewhere in the world either by dealing with governments in power or by supporting insurrections. It will do whatever the perceived interests of Chinese nationalism and the flexible doctrines of Maoist communism suggest is best for China.

A few smiles from Chou En-lai or tours by newsmen won't change this nor should we expect it to. While everyone would like less tense and more trusting relations with the Chinese, wishing won't make it so. Improved relations might do a lot to reduce the risks of conflict by misjudgment or misunderstanding, but that is about all we should anticipate.

[From the Lima (Ohio) News, May 3, 1971]

U.N. IS MAO'S GOAL

It becomes increasingly clear that Communist China's recent invitation to the American table tennis team was not an indication that the Peking government has changed its attitude toward the United States.

The first objective of the regime of Mao Tse-tung is membership in the United Nations. This is reflected in the selective, strategic issuance of table tennis invitations. Of the six nations invited thus far, only Nigeria already was Peking's ally in voting at the U.N. to seat Red China.

Appraisal of the significance of the Communist Chinese "ping-pong diplomacy" has been typical. The world, particularly the Western-oriented world, has tended to react as if this single informal gesture were a 180-degree reversal of the Red Chinese leadership in its 25-year history of bitter, militant hostility.

The discussion already has leap-frogged over basic principles to the mechanics of a two-China policy at the U.N.—of the Security Council role of each or either China, of the substantial U.N. charter changes that would be involved, of the voting procedures and other similar actions that would have to precede a two-China decision.

The optimism is based on nothing more substantial than a few miles from the Chinese upon a few American citizens who enjoy table tennis. This falls far short of proof that Communist China has changed its official policy. Peking leadership still is conducting its anti-American propaganda campaign. The Warsaw talks have not resumed. No American businessman has an order for goods in hand, and supplies pour through mainland China to North Vietnam.

Nothing that Communist China has said or done indicates that it has altered its often repeated goal—the destruction of the United States.

Nor as a matter of fact, has Communist China applied for membership in the United Nations, which the charter stipulates is an essential prerequisite. If it did apply, no member could honestly conclude that Mainland China is a "peace-loving nation"—also supposedly a prerequisite for membership.

Certainly the efforts of the Nixon administration to establish dialogue with the people held under Communist rule in China makes sense. It is conceivable that trade, travel and cultural exchanges can build a bridge of discussion between the people of the United States and the people of Communist China.

It is, however, naive to assume that today's political leadership of Communist China has in any way changed its hostility to the United States, or that it is interested in world peace. It is dynamite to give such a regime a new weapon in the form of U.N. membership, particularly since this would likely mean that East Germany, North Korea and North Vietnam also would be knocking at the doors of the world debating society.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the fine statement he has made. I share his views wholeheartedly, and desire to be associated with the sentiment the gentleman has expressed. I have noted that when this so-called ping-pong diplomacy came into being it appeared to be a possible thaw, but I have noticed since then that the ice has formed anew. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to share in the views of the gentleman from Louisiana wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, after dangling the carrot of friendship before the noses of Americans for a few tantalizing days, Peking has dealt a cruel blow to those whose hopes were kindled by the "ping-pong diplomacy" by declaring that there is no thawing after all.

The declaration was made by no other than Chou En-lai himself who, in a reception for the Philippine trade delegation in Peking on May 8, bluntly pointed out that:

There is no thawing in U.S.-China relations.

The major stumbling block, he said, was the Nationalist Chinese Government on Taiwan. He made the all too familiar charge that the United States has interfered in China's affairs by stationing the 7th Fleet in the Taiwan Straits, and unless we give up the two-China idea and pull out our forces from Taiwan:

There could be no breakthrough in the cold war between the two countries.

Anyone who has not lost his sense of proportion by Peking's smiling faces would notice that its hostility toward the U.S. Government, especially toward President Nixon, never slackened a bit while the ping-pong games were going merrily on. Its official propaganda organs were doing the usual business of grinding out piece after piece of anti-Americanism day in and day out. If anyone should doubt the authenticity of the abovementioned Chou En-lai's remarks which were not published by most news media here, let him read another paragraph from a New China News Agency article, carried by Peking's worldwide English-language service:

Since the visit of the U.S. table-tennis delegation to China upon invitation, there has been a new development in the friendship between the American and Chinese people. In these circumstances, the Nixon administration, which is beset with difficulties both at home and abroad, hastily made various gestures with regard to its policy toward China as if it wanted to improve relations with China. But this is actually intended to gain political capital in order to extricate itself from the unprecedented isolation at home and abroad.

Nixon's intention to establish normal relations with Communist China is all humbug, it said.

Thus, in no uncertain terms, the Peking Communists have ruled out the possibility of a quick thaw between them and us, and placed all the blames at our door. It is true that they have some distinction between our Government and people, by stressing that their friendliness toward our people remains warm as ever. This is itself humbug, because any meaningful improvement of relations cannot be achieved without governmental contacts. Clearly, Peking was only trying to discredit our President and the administration. If the Chinese Communists really mean it, they should resume the ambassadorial talks at Warsaw, instead of inviting our ping-pong players for sightseeing to a few spots on the Chinese mainland.

Other behaviors of Peking add to the confirmation that it still treats the United States as its enemy No. 1. In preparation for the May Day this year, the New China News Agency released a set of 31 slogans for mainlandwide use. Of the 31, 14 dealt with external matters and 10 of them carried anti-U.S. messages. Eight of the 10 specifically exclaimed that U.S. imperialism should be opposed and defeated.

A joint May Day editorial by the People's Daily, the Red Flag and the Liberation Army Daily declared that "the new height of struggle against the American imperialists and their lackeys is continuing its forward development," and vowed to "fight shoulder to shoulder" with the world people against "imperialists, revisionists and reactionaries."

On other major international issues, Peking's anti-American stand also shows little change:

Korea: A People's Daily editorial of April 15 entitled "The Korean People's Struggle to Unify Their Motherland Will be Victorious" claimed that "our common enemies are the American imperialists." It said withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea was prerequisite to any talk on solving the Korean question.

Indochina: A People's Daily editorial of April 25 entitled "The 50 Million Indochinese People Are Unconquerable" pledged once again that:

The 700 million Chinese will redouble their efforts to help the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos through their "anti-American war of national salvation."

Okinawa: A New China News Agency dispatch of April 27 accused "reactionaries of America and Japan" for preparing to sign an agreement concerning the return of the islands to Japan, thereby legalizing continuous presence of "U.S. imperialists" on the islands.

The Middle East: NCNA on at least three occasions, April 16, 23, and 25, accused the U.S. Government of supplying weapons to Jordan so that King Hussein could "take ruthless steps against the Palestinian guerrillas," and of supporting Israel, thus betraying its "true face as enemy of Arabians and Palestinians."

Africa: Li Hsien-nien, one of Peking's "Vice Premiers" said at a party for a group of Mali visitors April 27, that:

Red China will always stand on the side of African peoples and support their just struggle against imperialists headed by America.

Latin America: NCNA said in a report April 29 on anti-American struggles in the Dominican Republic that:

Peoples in America's own backyards are now heightening their fights to repel U.S. imperialist aggression and to protest their independence and sovereignty.

While continuing verbal attacks on the United States on world issues, Peking also never forgets to exploit our internal troubles. An NCNA correspondent article of May 25 cited "daily heavier burden of military expenditure, skyrocketing prices, the deaths of tens of thousands of youths, antiwar demonstrations and the dollar crisis," gleefully asserting that "the Nixon administration has found the going tougher and tougher at home."

The article's conclusion probably best sums up the Peking attitude towards us: "At present, a new surge in the struggle against U.S. imperialism is rising vigorously throughout the world. The death knell of U.S. imperialism is being tolled and its days are numbered."

All these are post-ping pong. Are we really so naive and so blind as to believe that Peking has changed its thinking about, or attitude towards us, behind Chou En-lai's dashing smiles?

A number of major newspapers in the country share my concern, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to make a part of this RECORD a few of the one's which have come to my attention.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Apr. 28, 1971]

WHAT HAS REALLY CHANGED?

The eager flurry of domestic and international maneuvering spawned by Red China's hospitality toward an American table tennis team has offered far more illusion of change than reality.

When one pauses to observe the dizzy whirl from a safe distance it appears that Washington is making much ado about little.

Modification of the United States' long-standing opposition to United Nation's membership for Communist China and the seeming willingness to cast aside Nationalist China are generous gifts indeed—especially since there have been no visible gains for this country in return.

Perhaps there will be. But the evidence to date suggests we are giving far more than we are receiving.

It has been reported that considerable groundwork was laid for closer Red Chinese-American relations long before the onset of "Ping Pong diplomacy." In the absence of direct diplomatic links the Nixon administration is said to have used "third" governments to relay messages of goodwill to Peking.

The President, according to informed observers, believes that an easing of tensions between the two governments would greatly aid his new Asian policy, which features a reduction of direct American involvement.

Others, however, feel that this abrupt shift in U.S. foreign policy represents a change for the worse.

Dr. Walter H. Judd, former congressman from Minnesota, said in a speech last week: "If in fact there has been some 'mellowing' and 'evolution' inside Communist China, has it been caused by their successes? Or by their failures? If economic and other pressures from within and without are compelling Mao and his gang of military dictators to moderate their policies, doesn't common sense dictate that we maintain those pressures rather than reduce them?"

Dr. Judd insisted that "admission of Red China to the United Nations is not inevitable" and that "nothing has changed the fact that there are no legal, moral or practical grounds for admission."

The former congressman put his finger on one of the most bothersome questions of the matter with this comment:

"If our concept of representative government is to have any meaning we must never accept as permanent any regime that enslaves human beings."

This is precisely what would be accomplished if the direction of America's China policy shifts to the indicated new path: the enslavement of 800 million Chinese would be recognized as a permanent, approved condition.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, Mar. 28, 1971]

THREAT TO GLOBAL PEACE—MAO TSE-TUNG'S REGIME IS NOT WORTHY OF RECOGNITION

The Communist conquest of China 22 years ago must be ranked as one of the worst catastrophies of modern times. Already, it has ushered in two Asian wars which inflicted more than 300,000 American casualties, including 100,000 dead.

For the Chinese people, the tragedy is without parallel.

The slaughters of Hitler and Stalin pale by comparison with the 15-million Chinese murdered by orders of the Mao Tse-tung regime.

Moreover, the extension of communism into China has brought the entire Asia land mass under siege.

The whole world soon will be threatened by hydrogen-headed missiles being incubated by Peking.

Certainly, the neglect of the United States of America and our mistaken policies contributed to the loss of three-quarters of a billion people as a firm ally.

Now, America stands once again at a historic watershed with respect to China which could alter the course of history.

The question is whether the United States should sanction admission of the Peking regime into the United Nations, assuming Peking is interested in UN membership.

Led by a flock of Senate doves, a small but vocal element in this country would embrace the Chinese Reds because, it is argued, a quarter of mankind should not be isolated. According to this viewpoint, the Mao regime would become civilized through a "meaningful dialogue."

The time has come for the American people to do some straight thinking about China.

The beginning of wisdom is the need to recognize the sharp distinction between the Chinese people and the government in Peking.

Those familiar with China today know that the Mao administration does not truly govern Mainland China; that Mao himself lacks authority.

After having the ancient and revered family concept attacked, after the disastrous communal farms, the backyard steel-furnace leaps and other Marxist horrors, including the unleashing of murderous Red guards at the orders of Mao, the stoic Chinese masses simply refuse to carry out Peking's orders.

In the face of all this, there is little wonder that the Maoists merely maintain the form but not the substance of power today.

We must, of course, eventually have dialogue with China—but only when it is in our interest to do so.

At the present time, it is not in our national interest. There is no need to dignify or help perpetuate the hapless Peking regime.

There is no significant promise of fruitful trade with Red China.

There is no promise of greater security. Finally, in all probability there is no one in Peking with whom we could hold a responsible dialogue.

If we are patient, the Chinese people will eventually prevail and the Maoists will be supplanted by the patient people of China.

Asia has a great future.

The United States could have a great role in that future provided we do not repudiate our friends and embrace our enemies—provided we do not help to perpetuate the Maoists through recognition.

To paraphrase a Chinese parable: This is not the time to cast our nets; it is the time to dry them.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Apr. 15, 1971]

SWEETNESS AND LIGHT

All of a sudden a measure of sweetness and light has broken out between the United States and Communist China.

How long this will last, or where it will lead, are questions no one can answer.

The Red Chinese initiated it by an "out of the blue" invitation to an American table tennis team to visit, the first Americans officially welcomed in China in 22 years. Piling hospitality on hospitality, the Chinese even gave the visitors a warm audience with Premier Chou En-lai, No. 2 man in the government.

Chou predicted more Americans would come to China, even newspaper reporters (although not all at the same time). He proclaimed great interest in "countries which do not recognize us," and declared a "new page" opened in U.S.-China relations.

President Nixon reacted by relaxing restrictions on trade with Red China, loosening currency controls, offering entry permits to Chinese wishing to visit the United States and amending some of the rules which have made Red China off limits to U.S. shipping and other interests.

The President didn't take off all the wraps. He simply took some steps which could lead to more normal relations with the Asian giant. Obviously, further steps will depend on Chinese responses.

Chou En-lai, in his interview with the table tennis players noted that U.S.-China "exchanges" have been "cut off for a long time." But he made no mention of why he laid no blame on the United States. The why, of course, is that the Chinese, by their own policies, virtually took themselves out of world society.

For years, hostility to the United States had top priority in Red China's foreign policy. Their only serious ventures outside their own walls were directed at countries they thought ripe for mischief-making—particularly Korea, the newer nations in Africa, Cuba and some countries in South America.

Now, on the surface at least, there has been a change.

"There is an old Chinese saying," said Chou, "When people travel to other countries they find friends everywhere."

Maybe. But Chou is known as a charmer, who can turn it off and on, and one whose understanding of the truth has not always coincided, at least, with the understandings of others—including U.S. officials in the past.

"If you think we are difficult to deal with," the late Soviet Foreign Minister Vyasheslav M. Molotov once said, "wait until you come up against Chou."

We have been up against him before and got singed. This time, as we read Nixon's actions, we will show our willingness to be sociable—but proceed warily.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT) for his participation in this special order today, and I am hopeful that it will help cause the administration to review with caution what is happening in China today.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in joining my colleagues in this discussion on Communist China, I believe that we must approach the subject objectively, and that we must especially be mindful of Red China's actions in comparison with their words. We must note the difference between carefully calculated public relations gestures such as the ping-pong invitation, and the more fundamental actions of the Red Chinese government.

It is obvious from many American commentaries, that the anticipation of results from Communist China's "ping-pong" initiative toward the United States has been so engrossing that it has obscured the passage of time and the meagerness of results.

Too much was expected when Peking suddenly announced that it would permit 15 American ping-pong players to join teams from other nations in a week of exhibition play in Mainland China. Too much still is expected.

In review, if anything has been exhibited during the 2 months that the ping pong diplomacy has been with us, it is that there has been no change whatever in the bitter Communist Chinese attitude toward the United States.

However, it can be said that the United States did try to generate momentum toward detente after the so-called breakthrough.

In the 2 months, for example, the United States has agreed to permit direct trade in dollars with Mainland China. The administration will allow American ships to carry Chinese goods and call at Chinese ports. The list of goods that can be sold to China has been expanded materially. All travel restrictions have been removed so far as visits to China are concerned, and the State Department even has hinted that it may be willing to be flexible on the issue of Chinese representation at the United Nations.

Objectively, we can describe the concessions made by the United States as major, especially the decision to permit Communist China to trade in dollars, the only international currency. As we review U.S. policy over the years, the administration's policy adjustment toward Red China does represent a substantial change, reflecting, perhaps, general American attitude even though the policy and attitude might be wrong.

But the Red Chinese have responded only by repeating their standard invectives, condemning the United States and all it stands for; this despite the fact that there is much Communist China could do to win world applause if they were to conduct a legitimate foreign policy.

For example, international applause would be immediately forthcoming, if Red China would indicate they were willing to discuss participation in any of the existing nuclear ban treaties or arms limitation discussions.

The Red Chinese should release the Americans that it is imprisoning and show some initiative in securing humane treatment for American prisoners of war in Indochina in accordance with Geneva conventions on the subject. Peking could also agree to resume direct discussions with the United States at Warsaw.

The Red Chinese are doing as much as the Soviet Union to encourage the aggression of North Vietnam against the South Vietnamese. Their aggression against Tibet and India is a matter of recent history and their war of aggression against South Korea and the United Nations' forces is still a major complication in the Far East.

Also, let us keep in mind that Communist China has never applied for membership in the United Nations. The United Nations General Assembly session this fall might well produce a situation where the Red Chinese would be invited but then decline to accept membership.

I still believe that admission of Red China would be a mockery of the principles of the United Nations. Unless Red China demonstrates that it will completely abide by international law it does not deserve admission to the United Nations. The Red Chinese are continuing subversive activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and admitting them to the United Nations would, in effect, be encouraging their future transgressions.

Mr. Speaker, Communist China, except for the ping-pong show, has not responded affirmatively to any overtures from our Government or from businessmen seeking to open up trade possibilities. We must approach this subject pragmatically and insist that the next round of concessions and adjustments must come from the Chinese Communists, as we have more than responded to the first ping-pong serve.

May I add one more point, Mr. Speaker? That is my strong belief that we must maintain our defense agreement

with the Nationalist Chinese Government. Under no conditions should we permit that government to be removed from the United Nations or limit our diplomatic, trade, and military relations with them.

Mr. Speaker, we must approach the question of contacts with Red China in a necessarily careful fashion—eyes and ears wide open and not permit the ping and pong of ping-pong diplomacy to lull us into premature agreements with the Red Chinese that could cause long-term adverse complications for our country and for the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very impressed with the number of Members who have shown an interest in this subject. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is performing a great public service by taking the time this afternoon so that the Members could properly caution the country on the need to go very, very slowly in any developments involving Red China.

I personally believe that what we have seen in this so-called ping-pong initiative is a very careful propaganda ploy, and it is not at all a relaxation of the position of the Red Chinese. It does not indicate that they would abide by international law, the Geneva Conventions, or anything that a responsible nation would conform to.

I think that rather than any false feelings of progress in trade or diplomatic or other relations, we ought to take a look at what has happened since the ping pong escapade. Frankly, what has happened is—nothing.

As the gentleman from Louisiana pointed out, they continue to abuse the authority of the United States and continue their involvement in North Vietnam and in Laos. They support the insurgencies against the government in Burma.

There is nothing in the Red Chinese pattern in the last 2 months that indicates anything but the classic anti-western and anti-United States foreign policy and their goal of world conquest by the hammer and sickle of communism.

So I believe it is well for us to caution Americans to try to avoid the wishful thinking that some seem to have of an era of peace and sweetness and light being generated by the Red Chinese.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for taking the lead in this discussion this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker. May I make some additional comments to direct to the Members, attention the record of Red China in its relations with neighbors in Asia?

The aggression of Communist China is in vivid form having manifested itself in various ways against the countries that lie on its borders. The approach of Red China has varied with each given situation, but the ultimate goal has always been the same—political, ideological and military subjugation. The approach to Tibet was direct and brutal. To India it has been one of harassment, and in Burma Chinese infiltration and subversion is a matter of substantial evidence. Therefore, it is timely to review these clear involvements of Communist China in the affairs of its neighbors.

Tibet was a victim of Chinese Communist aggression in its starkest form. On October 7, 1950, the Chinese Communist armies marched into Tibet. In spite of pleas to the United Nations, which did little but commiserate, expressing grave concern over the violation of the Tibetan people's fundamental human rights and the suppression of their cultural and religious life which followed, Tibet remained enslaved. In 1951, it was forced to renounce its de facto independence and come under Chinese Communist rule. Several uprisings were crushed with ruthless cruelty at an estimated cost of 70,000 lives, for a total population of close to 2 million. This is not counting those who died in camps, deported or from maltreatment. In March 1959, the Dalai Lama fled during an uprising. Some 80,000 of his subjects managed to escape too, mostly to India, Bhutan, Sikkim and Nepal. In India alone, some 21,000 children of whom 14,000 were orphans and were established in schools created for them. The regime of terror that followed occupation soon revealed itself aimed at the obliteration of Tibetan culture, religion, and even the people. The reports were so terrible that in 1959, a Legal Inquiry Committee was established by the International Commission of Jurists to study the reports on what was happening in Tibet. Their investigation reached the unanimous conclusion that Tibet had been the victim of flagrant violations of human rights, and genocide. Meanwhile the country remained under Chinese Communist rule and soon became a fortress from which incursions could be made on neighboring states. For instance, India.

India signed a non-aggression pact with Communist China on April 29, 1954, and with relation to the "Tibet region of China". But even this effort to disregard the plight of Tibet in order to safeguard her own interests, proved to little avail.

On October 29, 1959, Communist troops attacked an Indian force on the Kashmir border, the first of many similar, and more serious incidents. On November 20, 1961, an Indian note of protest to Red China mentioned further aggression and listed 11 incursions since April 1960. But the aggression continued. Serious fighting finally developed. On October 22, 1962, India broadcast a warning stating that the Communist Chinese attacks were "a menace that threatens the freedom of our people and the independence of our country". That same day, October 22, 1962, the U.S. delegate to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson, declared in the General Assembly that the Chinese Communist "naked aggression" against India was a new proof that that country was unfit for membership in the United Nations. Their actions on the Indian frontier "show their scorn for the Charter of this organization".

All this did not affect the Communist Chinese who continued their aggressive activities. India then declared a state of emergency, calling the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and France for help. Thereupon, quite characteristically, Communist China offered to call for a cease-fire.

From then on, after an uneasy peace, sporadic fighting resumed now and then. These activities were the more harassing because India could not very well forecast the future. On May 13, 1966, Indian Defense Minister Y. B. Chavan declared in Parliament that China had now 150,000 troops on India's northern border and that India could not eliminate the possibility of an attack.

Communist Chinese harassment was limited to open fighting. In April 1967, Indian Foreign Minister M. O. Chagla announced that two bands of rebels belonging to the Naga tribes, which for 14 years had been asking for independence from India, had gone to China for arms and training in guerrilla warfare. In June of 1968, the Indian Government stated that it had irrefutable proof that arms and other equipment manufactured in China have been smuggled into India for the subversive Naga elements.

Burma is perhaps the richest country in Southeast Asia as far as natural wealth is considered. It is also considered to be the most heavily infiltrated by Chinese Communists. A poorly drawn 500-mile long frontier with China, helps to maintain a situation of recurrent clashes and violations. Furthermore, the 360,000 Chinese residents are pressurized by Communist China and two out of three Chinese banks in Rangoon are controlled by the Chinese Communists via the Red China Embassy.

Constant border clashes have been beneficient to the Communists. On January 11, 1957, three villages were ceded by Burma to the Chinese Communists. The next year, in 1958, the People's Comrade Party became legal. On January 23, 1960, a 3-year border agreement and a 10-year nonaggression pact were signed by Burma and Communist China. These were followed by a $35 million loan without interest on January 9, 1961, followed also by a 5-year trade agreement on January 27, 1961. It was a case of economic and financial penetration, too. But military activities were not neglected. Rebel ethnic groups started to get serious help from the Chinese Communists. They soon held 35 percent of the country by day and much more by night, although they numbered about 15,000. It was verified that Chinese Communists were among the rebels.

This uneasy situation and a growing series of incidents and clashes with rebels has been continuing for some time, but no satisfactory end seems to be in sight for the partisans of law and order in Burma.

Mr. Speaker, in this commentary I did not discuss Communist China's actions in Korea, which have been very obvious. I have not discussed their involvement in North Vietnam and Laos, nor the role they played in attempting a Communist take over of Indonesia. I have not discussed, but would like to remind Members of the attempt by Red China to obtain control of overseas Chinese residents in places such as the Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia, and Mauritius.

I again commend my colleagues for their interest and attention this afternoon on this special order on the subject of Red China.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I think it needs to be said that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is a student of the Communist philosophy in government and has been as active as and even more active in the affairs of the captive nations than any Member of the House of Representatives. I certainly appreciate the gentleman joining in the discussion this afternoon.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that my distinguished colleague and very good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER), has yielded to me at this point. I want to commend him for his leadership in this important field and for the statements he had made and the soundness of his observations.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a Communist Chinese ping-pong team whipped an American ping-pong team in China. The American team was in Red China by invitation. Apparently, it marked a degree of change in the closed-door policy the mainland Chinese have observed toward the United States.

Since that rather unexciting event, the President has seen fit to order all Federal agencies to come up with a list of trade items we can share with the Communists. He has made unilateral concessions which the Communist Chinese had no reason to expect until after prolonged negotiations and a quid pro quo. He has said he will announce a decision on formal recognition of that nation sometime in July.

Rather than embarking on this Alice in Wonderland approach to diplomatic relations, perhaps it would have been more realistic to invite some Communist Chinese athletes to the United States to meet, say, the Dallas Cowboys or the Baltimore Orioles. If we can beat them badly enough, possibly the Chinese Communist leaders would see the error of their ways and agree to live in peace with the rest of the world.

Then, provided we can perfect the concept of ping-pong diplomacy, we would be able to disband our Armed Forces, close down the Department of State, and leave it all in the hands of the next Olympic games.

As absurd as this all may seem, some aspects of it appear to be occurring in our relations with Communist China.

There is a nagging concern that overlooked by the President and his advisers is the question of our close ties and long association with the Nationalist Government of China on Formosa. Since long before the United States became involved in World War II, we have enjoyed the important friendship of the Government of the Republic of China. In those dark days when only China stood between Japanese power and the rest of Asia, the United States provided arms, finances, and manpower to help keep that nation free.

When the United States entered the conflict, the Chinese fought side by side with us on the long road back from Pearl Harbor. Many Chinese gave their loyalty, indeed their lives, to help American servicemen escape Japanese imprisonment. Now, mainland China is overrun by the Communists, yet brave Chinese elsewhere to this day stand ready to defend both Chinese and American interests in the Far East.

For a great many years, it has been the policy of the United States to stand by its friends, the Chinese on Formosa being among the stanchest of friends. If we now are to abandon this firm friendship in exchange for the vacillating policies of the Communists, then truly the United States foreign policy is in need of congressional review.

Even as we make trade and travel concessions to the Communist Chinese, what have they been doing?

Among other things, they have been agitating in Latin America. They have been sending teams of diplomats scurrying around that part of the world holding out promises of financial and other help to those nations who, as the Maoist salesmen put it, "struggle against U.S. imperialistic domination."

The Communists harp on such points as the cry to nationalize all American-owned businesses in Latin America, and the plea that Latin American nations band against the United States with regard to the Panama Canal. Their efforts in Africa follow an identical pattern of disruption toward the West.

In the meantime, they have continued their tirades against the United States and their support of the Communist aggression in Indochina.

This, then, is the attitude of the Communist Chinese in the face of the President's decision to relax trade and travel restrictions as he decides on the future U.S. policy toward that nation, including such important matters as the admission of Red China to the United Nations, possibly to the exclusion of the Republic of China.

I do not think the President intends that our loyalist Chinese friends should be sold down the river. But we should avoid any appearance of this. To the contrary, we should continue publicly to strengthen our ties with these good friends. There is no clear indication that the common enemy is ready to cease their designs for the destruction of our forms of government. The desire of the President for world peace is admirable. Hopefully, we are step by step getting a little closer to that objective. It will take time for it to be accomplished. It cannot be done unilaterally by the United States. It takes more than ping-pong to make a peace.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) for speaking out on this occasion. Certainly, those who know Mr. SIKES know that this is not the first occasion that he has voiced his opinion on this subject.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, for taking this time to comment on this vital issue of our day—the idea of liberalizing trade, with Communist China. According to UPI, the President tomorrow will indicate what those items will be with which we will carry on extended trade in the future.

Yesterday, I inserted remarks in the RECORD dealing with this subject of expanded trade, and at that time I indicated that one naturally hesitates to disagree with the leader of his own party, and I am no exception to that. But, on the other hand, I do feel that the President has been ill advised on this issue of trade with Red China. I indicated as much yesterday. I have campaigned in the past in opposition to carrying on trade, any kind of trade, with those countries that are engaged in trade with our enemies in North Vietnam.

What concerns me very profoundly about the President's announcement tomorrow is the possibility that locomotives may be added to the trade list. I think that inasmuch as locomotives could be used to vastly accelerate the volume of trade that goes on between Red China and North Vietnam at the present time, locomotives can only be classified as strategic. I find it inconceivable that locomotives might be included in that list. I can only say that whatever opposition I have, morally and philosophically, to engaging in trade with Red China at this time will be profoundly aggravated if any kinds of strategic materials are included in that trade list.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is ironic indeed that in a single issue of U.S. News & World Report, that of May 31, 1971, two contradictory items appear. On page 4 it is written that—

> Some career diplomats, watching the evidence of 'thaw' between the U.S. and Red China are predicting that the trend, if developed, could lead to two-way trade between the two countries that would reach a total of 200 million dollars annually in two or three years.

Further on in the magazine, on page 42, we read of China's increasing activity of subversion in Asia. We learn that in Hanoi, "Peking is pressing North Vietnam to seek military victory, not negotiated peace. The magazine says further:

> In North Korea, Chinese leaders have patched up differences with Pyongyang, making Kim Il Sung more 'hard line' than ever. Chinese military aid is going to Red troops in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Mao Tse-tung's radical ideology is behind unrest in India, Ceylon, and the Philippines. Arms and ammunition are being smuggled to rebel bands in the jungles, mountains and swamps of Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, and Indonesia.

On page 40 of this very same magazine we learn that—

> Millions have been executed in Red China over the past 40 years—many after 'public trial rallies' which are staged without jury or defense counsel and with sentences determined beforehand. Chinese Communists in this way wiped out almost an entire segment

of society—the landlord class—just as Russia did after their revolution.

Why is the United States, given all of these facts concerning the unchanged nature of the Chinese Communist regime, now considering a change in our policy toward Communist China? Can it conceivably be for the trade which "career diplomats" foresee? Or are we simply fulfilling Lenin's prophecy that "The businessmen will sell us the rope with which to hang them"?

The current reappraisal is even more disturbing when we compare it with President Nixon's statements on this very subject during the 1968 campaign.

Speaking during the campaign on WITI–TV in Milwaukee, Wis., in September of that year he said:

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it, rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers in their present course . . .

Only as the nations of non-Communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically, and militarily—that they no longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward . . .

For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, of a creative counter-pressure designed to persuade Peking that its interest can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility.

Just 3 short years ago President Nixon declared:

I do not believe we should recognize Communist China now or admit it to the United Nations because that would be in effect putting the seal of approval on Communist China's present very aggressive course against India and against our forces, of course, in Vietnam, and against all of its neighbors.

While our policy appears to be changing, that of the Communist Chinese does not.

Since it took power 22 years ago, the Chinese Communist regime has murdered between 20 and 50 million of its own citizens. It has invaded three countries, Korea, Tibet, and India, and been condemned as an international outlaw by the United Nations.

Communist China planned, supported, and almost accomplished the overthrow and mass assassination of the Indonesian Government, which was at the time its leading non-Communist ally. It has fomented and supported guerrilla rebellions not only in South Vietnam, but in India, Thailand, Laos, Burma, Malaysia, the Philippines, and in black African countries too numerous to list.

China has pressed forward with the development of its strategic arsenal, refused to enter into any arms-control discussions, and stated in its official publications that a nuclear first strike is an acceptable subdivision of "people's war."

While, in the fact of unchanging Communist Chinese hostility, it is difficult to understand why our own Government is considering a change in policy, it is not difficult to understand the Chinese receptivity to such a change.

Columnist Richard Wilson noted:

America is getting out of Vietnam and the Chinese realize that. The real question is what kind of residual force will be left in Indochina and what its mission will be. Peking could quite conceivably get by smiles and friendly gestures from a gullible "American people" what it has not been able to get from four succeeding administrations—a rapid and complete exit from a strong sphere of influence in Eastern Asia and the Western Pacific. If Peking could convince the American public of its good intentions in the let-down from the Vietnam War, no American government might find it politically possible to sustain the strong Asian policy of the past anywhere in the Western Pacific.

This, clearly is what Peking is aiming for: a world in which China is to East Asia as the Soviet Union is to Eastern Europe. In Korea, Peking found that it could not dislodge an American presence by force of arms. Today, the Communist leadership seeks to dislodge us by soft words, deceit, and "understanding."

What have the British gained by recognition of Communist China? Hopefully, some understanding which many in Washington still lack. Sir Donald Hopson, Her Majesty's Ambassador to Peking at the beginning of the Red Guard fiasco in 1966, had to stand still while Mao's bullies beat him physically, sacked his Embassy, and violated the embassy's women before his eyes.

Despite the ping-pong diplomacy, it is important to remember that the Chinese leadership has not changed. The same men who smile at our ping-pong players are those who subjected Tibet to the most dangerous type of colonialism, the same ones who operate such a cruel and hated dictatorship that more Chinese attempted to escape in 1 recent month than all the East Germans who attempted to scale or penetrate the Berlin Wall in 10 years.

We must also remember that the United Nations Charter does not advocate universal membership. Rather, it has specific qualifications for membership, and Communist China does not meet them. The Communist regime has shown a consistent and total disregard for fundamental human rights, it has degraded the dignity of persons, and it has obliterated the rights of individuals.

At virtually the same time that many in Washington speak of an "opening" to Communist China, His Holiness Tenzing Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, now living in exile in India, reported in the New York Times that—

The Chinese have launched a veritable reign of terror. Tibetans of all classes are beaten, humiliated, tortured or killed on such flimsy trumped-up charges as harboring subversive designs against the regime, possessing religious objects or collaborating and helping "reactionary elements."

It is difficult if not impossible to relate these activities to the words of the United Nations Charter which member nations adopt on admission:

Faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, of nations large and small.

Our Asian allies wonder whether, if our commitment to Taiwan is subject to "reappraisal," they can rely upon any commitment made by the United States. Discussing Peking's ping-pong diplomacy, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore said:

Whether there is any significant change in basic objectives is very difficult to say. I think Mao is like de Gaulle—they are great men who, in the evening of their lives, have fixed views of what the world should be, and not what it is.

President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines said that his country's fear of China was of subversion conducted from Peking. Most Asian leaders interviewed within the past month are fearful of an American withdrawal from Asia coupled with an American abandonment of Taiwan.

It is essential that we not abandon our Asian allies or seek to do business with a nation intent upon world conquest and upon the degradation and enslavement of its own citizens. Until China changes, our own policy should not.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, actually this special order which has been allotted me was requested as well by three other colleagues here in the House, and others who requested to participate. Those of us who asked for this time, other than myself, include the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), and the gentleman who just finished speaking, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE). He made reference to what the President proposes to do tomorrow in releasing a list of items which will be traded with the Communist Chinese.

I would say only that we asked for this special order this afternoon prior to the release of those items so that we could say ahead of time what we felt the course of action by the President and his administration should be, rather than just being critical after the list of items to be traded has been released.

It is a matter of record that within this administration the Department of Defense has vehemently opposed through the years any traffic in locomotives because these can be used to transport, and, of course, we believe would be used to transport materials and weapons of war.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, we are accustomed to reading heart-rending stories in the American press about foreigners who are opposed to American policies and express their discontent through nonviolent methods such as prayer and fasting. For some reason, whenever these stories appear, they are always designed to force American policy further to the left. They put forth a strong humanitarian appeal and imply that these particular heroes are representative of foreign opinion.

But commonsense tells us that foreign opinion must be just as diverse as our own. There are millions of friends of the United States throughout the world and they are clearly distressed by the

false picture given by distorted emphasis on the leftwing activists.

I was deeply struck by this thought when reading a recent dispatch from Tokyo which received practically no attention in the American press. This story told of 160 Japanese citizens who went on a hunger strike in the Sukiyabashi Park, in the heart of Tokyo. I believe that the reason these hunger strikers received so little attention was because they were anti-Communist in their protest. They were Western oriented, pro-American. But what they were protesting; however, was the threatened weakening of American policy in Asia. This group fasted for a whole week to express their opposition to recognizing the Chinese Communist regime.

The strikers were members of the Victory Over Communism League and had all attended an anti-Communist rally sponsored by the Japan chapter of the World Anti-Communist League. The strikers lived on water alone, sitting on chairs inside a big tent in the park. They sat up straight and each wore a white band across his chest reading "Absolutely Opposed to Recognition of the Chinese Communists." By the end of the week most of them complained of nausea and extreme weakness. Some of them could hardly stand up. Yet, they continued the fast as an expression of the depth of their conviction.

Mr. Speaker, I find this is a truly moving display of solidarity. The World Anti-Communist League, led by its President Mr. Osami Kuboki, has chapters in free countries all over the world. Its annual convention draws tens of thousands to the convention city. Last year some 40,000 came to Tokyo, including a large percentage of Japanese citizens, who are traditionally thought of as neutralists.

I think that this recent demonstration is indicative of the feeling of Asians throughout Asia. They are opposed to communism as we are opposed to communism. The common people everywhere are opposed to communism. It is our leaders who sometimes forget the true attitude of the people and think that they can engage in diplomatic games without disastrous consequences.

In recent weeks, I have read a vast number of newspaper editorials and syndicated columns expressing this same cautious view and, with your permission, I would like to include just a sampling here with my remarks:

[From the Baltimore News-American, May 16, 1971]

A WARNING ABOUT RED CHINA

(By Bob Considine)

Not much had been heard of late from a conservative American group called "The Committee Of One Million," formed after eviction of Chiang Kai-Shek from mainland China. Its prime thrust through the ensuing generation has been to protest against any real or imagined appeasement of Red China.

But then in swift succession our Ping-Pong players went to Peking, Mr. Nixon called China "the Peoples Republic, etc.," Chou En-lai served tea and laughed, the gentleman from the Times was given a month's visa, and there was a pledge by Washington to loosen its trade restrictions with the world's most populous yet isolated nation.

This sequence of events provided a shot in the arm for "The Committee Of One Million," whose slogan might be "One Ping-Pong Ball Doth Not An Entente Make." The committee called on one of its smallest but mightiest guns to bark a reply—Lt. Gen. V. H. "Brute" Krulak (USMC, Ret.)

During his years as commanding general of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, before his retirement in 1968, Brute was the shortest man and probably toughtest man in the Corps. On his frequent trips to the Vietnam fronts where his Marines were fighting, his men, most of whom towered a foot over Bruce's head, would look straight ahead, over his head, when answering his questions.

There was a large action photograph in Brute's office at Camp Smith, near Honoluu, showing a Marine in full battle dress charging an enemy position on Iwo Jima. The little general would explain in his ringing voice that that Marine was the epitone of a fighting man. He carried everything he needed and knew exactly how to use it. But his greatest weapon was his stout heart, Brute would continue. "That picture," he would conclude," was snapped a second or two after he was dead. But look at him—still charging."

As for the flickering dawn of what could mean the renewal of U.S.-mainland China diplomatic relations, Brute sounded off loud and clear in a recent speech to the World Affairs Council in San Diego. He had just returned from a swing through Asia in his capacity as an executive of the Copley Newspaper chain.

"Dialog with China?" he asked. "There's no argument there. Certainly, we must have it and, if it were definitely in our selfish national interest to do so we would be justified in dealing with those cut-throats this very day.

"But it is not in our selfish national interest. There is no pressure whatever on us to dignify them or help perpetuate them. There is no pressure whatever on us to demoralize the opposition to Mao inside China."

He used the Chinese proverb, "If you wish to know the road ahead, inquire of those who have traveled it" as a springboard into his next assessment:

"Ask Sir Donald Hopson. Her Majesty's ambassador to Peking, at the beginning of the Red Guards fiasco in 1966, had to stand still while Mao's bullies beat him physically, sacked his embassy and violated the embassy's women before his eyes.

"Ask the Russians how they fared when they tried to have a dialog with China. Ask the black African countries why they threw out the Chinese.

"The men who rule China's 750 million people are a band of nihilistic Marxist brigands who have survived literally by killing off the opposition. They have committed 15 million murders since 1949. They are a group of arrogant and frightened men who have failed in every one of their social experiments, who inspire no loyalty, and have a mandate weaker than Attila the Hun.

"We might as well get in bed with a nest of rattlesnakes."

The brute had a warning to U.S. businessmen who now are looking longingly at a huge and relatively untouched market for their goods. Every fourth child born in the world today is Chinese. He reminded the businessmen that their British cousins envisioned the same kind of bonanza when the U.K. and Mao exchanged ambassadors. But the trade between the two countries is piddling, considering the multitudes of potential customers involved.

He said, in effect, "Yes, it's an exciting prospect for any businessman. But this should be remembered: You'll be doing business with 750 million people—all broke."

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 29, 1971]

COMMUNISM FOE WARNS AGAINST DEAL WITH PEKING

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—"It's 1933 all over again and unless we are alert, we are going to make exactly the same mistake."

Dr. Walter Judd, chairman of the Committee of One Million, was standing before a huge world map. One finger pointed at the Soviet Union. Another tapped the Chinese mainland.

"In 1933 Maxim Litvinoff (Soviet foreign minister) came to Washington and talked President Franklin Roosevelt into recognizing the Soviet Union," Judd said. "He was full of smiles and promises. The huge Russian market, he said, would revitalize American industry, pull us out of the great depression.

"So Roosevelt recognized the Russians and what happened? Nothing. In fact, trade with the Soviet Union declined. Not until 1963, when Russia was forced to make that big cash purchase of wheat, did U.S. trade with the U.S.S.R. reach the levels of 1927–32. But Moscow had the 'respectability' it so desperately needed.

CHOU EN-LAI SMILES

"Now Chou En-lai is smiling. We had better study that lesson before we rush into any embrace with Communist China."

Judd once was a missionary doctor in China. A Minnesota Republican congressman and key foreign affairs committee member for 20 years, he now leads a struggle to block Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations.

His Committee of One Million is an organization dedicated to this proposition. Influential in the late 1950s, the committee had declined in importance but Judd is trying to rally it in the wake of Peking's welcome to an American Ping-Pong team and its overtures of friendship toward the American people.

"Some people call it 'Ping-Pong diplomacy' " said Judd. "I call it 'Ping-Pong propaganda.' " But it has been effective.

"Peking has set out deliberately to put the American people against their government. There is a lot more involved here than just membership in the U.N. A drive is under way to oust us not only from Indochina, but from all of Asia.

SENSE RIGHT MOMENT

"The Chinese Communists sense that this is the moment to capitalize on the tired, dejected, frustrated attitude of millions of Americans toward the Indochina war. They know Americans have become weary of Asia. They have not been able to coerce four American administrations with threats, so they now are trying to go around our government."

Judd warned that while many Americans dismiss the U.N. question as unimportant because of the world organization's tarnished image, Asian nations regard it as an ultimate test of strength between Washington and Peking.

"If Peking is seated," he said, "it would be regarded in Asia as the Communists' biggest victory since the Korean truce was signed—and in 'face-conscious' Asia that was a Chinese victory.

REJECTS SUGGESTIONS

"Free Asia will crumble if it is ever convinced that the Red Chinese will win their struggle with the United States, and admission to the U.N. would mean that they have won."

Judd rejects suggestions that President Nixon should support the admission of Peking in hopes of pitting mainland China against the Soviet Union.

"When we stick to principles, the United States is invincible," he said. "When we try

to be devious, to play at being clever, we lose our shirts . . . remember when Franklin Roosevelt said he knew how to handle Stalin. That cost us Eastern Europe."

Judd refuses to accept the popular Washington view that the split between Russia and China is beyond repair.

"It is still not a quarrel between two nations, but between two factions of world communism," he said. "Ultimately nationalism may prove stronger. But today it is still an argument not over what to do, but how to do it."

REAL CONCERN

Moscow's real concern with Peking, in Judd's view, still centers on Mao's challenge for leadership of the world Communist movement, not on the Chinese threat to its Asian borders.

"In the meantime, they both play on our yearning for peace," he said.

American businessmen who dream of huge new markets inside China also are deluding themselves, Judd said. Peking is playing on these dreams for its own political ends, he said, but once those ends are accomplished the would-be traders will awake empty-handed.

"They read Lenin," he observed, "and it was Lenin who said 'we can always count on the stupidity of the capitalists.'"

COMMISSION PLAN

On Monday, a 50-member presidential commission urged Mr. Nixon to back U.N. seats for both Communist and Nationalist China.

The members of that commission are Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman; Frederick L. Ehrman, vice chairman; Dean Francis O. Wilcox, chairman of working group; Terence Cardinal Cooke, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Sen. George D. Aiken, Dr. Ruth E. Bacon, George F. Baker Jr., Bernice W. Behrens, Joseph L. Block, Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Dr. Landrum R. Bolling, Erwin D. Canham and Susie A. Chan.

Also, Richard Talbot Clark, Sen. John Sherman Cooper, Americe V. Cortese, Dr. Lee A. Dubridge, Justice Robert M. Duncan, John Clifford Folger, Sen. J. W. Fulbright, Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, James C. Hagerty, Marie-Louise Handal, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Dr. John R. Howard, John T. Isaacson, William D. Jackson and John H. Johnson.

Also Robert B. Kamm, Rabbi Bertram W. Korn, Andrew Letendre, Arthur G. Linkletter, Rep. Sherman P. Lloyd, Mary P. Lord, Benjamin M. McKelway, Paul Miller, Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, Eugene Ormandy, Thomas A. Pappas and Mildred Emory Persinger.

Also Charles S. Rhyne, Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, Mary Louise Smith, Sen. John J. Sparkman, Vernon Stouffer, Ronald F. Stowe, Sen. Robert Taft Jr., Thomas Vail and Andrew W. Wyeth.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Apr. 15, 1971]

ONLY PEOPLE'S SMILES SINCERE: CHINA'S RULERS PLAY FAST GAME

It was a foregone conclusion that the first visit to mainland China by American sportsmen and newsmen in 22 years would be stage-managed for propaganda effect by the Communist government in Peking. Nevertheless, the amount of sweetness and light bathing the current table tennis tour is probably more than the players or the journalists expected. With Chou En-lai himself turning out to greet the visitors, the political overtones of this "cultural" event becomes inescapable.

President Nixon lifted the ban on travel by Americans to Red China because it is in our national interest to develop more personal contact with the Chinese people. His decision was perfectly sound. We must face the reality of 800 million mainland Chinese as human beings rather than an ominous statistic.

The relaxation of trade restrictions with Red China announced by Mr. Nixon yesterday is in the same vein, and appears to be limited enough in scope to assure that diplomatic and strategic considerations are not compromised. Clearly, the President has signaled the beginning of a new effort on our part to pierce the bamboo curtain in the specific areas of business and personal travel.

Looking at the other half of the equation, however, we are reminded that the Chinese people are not their own masters. The diplomatic gesture of inviting our table tennis team into Red China did not spring from the people themselves but from a tiny ruling group in Peking. We must accept the fact that Mao Tse-tung and his Marxist cohorts agreed to let some Americans tour China only because it is in their own interest to do so.

The effort by Red China's ruling clique to create such a radiant image at this point in history leads to the conclusion that Peking has decided this is the year to make a serious run at gaining membership in the United Nations. The growing strength in the U.N. for seating a Peking delegation and decisions by Canada, Italy and other nations to give diplomatic recognition to the Peking government have created a momentum which the Chinese Communists are ready to ride toward the attainment of their fundamental goal in world diplomacy—the recognition that there is one China, that Peking is its capital and Mao Tse-tung is its high priest.

To find a course preserving the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Free China government on Taiwan is a challenge of the first order to our own diplomacy in the months ahead. The Free Chinese have stood steadfast as our friends for a generation, something we cannot in good conscience forget.

Nor can the U.S. government and the American people afford to forget that the emissaries Red China is sending to world capitals—and would send to the United Nations—are not ping-pong players. They are representatives of a regime that bases its claim of sovereignty on terrorism, violence and oppression, a regime that has declared itself opposed to the very existence of the United States of America.

[From the Oakland (Calif.), Tribune, Mar. 17, 1971]

NEW RED CHINA POLICY?

The State Department's decision to lift the existing prohibition against travel to Red China by Americans can be interpreted only as a cautious Administration step toward some alteration of the existing U.S.-Communist China relationship.

There is little evidence to suggest such an effort on the part of our government will accomplish anything but to foster uneasiness on the part of our allies in the Chiang Kai-shek government on Taiwan.

There have been other recent hints of an impending change in the official U.S. policy toward Communist China.

President Nixon, in his second annual foreign policy report Feb. 25, reiterated the ongoing U.S. commitment to the Nationalist Chinese, but said "the United States is prepared to see the People's Republic of China play a constructive role in the family of nations."

Significantly, it was the first time President Nixon had referred to Communist China by its formal name, the "People's Republic of China."

It represented a strong suggestion that the Nixon administration may be inching toward a so-called "Two China" policy, toward accepting the seating to Communist China in the United Nations so long as a seat would be retained for Nationalist China.

It is, at best, a risky venture on the part of official Washington.

The premise apparently is, as the President said, that Red China is somehow ready to "play a constructive role in the family of nations." There is little, if any, reason to accept any such premise.

Red China is ruled by a Communist dictator. He demands total hero worship from his subjects and makes no secret of his complete commitment to primitive Marxism-Leninism which has world-wide expansion and conquest as its ultimate objective.

The sort of "constructive role" such a man, or nation, could play in world affairs is difficult to image.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal, Apr. 6, 1971]

RED CHINA STILL A TYRANNY

The Communist conquest of China 22 years ago must be ranked as one of the worst catastrophes of modern times. Already, it has ushered in two Asian wars which inflicted more than 300,000 American casualties, including 100,000 dead. For the Chinese people, the tragedy is without parallel. The slaughters of Hitler and Stalin pale by comparison with the 15 million Chinese murdered by orders of the Mao Tse-tung regime. Moreover, the extension of communism into China has brought the entire Asian land mass under seige. The whole world soon will be threatened by hydrogen-headed missiles being incubated by Peking. Certainly the neglect of the United States of America and our mistaken policies contributed to the loss of three-quarters of a billion people as a firm ally.

Now America stands once again at an historic watershed with respect to China which could alter the course of history. The question is whether the U.S. should sanction admission of the Peking regime into the United Nations, assuming Peking is interested in U.N. membership.

Led by a flock of Senate doves, a small but vocal element in this country would embrace the Chinese Reds because, it is argued, a quarter of mankind should not be isolated. According to this viewpoint, the Mao regime would become civilized through a "meaningful dialogue."

The time has come for the American people to do some straight thinking about China. The beginning of wisdom is the need to recognize the sharp distinction between the Chinese people and the government in Peking.

Those familiar with China today know that the Mao administration does not truly govern Mainland China; that Mao himself lacks authority. After having the ancient and revered family concept attacked, after the disastrous communal farms, the back-yard steel furnace leaps and other Marxist horrors, including the unleashing of murderous Red Guards at the orders of Mao, the stoic Chinese masses simply refuse to carry out Peking's orders. In the face of all this, it is little wonder that the Maoist merely maintains the form but not the substance of power today.

We must, of course, eventually have dialogue with China but only when it is in our interest to do so.

At the present time it is not in our national interest. There is no need to dignify or help perpetuate the hapless Peking regime. There is no significant promise of fruitful trade with Red China. There is no promise of greater security. Finally, in all probability there is no one in Peking with whom we could hold a responsible dialogue. If we are patient, the Chinese people will eventually prevail and the Maoist will be supplanted by the patient people of China.

Asia has a great future. The United States could have a great role in that future provided we do not repudiate our friends and embrace our enemies—provided we do not help to perpetuate the Maoists through recognition. To paraphrase a Chinese parable, this is not the time to cast our nets; it is the time to dry them.

[From the New York News, Mar. 28, 1971]

RED CHINA AND THE U.N.

It looks more and more likely that Red China will muscle into a United Nations membership before long—possibly at the General Assembly's fall-of-1971 session.

We hope not; but the Nixon administration appears to be reconciling itself to that contingency, though it keeps saying it will not betray Free China (Taiwan; Formosa) if it is pressured by force of circumstances into consenting to Red China's admission.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this assurance will be lived up to, come what may. It is as true as when Gen. Douglas MacArthur first said it that Taiwan is an unsinkable aircraft carrier where we most need one in the far Pacific.

As for what kind of people the Red Chinese tyrants in Peking are, you can find out by reading a new book: "Hostage in Peking," by Anthony Grey; Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N.Y.; 365 pages, 30 illustrations, $7.95.

Mr. Grey is the Reuter correspondent who was kept in solitary confinement in Peking for two years by Mao Tse-tung's sadistic Communist rats for no real reason.

He lived to tell the tale—and a grisly and infuriating tale it is (including a Red mob's murder of Grey's harmless and endearing pet cat), which we think ought to be read and pondered all over the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President of the United States and our Nation will proceed with extreme caution as we labor to better define our policy with reference to Communist China—and certainly to the end that true freedom can best dominate the world.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ).

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Chiang Kai-shek was recently interviewed by Mr. Morley Safer of the Columbia Broadcasting System. When asked whether he felt that Nationalist China was being stabbed in the back by the United States Chiang replied:

Traditional Chinese philosophy teaches us that in dealing with friends we should be loyal and faithful. In all our relations with friendly countries, we have been strictly adhering to these principles of loyalty and faithfulness. Of course, we expect our friends to do the same for us.

Has our foreign policy become so intertwined with sophist slogans drawn from spineless appeasement posturing that we have forgotten basic tenets of this type? Has our vision become so clouded with the miasma of peace through palaver that we are actually going to dump a a longtime ally in order to curry favor with a despotic, totalitarian regime? Those who say that the recognition of the Communist Party of Mainland China does not mean that we are abandoning Nationalist China may be fooling themselves, but they are not fooling anyone else.

Pious words coupled with dishonorable deeds are certainly not going to deceive the leaders of the non-Communist Asian nations who are responsible for the lives and future of their own people into believing that the United States is a reliable ally. These leaders are hardly likely to look upon massive confusion as some new type of "courage".

Any U.S. encouragement of Red China is obviously in complete contradiction to the Nixon doctrine tenet known as partnership and the subsidiary defense doctrine known as the total force concept. One can hardly expect small nations threatened by Red China to make serious efforts to oppose the Communists when the United States is showing that it is not really serious about its opposition to the Red Goliath.

It is perfectly obvious that we are the only power to which these weaker nations can turn to protect them against the overwhelming influence of their Communist neighbor. If the United States makes significant overtures to Peking, then the security of these small nations will be disastrously undermined.

There is little disagreement that so-called normalization of relations with Peking will have any appreciable effect on Peking's imperialistic designs. Thus the little nation which nestles in the shadow of Red China will still be threatened or blackmailed by Peking, even if some kind of peaceful coexistence or even friendlier relations take place between the superpowers.

A key country which finds itself in such a position is Thailand. Thailand has been watching the United States closely, and, I might add, with great apprehension. It is of a particular note that the moment when the United States fell into the game of ping-pong diplomacy, Thailand immediately began to consolidate its position between the superpowers. I do not blame Thailand for feeling that something must be done to mend relations with Communist China when it sees its protector, the United States, engaged in such activities.

On Wednesday, April 21, Mr. Thanat Khoman, the Thai Foreign Minister, made several statements which bear out what I have been saying, Mr. Khoman said, and I quote:

I can say with truthfulness that we in Thailand were not caught by surprise because there have been a number of steps taken by the United States to relax the position between the United States and mainland China.

He indicated that Southeast Asian leaders had been discussing the question since the latter part of last year and even before, and they had detected if not a new policy, at least a new attitude on the part of the United States.

It is also interesting that Dr. Khoman, from his vantage point outside the United States, was able to evaluate correctly the way in which the Red Chinese have tried to manipulate American opinion. He said:

I think that while the United States government seems to be rather cautious, certain political and mass media circles are enthusiastic, or I might say that they are eager, and Peking will take note of that and use it to their advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should note carefully what Dr. Khoman is saying in such a delicate and diplomatic manner. What he is saying is that the Chinese Communists are making fools out of us. He is saying that they are actually seeking to manipulate our mass media and to influence the tide of public opinion.

When he sees such dangerous signs of weakness in the United States, there is very little advice he can give to his own country which is a relatively weak country. Dr. Khoman said:

We watch these developments with great interest. If the new smiles were to be followed by measures to ease the situation in Southeast Asia, so much the better. What we would like to know is what is actually the meaning and importance of these new smiles. Was it to pave the way for more recognition by more countries, or to project what Peking has called "hostile collusion" between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Thus, it appears that Thailand, although almost moving too cautiously to try to change its own relationship with Peking, is much more cautious than the United States. Thailand knows that dealing with the Red Chinese is a dangerous game. The only problem is that Thailand is in a much weaker position to play the game. Although some people in the United States appear to want to be deceived, Thailand is not to be deceived. Dr. Khoman said:

The first important test of Peking's real intention is the Vietnam War. If there were a real change then we should see a new mood or atmosphere reflected in the attitudes of North Vietnam and the Vietcong in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that Peking has already flunked the first important test seen by the Thai minister. As we all know, just last week Madam Binh and the Communist negotiator in Paris dropped all pretense of negotiations and held out for immediate withdrawal and the dissolution of the Government of South Vietnam. This is indeed a new mood in Paris, but it is a mood which is a change for the worse.

However, Dr. Khoman had a second test as well. He said:

The second important test is the situation in Southeast Asia, especially Peking's attitude toward Thailand and other countries in the region. If Peking were to adopt a more peaceful approach with less doctrinaire support of "wars of national liberation" then there would be a real change in the Chinese attitude.

As in the first test, the Chinese have done nothing to indicate that they will pass the second test. In fact, the Chinese in their May Day slogan continued to blast the alleged imperialism of the United States and all the American allies whom the Chinese refer to as "running dogs." Plainly there is no change in Communist doctrine here.

Mr. Speaker, I have concentrated on the views of just one of the small nations surrounding Red China. I remind you that these nations have little choice but to deal with the double when the United States is engaged in such deals itself. It is worthwhile to note too that the Thais seem to be going into such a relationship with their eyes wide open. They look upon it as the lesser of evils, yet it is an evil which is being forced upon them by the apparent change of attitude in the United States policy. I hope that the President will take heed of the extra burden he is imposing upon

our allies and realize that he is in effect driving them into the enemy camp.

There is a four-faced Buddha which sits at Udon, Thailand. He looks both to the east and to the west. His concern is for the Thai people. The faltering of the West in its determination to oppose tyranny will be noted.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD a few of the editorials which have appeared recently concerning the subject of the projected change in our China policy. There is obviously a great deal more concern across the country about this matter than is immediately apparent in Washington, D.C.:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Apr. 27, 1971]

HONESTY IGNORED

As part of the build-up for American support of UN membership for Communist China, a presidential commission headed by Henry Cabot Lodge yesterday proposed that the United States advocate allowing Nationalist China to keep its UN Seat but to create an additional one for the Communists.

In addition to the appeasement-mindedness this represents, it is highly alarming to see men of stature and position announcing to the world that they really do not uphold honor and honesty, really prefer to accept a lie rather than the truth.

How is this? Just look at the UN Charter provisions for new members and you will clearly see:

Chapter II, Article 4—"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

If the UN Charter is not a lie, then Red China rules itself out of eligibility for membership, for it has proved it is not "peace-loving." It has repeatedly engaged in aggression, holds conquered people and supports aggression today. If the judgment of the UN is that the Red China record is one of a peace-loving nation, then the UN is something that the United States should get out of.

There is much talk to the effect that we can't simply "ignore" a nation with three-quarters of a billion people. That's right. We shouldn't ignore it. But we ought not to be dishonest about it, either.

If those who want Red China in the UN would amend the Charter to say new members may be either "peace-loving" or "killers," then at least there would be honesty about promoting Chinese Communist membership.

But instead of honesty we resort to deceit. It will cost us.

The effort to recognize Red China diplomatically, to give Red China UN membership, and to promote trade-aid with Red China may be the worst such move since the monumental mistake of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933—with Russia's promise to be peaceful to quit seeking the overthrow of the United States and to end its espionage activities within our country.

History is repeating itself—but it wouldn't if the people would just face the facts.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald April 26, 1971]

THE CHINA "THAW"

Under the auspices of President Nixon, a new U.S. policy toward Red China appears to be evolving.

It is illustrated by the report of a special 50-member commission named by the President. This commission, headed by Henry Cabot Lodge, now envoy to the Vatican, was assigned to make recommendations about the United Nations.

But its foremost proposal is to support the ultimate admission to the United Nations of all "firmly established" governments—no matter how they got there. First of all, this includes Red China, but also North Korea, North Vietnam and East Germany.

The Lodge group took note of "awkward and discordant" possibilities in letting Red China join the United Nations and seemed to favor a play-it-by-ear policy; no instant initiative on the part of the United States along this line.

It also strongly insisted that Nationalist China, whose government in effect is in exile on Taiwan, should remain a U.N. member, even though both Red China and the Nationalists now say they will not sit in the United Nations with the other.

Red China probably is headed for eventual membership in any event, whether the United States supports the admission or not. A majority in the United Nations voted favorably only last year—but the vote fell short of the necessary two-thirds.

But U.S. support for this move should hinge on something more than Red China's wish to get in, if it does wish membership, or on the majority view on this issue. Our support should be based on conclusive evidence that the recent ping-pong diplomacy is more than a propaganda gesture.

We ought not forget that the Red Chinese have been substantial contributors to the Communist attempt to take over South Vietnam, that the Red Chinese have been involved in ambitious schemes for mischief else where in the world (Indonesia, for example) and that their total policy the last 25 years has been strongly anti-American.

Every friendly gesture by this country has been labeled a "fraud" and Mao Tse-Tung's central thesis, widely proclaimed, has been that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

If the Reds have indeed decided on a change of course, the United States and the whole world should take advantage of this. But we need to be sure, as we go along, that there is a "thaw" in Red China as well as here.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1971

THE DALAI LAMA SPEAKS

(By Tenzing Gyatso)

(NOTE.—His Holiness, Tenzing Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, lives in exile at Upper Dharamsala, East Punjab, India.)

UPPER DHARAMSALA, INDIA.—According to every principle of international law and custom, whether historical, geographical, cultural or linguistical, we Tibetans are an independent nation distinct from China.

Since the Chinese have little respect or scruples for such international principles, they attacked Tibet with the avowed aim of "driving out the imperialist aggressive forces."

When world opinion condemned this naked and shameless aggression, China loudly protested, with a halo of righteous indignation, that Tibet was "an integral part of Chinese territory," and as such, "an entirely domestic problem."

With the forced signing of the infamous 17-Point Agreement military operations were suspended and a program of consolidation and "democratic reforms" was vigorously carried out to meet their objective of colonizing the country.

Recent reports now tell us of massive indoctrination at compulsory meetings, radio broadcasts, distribution of leaflets, and complete control over the educational apparatus.

Yet, the Chinese everywhere meet determined resistance from both underground guerrillas and the peasants. The very Tibetan cadres, so meticulously and painstakingly trained in China, are said to be at the forefront of the freedom struggle. As a result, the Chinese have launched a veritable reign of terror. Tibetans of all classes are beaten, humiliated, tortured or killed on such flimsy trumped-up charges as harboring subversive designs against the regime, possessing religious objects or collaborating and helping "reactionary elements."

In short, Tibet is now experiencing a far more dangerous type of colonialism than the world has ever seen. All the resources of the land are being exploited while the Tibetans are starved and worked to death to feed the occupation army and the Chinese populace.

With such conditions existing in Tibet today, we, who are in exile, solemnly remind ourselves each year on the anniversary of the March Uprising, determinedly to achieve the sacred task of liberating our countrymen from the brutal yoke of Chinese oppression. All over the world, the twin evils of colonialism and imperialism have been condemned and resisted in the past. We too take up our share of the burden and struggle against this new form of exploitation.

Besides this all-important task, we are faced with the problem of preserving our unique culture. We have taken a number of appropriate steps in this direction. Much progress has been achieved due to generosity of the Government of India and international voluntary agencies. We are forever indebted to them.

Simultaneously, we do not delude ourselves that Tibet will remain the same as before. Such thoughts are wishful thinking and in complete contrast to the approach we have adopted in the event Tibet achieves her freedom. It is in this connection that a draft constitution was promulgated on March 10, 1963, taking into full consideration both the doctrines enumerated by Lord Buddha and the system of democracy based upon justice and equality. This constitution was warmly received by the representative of my people in exile.

Finally, while preparing for a new and young Tibet, the opinion of the forward-looking younger generation will be an influential factor. Many young boys and girls are working or receiving an education so as to serve Tibet better. A national consciousness is slowly developing and asserting itself among the younger generation. This is a healthy sign for it indicates that the younger generation is not satisfied with the present state of affairs. It also means that they are not just content to sit it out but to face the challenge with constructive efforts for a free and independent Tibet. In the ultimate analysis. It is they who will have to continue the struggle and preserve our identity and culture.

Our cause is a just one and I take this opportunity to appeal to all those nations who cherish freedom, to give us their firm and strong support. The Chinese should well remember that no imperialist power has succeeded in keeping another nation under colonial subjection forever.

In conclusion, I wish to offer my prayers to invoke the blessings of the Triple Gems for peace and happiness to all sentient beings.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 3, 1971]

CHINA'S ADMISSION POLICY LACKS ZIP

(By Paul Greenberg)

PINE BLUFF, ARK.—Whether to admit Communist China to the United Nations would be a question of the greatest importance—if.

If No. 1, Red China were turning over a new leaf, or if it could be persuaded * * * Nations into the cause of peace.

And if No. 2, the United Nations were a relevant force in upholding the peace of the

world, or even if it were as relevant as it was before U Thant took over. In that case, who belonged to it would be a matter of the greatest importance.

But as of now, the principal function of the great debate over admitting Red China to the U.N. is brighten up a dull news week. It is not exactly one of the great questions of our times. Rather, it is one more sign of the creeping debility of the United Nations that an American commission studying ways to revive it should be able to come up with nothing more striking than the admission of Red China.

Even the commission tacked a proviso onto its enthusiasm for an open admissions policy at the United Nation: "The U.N. can best do its job of war prevention and settlement of disputes "if its membership includes all the governments in the world, provided they subscribe to the principles of the U.N. Charter." This is no small qualification, particularly in the case of a continental mass of 700 million souls, give or take another hundred million or so, ruled by a government that has fought one war against the United Nations in Korea and still has to make a formal peace there.

But won't belonging to the U.N. extend a beneficial effect on Peking? The commission hopes so: "Exposure of the Peking government to the United Nations, to world opinion, to the free press, and to the way of the free world, may result in more harmony among the nations of the world communty." Or then again, it might prove as effective as exposing Stalinist Russia to the United Nations, world public opinion, the free press and to the way of the free world. The picture of Joseph Stalin sitting up nights in the Kremlin worrying about what the New York Times might think of him is a magnificent tribute to the imagination.

If the United Nations were as strong as it ought to be, or even as strong as it once was, the danger of allowing Red China to subvert it from within would be a powerful argument against its admission. But the weaker the U.N. the stronger the case for admitting Red China—on the ground that there is little left in the U.N. to subvert. The case for admitting Red China has grown stronger every year of U Thant's leadership.

The decision to admit Peking to the United Nations will not be significant in itself, but only as a sign of changing attitudes in Peking and elsewhere. Something clearly has changed in Washington, where Communist China is now being called the People's Republic of China without a trace of sarcasm.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.), Intelligencer, May 11, 1971]

LODGE COMMISSION OK QUALIFIED: NO BLANK UN CHECK SOUGHT FOR RED CHINA

(By John Chamberlain)

Amid all the ping-pong euphoria of recent days, one wonders how many people have actually read the few sentences that the Henry Cabot Lodge Commission on the UN devoted to the problem of bringing Red China to the "Glass House" by Manhattan's East River. What the report says is that the UN "can best do its job . . . if its membership includes all the governments in the world, provided they subscribe to the principles of the UN Charter."

Somehow, the Lodge commission qualification for UN membership got lost in all the hub-bub about a reported "change" in U.S.-China policy. The clack of ping-pong rackets has addled our brains, and we have lost the art of reading whole sentences. But, as Senator Peter Dominick will soon be pointing out in a major policy speech, what the 50-member Lodge commission said about subscription to the Charter is a mere repetition in substance of what the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations has been saying for years. Even the late Alfred Kohlberg, the self-confessed one-man "Free China Lobby," would have surrendered to Peking's good behavior.

Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and their mates must decide to accept the Geneva Convention about war prisoners, forswear their ambitions to seize Taiwan by force, call off their genocidal reign of terror in Tibet, cease their conniving in northeastern Thailand, and promise—in the Charter's words—to have faith in the equal rights of "nations large and small" (including South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia). If that were done, then the U.S. would certainly withdraw its objections to a UN seat for Peking alongside the one held by Taiwan. (Whether Taiwan would go along is, of course, another story, complicated by the question of who would dispose of "China's" seat in the Security Council.)

In the savage politics of the U.N., which actually includes many nations that pay mere lip service to the Charter, Red China could very likely get a hypocritical acceptance by a scant majority. But this would depend for its validity on the U.S. turning hypocrite on its own by deciding not to press for consideration of Red Chinese admission as "an important question" requiring a two-thirds approval. We have always held out for the "important question" qualification. And now that Nixon has decided that Red China's good behavior is more important than ever it would look crass if he instructed the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., George Bush, to deal with the matter of Peking membership as if it were something on a par with that of the inoffensive Andaman Islanders. Surely no President of the U.S. would dare to be that cynical.

Aside from U.N. expectancies, there has been a subtle and damaging change in the Far Eastern balance of forces. The Orientals are looking coolly at the U.S. will to prevail, and are finding it wanting. Thanat Khoman, the canny Thai foreign minister, thinks we are "psychologically tired," and so he is wooing Red China on his own. The Japanese are about to double their military force. Nixon may hope to get some action on the SALT talks out of Russia by playing up to Peking, and he may hope to "spring" our war prisoners from Hanoi jails by getting Chou to intervene.

But if our diplomacy succeeds in building the strength of the Red Chinese at the expense of all the nations on the Asian periphery, Japan will certainly need its own atomic missiles to counter those which Peking is developing. And, in the event of war between Red China and Soviet Russia, Japan might have to move again in Manchuria to protect her western flank from possible domination by a powerful continental monolith.

The post-World War II era is coming to a close, and we'll be fishing henceforward in very troubled waters. The only sure guideline for our policy, whatever it becomes, is that it must not seem weak to the rest of the world. If we don't exact real ponderable quids for our quos, the jackals and the hyenas will gather, and there will be a mighty feasting on the U.S. corpse.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Apr. 18, 1971]

UP TO CHINA

Peking's public perception of a new page in relations between the American and Chinese peoples pointedly said nothing about relations between the two governments. Historically, such statements from Communist governments have invariably implied that the particular capitalist government is lagging far behind its citizens.

The fact is, at any rate, that Peking thus far has confined itself almost entirely to words rather than deeds. The unprecedented outbreak of Chinese hospitality for American Ping-Pong players and newsmen was nice for openers. But President Nixon's response—sweeping relaxation of trade, travel and currency restrictions—was one of action.

The verbal initiative was also first taken by President Nixon. He has for a long time been proclaiming that "there will be no more important challenge in this decade than drawing the People's Republic of China into a constructive relationship with the rest of the world."

China's "new leaf" reaction was an indirect but certainly encouraging signal. Obviously China is interested in gaining a voice in international councils dealing with Asia, disarmament and various other global problems.

Unlike the Chinese Communist leaders, the President had to take a courageous stance against mixed domestic opinion and established commitments when he espoused the admission of Peking into world councils. Peking, on the other hand, need not worry about opposition from its citizens.

As a matter of reciprocity, it would seem both appropriate and wise for Peking to reply in kind to the Nixon relaxations. Then it should not be difficult for the two nations to agree on resumption of the private talks in Warsaw which are now in suspension. It would be possible to set up ground rules for private negotiations that could pave the way for really turning over a new leaf—government to government—such as would perhaps really bring Peking into a constructive relationship with the United States.

But the ultimate test of whether Peking desires decent relations with the United States would be if it were to close down its Maoist-inspired schools for insurrectionists terrorists and political saboteurs. No matter how cordial conversations may get, that is one test which Peking is not likely to pass in the foreseeable future.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, May 2, 1971]

CHINA LOBBY, A SLEEPING DRAGON, FIGHTS RECOGNITION

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's new "soft" diplomacy toward China has drawn fire from within his own ranks and threatens to put him on a collision course with many of his strongest supporters.

The Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations, which also opposes recognition of the government and trade with it, plans to mount a vast educational campaign this summer, designed to convince Nixon he is headed in the wrong direction.

TWICE BEFORE

The committee head, former FOP Congressman Walter Judd of Minnesota, hopes to accomplish what he claims to have done twice before—prove that the time is not right for recognition, as he says he swayed Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy in 1953 and 1961.

Judd and his committee are unalterably opposed to the new policy, to the dual China recommendations of a commission headed by Henry Cabot Lodge and given implied, if not actual, blessings by the White House, and even extensive trade with the Chinese.

The committee has supporters among both Republicans and Democrats, but clearly and admittedly the bulk of the "angels" are members of Nixon's GOP. Many of them, moreover, are people who can be counted upon for financial help when the political bills become due.

Judd is physician-missionary-politican who spent enough time in China to have learned the language and the mores of the people. He is a conservative who does not think of himself as a rightwinger.

FIRST OBJECTIVE

Judd sees no harm in "appropriate" responses to Communist initiatives but he opposes, as he puts it, giving them a horse when they give us a rabbit.

"The first objective of Mao and Chou is to set the American people against our government," he said. "They also want to whet the appetite of the business community, which was so eager to trade with Hitler and with the Japanese—and now with Red China.

"Lenin said it best when he declared you can always trust the cupidity of the capitalists."

BACKS AGNEW

Judd believes the Chinese people do not approve of the Mao government, but rather are bending like the bamboo in the wind to preserve their roots.

"That's why we feel that what Vice President Agnew is saying is what the Administration really feels," he said. "I think President Nixon welcomes what we are trying to do—we are not fanatics on the far right—because he has a sense of history and doesn't want to preside over a debacle."

Judd laughed when he talked of the recommendation of the commission headed by Lodge which recommended what he opposes.

"Cabot was said to have been studying Chinese," he snorted. "He wants to be the ambassador to Peking."

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) has counseled caution on several occasions prior to this. Certainly I believe his counseling of further caution this afternoon is properly in order.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to another distinguished Member of the California delegation (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding and providing this opportunity for those of us who have felt for many years on the basis of the record that dealing with Red China or any totalitarian regime is really an impossible dangerous task. There is no such thing as an honorable exchange with tyrants of this type.

I was very disturbed to read in my own newspapers in California this past weekend, particularly the Pasadena Star News, that the Department of Commerce has just granted export licenses to various manufacturers of truck parts and other critical materials to Red China. I believe it is further evidence that the so-called new ping-pong policy is now being fully implemented even while the Congress and the American people are told that we are "going slow."

Mr. Speaker, since there is a great deal of discussion about "doing business with Red China," and our administration seems quite intent upon re-establishing trade with Communist China, it might be worthwhile to consider the actual experience of a British businessman by the name of George Watt who was sent in 1966 to Lanchow, a walled city in western China, to supervise construction of a textile factory for his firm Vickers-Zimer. The Sun, of Sydney, Australia, recently printed a story written by Mr. Watt which describes his experiences while engaged in the construction of this textile manufacturing plant in Red China. Since most American citizens are anxious to obtain facts about what actual conditions might be existent in dealing with the Red Chinese government, I thought the "business atmosphere" in which this business engineer found himself would give some insight into what Americans might expect, as I am not sure that the experience related by Mr. Watt will be presented by our State Department.

The account of George Watt's observations and experiences which were released as a series of articles in The Sun of Sydney, Australia, January 4 through January 11, 1971, are now submitted for the serious consideration of my colleagues and others who might be considering trade with these "lovable agrarian reformers":

On the afternoon of December 19, 1966, I was in a small Russian-built plane somewhere over Central China and about 40 minutes' flight from my final destination, the old walled city of Lanchow. At Lanchow Airport I was met by my interpreter, Mr. Gin, who embraced me as if I were an old friend. He and his companions bowed and smiled.

After dinner that first evening Mr. Gin briefed me on what I could and could not do while I was in Lanchow. It took two hours in all. I cannot recall everything he said but the main points were:

I was not allowed to hold the hand of a Chinese girl or to be familiar with her. Even a friendly smile at a waitress could be misconstrued.

I was not to take photographs of anything or anybody without permission. I was not to enter Chinese homes and I was not to leave the hotel without an interpreter.

There was no place outside the hotel where Europeans could eat. I could go shopping only on Saturday afternoons. The hotel doors would be locked at 10 every night.

Toward the end of my first week in Lanchow I was taking a Sunday stroll with a British colleague, accompanied of course by Mr. Gin, along the road which led from the hotel to the city. About a quarter of a mile from the hotel, near the bank of the Yellow River, we saw a group of about a dozen Red Guards ahead of us. They were shouting, blowing whistles, and were obviously highly excited. One of them was carrying a bundle.

Suddeny he threw the bundle to the ground and they all gathered round, red books containing the thoughts of Mao raised above heads, shouting: "Wa, wa, wa." Then they walked on still cheering.

The bundle was the nude body of a boy of about three years old. He was dead and had been badly burnt.

It was my first taste of the savagery which could be so suddenly unleashed in this frightening country. I felt physically sick.

Months later I was to learn that this was a fairly common form of action against "enemies of the people." A wife, husband, or child would be killed or badly maltreated to intimidate the offender's family.

That evening a political commissar arrived at the hotel to warn us not to mention what we had seen on the bank of the Yellow River and "not to spread alarming rumours."

Soon I was to experience fear myself. Two senior Chinese engineers had invited all the Europeans at the Friendship Hotel—there were about 30 of us, British and German, with one or two wives and a few children—to dinner at the hotel.

It was a much better meal than we usually had there and the wine flowed. One of our hosts, who could speak English, made a speech saying the dinner was to welcome us to China.

It was a couple of days later that Mr. Gin suggested that I might like to visit the curio and antique shop in the city. It is situated in a corner of a wide open space called Anti-Revisionist Square. When we approached the shop, the square was filled with a howling mob.

Then I saw my host of two nights before. He was strung up by the neck to a lamppost and he was dead.

I turned to Mr. Gin in horror, "Why, why?" was all I could say.

Solemnly he told me: "He has been punished for a number of crimes. He has taken the capitalist road and has lorded it over his comrades by wasting public funds on high living and needlessly entertaining foreigners."

And all the time, as he spoke, Mr. Gin watched my face with hardly a blink of his eyes. . . .

One Saturday evening in the Anti-Revisionist Square I saw two men accused of "giving aid to the enemies of the masses, following deviationist policies, and refusing to confess."

Transistor-powered loudhailers were placed first against one ear of each of two men. Red Guards howled through the hailers, blew bugles, whistles, and clashed ear-splitting cymbals until the men collapsed.

They were hauled to their feet and the hailers switched to the other ear. This was repeated again and again until finally the men had to be held up. I am sure they were unconscious.

Mr. Gin, who had watched all this without a trace of emotion, calmly told me: "Their punishment is to be deafened so that no more reactionary remarks enter their ears."

There had been fighting somewhere to the east of the city. We Europeans had heard rumors about it, but had deliberately avoided asking any questions. Work at the site had been stopped and we had been told to stay in the hotel for a few days. It was sticky weather, with the temperatures soaring into the 90s.

One afternoon, a few of us had strolled into the hotel courtyard to get some fresh air. Hearing the rumble of heavy traffic on the road outside, we looked through the gates and saw a parade of grey, open lorries packed with Red Guards carrying home-made spears.

There must have been 50 vehicles. They came trundling by about 20 feet apart at about five miles an hour. And across the radiator of each truck was lashed a human being. Some trucks had two people. All had been spread-eagled diagonally and tied down with wire or rope.

Other captives in groups of two, three or four, had been strapped to the backs or roofs of each driving cab.

They were young and old, women as well as men. Some had been wounded. Many were in a state of complete collapse.

We were in the middle of a vicious battle for power between Mao Tse-tung and his onetime friend, President Liu Shao-chi.

Tens of thousands of workers from various parts of China had been drafted in to work on the vast complex of plants outside the city . . . Food was becoming short.

The food shortage was so severe that the peasants hid much of their produce in mountain caves instead of giving it to the State. The explosion came when some site workers, discovering these food caches, killed six or seven peasants.

In the next few days I watched with mesmerised fascination the preparations for a civil war. One day at the site I found the workers cutting up narrow piping into six-foot lengths to use as spear shafts.

This was piping that had already been fitted and installed. I almost went berserk. "Are you crazy?" I yelled. "These are the arteries of this site . . . if you cut them out you kill this site."

I was ignored. They carried on fashioning the pipe lengths into crude spears by lashing

screwdrivers, chisels, and other sharp tools to the ends.

On approaching the hotel that evening, I saw hundreds of people making large blocks out of mud, stone, and concrete. They used them to block up the ground floor windows and doors of their homes and shops. Men were hauling up baskets of stones to the roofs to lay out on the parapets for action. Rope ladders dangling from upper story windows showed how they were entering and leaving their fortress homes.

Later that night we heard the noise of hammering metal. In the back courtyard of the hotel was an anvil and a portable charcoal forge. Around them were the hotel waiters and cooks—and they too were making spears. Broom handles and lengths of bamboo were being used for shafts and the heads were being fashioned from the tops of nearby railings. Some simply had kitchen knives and forks lashed to the end.

This do-it-yourself weapon-making went on for two or three days until one morning we were awakened at about four o'clock by the most terrifying screaming. From our bedroom windows we saw about a dozen fires on the outskirts of the city. We could only look and wonder.

This was quite obviously a fight between the city folk and the workers from the plants. But the thing that really astounded me was the fact that both sides were backed up by troops. Soldiers from the city were firing on those who were normally stationed out at the sites. And the "site" soldiers were firing back.

The battle swayed along the road outside the hotel for two or three days. Dead and injured lay all over the place. During a lull, I made a dash for the shop at the entrance to the hotel to get some sweets and fruit for the children and some beer for ourselves.

The old man who ran it was dead. The inside had been wrecked and the old man, a spear driven right through his stomach, was suspended in the space of the counter flap by the ends of the spear being placed on each side of the counter.

He had once owned the shop and, when the Communist revolution took over, had been allowed to remain as manager.

I had to get my family out of this mad, mad country. They could not take this sort of thing much longer, and I could not stand watching their misery.

When the fighting died down a couple of days later—I sought official permission to take my family to Peking and then on to Hong Kong for a two week holiday.

We landed in Peking on August 22 and in our room at the Hsin Chaio Hotel I tuned in my transistor radio to London. I was just in time to catch the BBC news. Jo and I looked at each other in despair as we heard that that very day the British Chargé d' Affaires office in Peking had been attacked by mobs and was in flames.

I knew my way to the diplomatic compound having stayed in Peking for a few days on my way to Lanchow. We stopped on the far side of the married quarters, a block of flats built in a rectangle around an enclosed courtyard.

The mission was still smouldering and around it, dancing, prancing, capering, yelling and screaming were thousands of Chinese.

As I pushed through the mob I occasionally waved a clenched fist and yelled "Up the Irish" if I spotted any Chinese face eyeing me with suspicion. And I would nod and wink as if we were the best of friends and push on as fast as possible. Not very bright perhaps, but all I could think of on the spur of the moment.

Eventually I reached the mission railings just a few feet from the building itself. It looked completely gutted.

"If anybody is in there," I told myself, "he won't be alive."

After a few minutes I turned and carefully edged my way back through that heaving crowd until I got to the taxi.

Telling the taxi to wait we made our way up to the flat of Mr. Theo Peters, First Commercial Counsellor at the mission. He had had his neck twisted and his throat bruised.

Upstairs in a room converted into a temporary office, I learned how the British diplomatic staff had faced the crisis. Jo and I were feeling a lot better as we drove back to the hotel. Nobody had been badly hurt and the danger seemed to have passed for the moment.

In the hotel foyer I met Mr. Shah, the interpreter who had been assigned to me in Peking. There was another official with him and they were stiff with anger. I told Jo and the children to go on up to the room and waited to receive what I thought would be a ticking off for having left the hotel without Mr. Shah.

A stream of abuse was unleashed. They were both shouting at the tops of their voices, and then I heard only Mr. Shah's voice.

"You," he said, stabbing a finger at me, "are an Imperialist lackey who has been rendering aid to the diplomatic enemies of the Chinese people.

"You have not heard the last of this. There are no seats on the plane tomorrow [*it was to take us to Canton where we would catch the train for Hong Kong*] for you or your family. You are all to stay in Peking until further notice."

Now I was filled with dread. We were to be punished—not only I, but my wife, Jo, our nine-year-old daughter, Christine, and son Steven who was barely two—because we had visited the British diplomats who had been injured in attacks by angry mobs.

Mr. Shah smiled and, with sinister politeness said, "Good evening, Mr. Watt." Then he spoke with venom: "We now have a more detailed report of your serious crimes against the Chinese people and the Red Guards are very angry. They feel it only fair that you should receive the same treatment as that given to the Imperialist diplomats whom you aided."

I said, "You are, of course, Mr. Shah, speaking only about me?"

"No," he replied, "we mean your family. You were all there."

"But," I protested, "you cannot beat up a woman and two children." Even as I spoke, I thought of the Chinese of all ages whom I had seen receiving hideous "punishment" from the Red Guards.

"Yes, we can," snapped Mr. Shah. "You are all British and the British owe us blood debts from 1842, debts which must be paid in blood."

Then he departed, leaving me to sweat. For the next two weeks I lived out this cat-and-mouse existence with Mr. Shah and other Chinese officials who were tormenting me with hints of what could happen to my family.

By the tenth day of that fortnight I had had all I could take. That night, after dinner I locked Jo and the children in the room and went upstairs to the bar. I ordered a glass of Chinese beer and looked around. There were quite a few happy people present.

There was a group of Tanzanians and Zambians, members of a party of 50, who told me quite openly that they were in China to be trained as "liberation fighters to operate in South Africa."

There was also a bunch of Australians, all confirmed Maoists, who said they were in Peking for indoctrination and training.

One of them slapped me on the back and said, "Have a brandy?"

I replied that I did not drink spirits. "It's good brandy," he said. "It'll do you good. You look worried."

In the next half hour I downed four or five Chinese brandies made, I believe, from bananas. They loosened my tongue.

I had been listening to the Australians singing the praises of Mao and of how they were going back to Australia to "tell the truth about the new China."

"That," I broke in bitterly, "is a first-class idea. Tell the world the truth, tell them the Chinese are holding my wife and infants hostage in Peking, tell them they have threatened to beat my family."

An Australian girl said: "Are you really suggesting that the Chinese would do such terrible things?"

"You're their friends," I replied. "Ask them for yourselves." Then I left for my room slightly weaving.

Next morning in the lift to the breakfast-room, I met one of my Australian bar companions of the night before. She was a woman in her early sixties who had told me that she had been to China many times.

I heard her whisper in my ear, "Don't worry, we're working for you. I think your wife and children will be able to leave.

I decided to try to turn this little incident to my advantage. I had nothing to lose.

I found Mr. Shah and said to him, "I think I ought to tell you that other guests in the hotel are asking me if it is true that my wife and children are being held here against their will. This story is now spreading among non-Chinese guests here and it is not doing your country any good. Why not let them go and keep me? I know you have something in store for me, I'm perfectly willing to stay and face it."

There was no definite answer of course. I waited two days more without word or sight of Mr. Shah.

Then Mr. Shah came to me to say, "Your wife and children must pack their bags. They will leave for the airport at noon tomorrow."

It was September 5, 1967, and we were at Peking Airport. But the agony was not yet over. The Chinese played every delaying tactic they could devise. My family's baggage was searched and they were all, even little Steven, searched bodily. It took two hours and all the time Chinese officials kept hinting that the plane would have to leave. Finally one of them announced: "The plane has gone. You must go back to the hotel and wait for another day."

My wife's eyes were swimming with tears. We were so downcast that we could not say a single word to each other. Then Mr. Shah suddenly intervened. "All right," he said, "your wife and children can now go to the plane."

The last I was to hear from my family for three years was the voice of my son Steven as my wife carried him across the tarmac to the waiting plane, "Daddy, daddy."

I walked to my room and picked up the phone to tell the British mission I was about to be nabbed. Before I could ask for the number, the door flew open and a half-dozen Red Guards piled in. They grabbed my arms, A gun was rammed into my side and somebody else wrapped an arm around my neck.

I was told: "Don't make a noise." I could hardly breathe.

I was marched off to a large room on the same floor which was often used as a reception or meeting hall.

Behind a table in the middle of the room sat six men dressed in grey uniforms. I was placed on a chair in front of that table and for ten minutes nothing was said. Everybody just stood and stared, rigidly pointing at me with stabbing fingers.

Mao Tse-tung has a saying: "A thousand pointing fingers and a man dies without a sickness."

I had not been properly arrested. No formal charges had been read out. I had no lawyer. Yet quite clearly I was the defendant at a trial.

Shah took 15 minutes to read out a list of the crimes I was alleged to have committed.

I had given aid to the British diplomats when they were "receiving punishment." I

had performed deliberate acts of provocation (one of which was that I had gone shopping for one of the diplomats' wives to buy wickerwork baskets from a Peking department store).

I had spread false rumours connected with the delay of my family's departure, thus trying to "drive a wedge between the Chinese people and their foreign friends."

My final insult to the Chinese people was that I had "publicly entertained the Imperialist British diplomats while they were under restriction."

But at this stage there was no mention of any accusation that I was a spy.

Mr. Shah then took my wallet from my pocket, counted out some notes, kept them and handed me an air ticket, saying, "There is your plane reservation. You are under arrest, and the Peking Revolutionary Committee has decided to return you to Lanchow, where it is understood other charges are pending. It is not necessary for you to make a plea at this time. But we advise you to admit your crimes in full—the Chinese people may show some leniency."

I was told I would be held at the Friendship Hotel under armed guard while being investigated by the Public Security Bureau. I was placed in a room which had been converted into a temporary cell. Wooden slats three inches wide had been screwed across the windows just six inches apart. Two armed guards were in that room with me during the entire period I was there.

The investigation of the charges against me lasted six months.

I was interrogated almost daily and sometimes three times a day. The questioning would start at 9 a.m., last until noon, restart at 2 p.m., and carry on until 5 p.m. The interrogators would then give me an hour's break and start again. The evening sessions usually lasted until at least 11 p.m. Sometimes they went on into the early hours of the morning. Occasionally after being dismissed late at night, I would be woken up at one, two or even three o'clock in the morning to face more questioning.

For all my interrogations, I was taken from my room to another just across the corridor. There I was made to sit on a hard, wooden chair placed in a corner. That chair was a torture instrument itself.

The seat, a natural width at the front, converged until the rear edge was no more than three inches wide. The back, too, was only three inches wide and set absolutely straight up and down.

I could not lean back in comfort and the hard, sharp edges cut into my flesh. If I leaned forward and rested my elbows on my knees, I would be immediately told not to be disrespectful to the court and to sit up straight.

As the days passed, I grew more and more weary—so tired that at times I would doze. Sometimes a guard would force me awake with the tip of his bayonet. Not a savage jab by any means but enough to rip my shirt and nick my skin.

At the end of that six months, my chest and stomach were marked by 50 or 60 such nicks.

At all times a bright light shone on my face. I had two main inquisitors, whom I privately named Mr. Rage and Mr. Kind.

Mr. Rage would rant and threaten me with dire consequences until I confessed. When I refused, he would apparently lose his temper and shriek: "Dirty British spy! Why waste time with him? Let's take him out and shoot him now."

Mr. Kind would intercede, saying: "Yes, I know he deserves it. But he has a wife and two lovely children. It would be terrible to think they would never see him again because he has been used by the British Imperialists. Let us give him a chance to admit his crimes."

I began to hate Mr. Rage and to think that I would have had no hope at all if it had not been for the intervention of Mr. Kind.

They had me in a daze, day and night. They went through my family history demanding the names and ages of every relative on both sides of the family.

Then they would snap out threats such as: "Now we shall break you down, expose your false family and find out who you really are."

Where did you do your military training? Where did you receive your espionage training? They seized on the fact that I had once been a manager with an American construction company and converted that simple fact into a link with the American CIA.

My normal weight is 196 pounds. By the end of that six months I reckon I was down to 154 pounds.

The same questions were repeated over and over again. I felt I would have gone mad if it had not been for the apparent thoughtfulness of Mr. Kind. There were several times towards the end of that six months when I fell out of my chair in a state of near collapse. They would drag me off to my room, dump me on the bed and let me rest for 20 minutes before helping me back into the interrogation room.

I finally decided I would have to make some sort of "confession" when they produced photographs of mine which were allegedly of prohibited areas. The pictures were of nothing more than the Yellow River and the anti-British posters stuck outside the hotel.

Very guardedly I said, "I wouldn't exactly say I am a spy. But from your point of view I know I am a 'spy.' I am prepared to admit this if you can differentiate between a trained spy and one who is an engineer, but not a trained agent."

"We cannot differentiate," they said. "You are either a spy or you are not. So admit you are."

Then Mr. Kind, who all these months had been the nearest thing to a friend I was likely to find, suddenly exploded.

"This," he roared, "is the end. I've done all I can for you. I've been your friend and you have betrayed that friendship. Now I am in trouble. This is your last possible chance. There's your confession (he threw about 50 typed pages into my lap). Sign it now or pay the price of your guilt."

I didn't even try to read those pages. One of the guards turned the pages for me. I signed each one. As I wrote the signatures looked too large, sweeping up and down too far in both directions and sprawling almost across the entire page.

Then I was allowed to sleep. I awoke the next day at 10 a.m. It was March 14, 1968. The events of the day before were like a nightmare, but I knew it was no dream. I was bitter and disappointed that they had temporarily managed to defeat me. But I had no time to sit and brood.

About 10 guards marched into the room, pushed me to the floor and then thrust me down again as I struggled to my knees. Then they dragged me out along the corridor and pushed and pulled at me as I bumped on my side down the stairs of the Friendship Hotel.

I was dumped into a jeep and, accompanied by guards and two interpreters, was driven off to Anti-Revisionist Square where months before I had seen Chinese hung and tortured for their alleged crimes. The "masses" were there in their thousands. The guards took me through a side door of Anti-Revisionist Hall, on the edge of the square, and marched me into a massive auditorium. There I was placed on a platform.

The hall was crammed with shouting Chinese.

On the platform I was facing a huge picture of Mao Tse-tung edged on each side by heavy red drapes. I remember thinking: "That is about the friendliest looking face in this hall."

An interpreter just below my platform was telling me: "Bow your head, George Watt, bow to the masses." I did, placing a hand over my eyes as if in penitence but peering through slightly opened fingers at that fantastic and frightening scene.

From a stage in front of me a young woman judge—she was little more than 21, and would have been good-looking if her face had not been so twisted with hate—hurled a stream of abuse at me.

The only pause in her harangue was when she broke off now and then to spit in my face.

She read out the charges, she read out my confession. It took about an hour. I didn't really listen.

All this was being relayed by loudspeaker to that huge writhing mob in the square.

Then the interpreter was calling to me: "Come. Come down, George Watt. The masses are calling you."

I was marched through the hall to the front entrance, through the doors and out on a big terrace built about 10 feet above the level of the square. The only means of approach from the square were a set of stairs at each side, which were guarded by armed troops.

All the time the soldiers prodded me with their rifle muzzles to move me from one side of the terrace to the other so that I was displayed to the best advantage.

I felt sweat pouring down my face and I felt myself sinking. Then I was on the ground and the sky was swimming around above and filled with watching Chinese faces.

They carried me back into the hall and sat me in a chair for a few minutes. Then I heard the interpreter telling me: "The masses are calling you again, can't you hear them? You must go and bow to them to show your repentance."

I was marched out again. My knees were wobbly and I wanted to be sick. Again those rifle muzzles began prodding, and went on prodding until I collapsed again. Once more I was taken back into the hall and allowed to recover slightly before being marched out again.

I don't know how many times this happened, but I have a feeling that I had to take eight or nine of those terrific curtain calls. Again I collapsed. When I came to in the hall I had the impression that I had been out for a long time.

My right eye was closed and the blood from a rip in my left ear was pouring down the inside of the neck of my shirt. In fact I could feel it streaming down to my waistline.

Dimly I heard the interpreter's voice again. His voice seemed to be coming from a long way off and gradually I realized that he was giving me different orders this time.

"Run, run. You have to run, George Watt. Quickly, before it is too late."

Fuddled and bemused, I struggled to my feet and then the soldiers gathered round and half carrying me, got me to the side door by which we had entered this torture chamber. I was dumped into the back of the jeep. Lying there I could just see over the tailboard.

People were running towards us. They began to chase us, waving and shouting. Some had broken down the doors of Anti-Revisionist Hall and had poured through the hall in a bid to get me.

The jeep driver speeded up and cut across a piece of waste land, as a short cut to the road.

The car bounced hard and high over boulders and holes. Still that crowd came on. By now the main mob from the square were racing across to try to head off the jeep from the road.

We made that road with only yards to spare. I stared, almost hypnotized, at that frantic mob as we sped away.

I was taken to Lanchow jail. They put me into a cell, but all I knew about it was that the wooden bench on which I was lying felt like a bed of stones.

Pulling open my shirt, I looked at my body. It was covered with hundreds of little ring bruises . . . the pattern left by the rifle muzzles. In some places there were so many of them joined together it looked like chain mail. I remember thinking, stupidly, "How pretty that looks."

Then I heard a voice saying in English: "Here is some water. Drink it. It is all over."

Half an hour later I was disturbed by thousands of voices singing "The East is Red." The sound came closer and closer. I looked through the cell window to see armed soldiers dashing about in the courtyard outside . . . the mob had come to the prison to get me.

The noise grew louder. I guessed the mob was now through the main gates of the prison and in the outer courtyard.

An interpreter entered the cell. "There is trouble outside," he said. "The people think you have been let off too lightly. They say you should hang. . . ."

The pandemonium lasted probably no more than 20 minutes, though it seemed much longer to me. Then the row began to fade until there was complete silence.

The interpreter reappeared. This time he was smiling reassuringly: "Do not worry any more," he said. "It is all over. The masses were demanding your execution. But there was a wicked landowner who had been in this prison for some time. He had refused to repent and remould himself. The masses have taken him and he will be punished in your place."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my colleagues for permitting me this opportunity to join with him and others in calling this retrogressive policy to the attention of the House of Representatives and the American public.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) counseling caution again, as he also has done on a number of occasions. What he has had to say can and has been accurately documented.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana yielding, and certainly I want to comment favorably on and to associate myself with the remarks he has made in the well. I compliment the gentleman for taking this erstwhile time to make his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, down where I come from, in the Ozark Hills of southwest Missouri, there is an old adage which states:

You can't get in bed with a rattlesnake and not expect to get bit!

I hope this little bit of homespun Ozark advice will be heeded by our national leaders before they go so far as to kneel down and say their "Now I lay me's" with Chairman Mao.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little hard for me to realize that while we reject any and all diplomatic relations with the small nation of Rhodesia, we contemplate recognition of a nation which has systematically tyrannized, starved, and murdered its own people, to say nothing of those others who stood in their way, for the last 22 years.

It is hard for me to realize that the American news media can work themselves into a state of bliss, watching the bounce of a ping-pong ball, yet never give a moment's thought to the player holding the paddle.

It is hard for me to realize that while we are engaged in combat in Southeast Asia, we seemingly are preparing to open the door to the United Nations to the enemy's chief supplier and motivator. We have watched them become nuclear capable, and now watch as they become delivery capable and even build a nuclear-powered submarine.

Let me remind you that Great Britain recognized Red China in 1949. Since that time its representatives in Peking have been harassed, insulted, and injured as the regime demonstrated its contempt for the capitalist enemy.

I remind you, too, that it was the diplomatic recognition of Russia, by this Nation, that gave it respectability, enabling the Soviet Union to receive concessions and open doors that would never have been possible, had we not so permitted.

Are we now preparing to offer ourselves on that same alter again, hoping that such a seemingly small sacrifice as "standing aside" will possibly bring about a few additional moments of fleeting peace?

It is a paradox to me that while we fight communism with the one hand, we extend the other in a gesture of friendship. Surely, one is not compatible with the other.

I am the first to agree that talk is better than bullets, and no diplomatic doors should be closed to any nation desirous of peace and willing to put their cards on the table. However, I for one am not ready to sit in the game until this Nation is assured of a straight deck, a proper shuffle, the option to cut, and a deal that will place all the cards flat on the table, face up. The stakes are much too high. It still takes two to tango.

Mr. Speaker, let us decide right now that in all future dealings with the sleeping dragon, if we are to err, let it be on the side of might.

I include the following:

PING PONG IS OLD DIPLOMACY

WASHINGTON.—American foreign policy carries a thread of rationality in its essentially mad fabric. These relationships explain its capacity for instant and continuing failure. If we look back on the panorama of forty years, we find only isolated and inconsistent successes to record.

It is clearly mad to suppose that a regime which has systematically tyrannized, starved and murdered its own people for 22 years is in any significant degree changed by its invitation to an American ping pong team to play in Red China. We must relate the invitation to the continuing aims of Maoist policy. The rush of U.S. news analysts to hail a new era of better Washington-Peiping relations illustrates the incapacity of our policymakers to face up to reality.

We make foreign policy in an atmosphere of make-believe. Our Christian philosophy inclines us to apply in international affairs the personal relationships enjoined within our own community, even when their application is inapt. We have persisted for forty years in believing that our patient and persistent effort to reach accommodation with the Soviet Union could be productive. We have refused to admit even to ourselves that these efforts were preordained to fail.

The Soviet leaders see our love of peace as cowardice, our quest for accommodation as stupidity, our persistent utopianism as decadence. Our behavior, instead of restraining their rapacity, has spurred them to greater exertions. They are confident that they will bury us.

I subscribe to the thesis that nations have character and that their policies should reflect that character. Our government represents a Christian people and should conduct itself accordingly. This is the rational thread of our policy.

I reject, however, the false thesis that Christian judgments can be made in disregard of the reality which confronts us. Our foreign policy today is based not on rational Christian judgment of our interests but upon a blind and un-Christian clinging to vain hopes long ago shattered by reality. This is the madness.

The deeper wellspring of this policy is commercial. As with President Roosevelt when he recognized the Soviet Union in 1933, so today President Nixon is pressed by commercial interests seeking trade with the communist powers. The Rockefellers and the Eatons see visions of vast new projects to be financed by U.S. taxpayers—"and visions of sugar plums danced in their heads"!

It is the judgment of our business leaders that we must reach accommodation with the communist powers in order to avoid world war. They seek negotiation, not confrontation, and they are getting it. But in that policy they abandon freedom and the oppressed peoples to cooperate with the communist tyrannies. There must be retribution for such policy.

Under these influences the United States has pursued for almost forty years a policy of service submission to communist initiatives. When Moscow smiles, we fawn. When Moscow scowls, we are hurt. It is from this self-debasement that we see the invitation to a ping pong team as opening a new era, instead of asking what Mao wants now.

Through these four decades of our servility, the communist leaders have exploited our gullibility to build their own strength. They used the carrot and they used the stick. When in periods of disillusionment we saw the disastrous consequences of our naivete, they turned to new offers of detente to build our illusions anew.

In Southeast Asia, the ending of North Vietnam sanctuary in Laos and Cambodia assures the defeat of the North Vietnam aggression. Red China cannot risk the war with the United States which two Democratic administrations feared would follow the denial of sanctuary. It must therefore move diplomatically to convert the Nixon success into a defeat. It wants a face-saving peace which will leave the door open for future aggression in Southeast Asia. It is confident that Richard Nixon, like his predecessors will waste the substance of victory to get the appearances of peace. This is the meaning of ping pong diplomacy.

CHINA POLICY COURTS TROUBLE

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon relaxation of trade restrictions with Red China must be viewed in its historical context. Partisans of Red China believe that the "conservative" Republican administration can do what a liberal Democratic administration could not do. Hence their new thrust for recognition and for admission to the United Nations.

American liberals carried their love affair with the Chinese Communists as far as they could in the Truman administration. They followed the lead of British propagandists in maligning the government of the Republic of China and in lauding Mao's "agrarian reformers". They worked hand in glove with Soviet agents within the United States Gov-

ernment who defied the will of Congress by blocking the delivery of aid authorized for the Republic of China. As Congressman John F. Kennedy said, they delivered China into communist bondage.

When, after the retreat of the Government of China to Taiwan, Secretary of State Dean Acheson produced a viciously slanted "white paper" to promote U.S. recognition of the Red regime, Congress and the American people rebelled. They had been deceived into disaster but they were too honest to pretend that the result was good.

The loss of China to communism so discredited the Democratic Party that its leaders sought thereafter to avoid the subject. Any talk of recognizing Red China would revive painful memories of the Party's responsibility for the betrayal of the Chinese people.

There was some talk of a two-China policy during the Eisenhower administration; but the hostility of the Red Chinese, the attacks on Quemoy and Matsu and the persistent threats to Taiwan allowed little elbow room for amicable diplomacy. Now the ping pong diplomacy of Chou En-lai seems to have excited in the imagination of Richard Nixon visions of detente in the East.

Americans must come to realize that the triumph of the communists in China was not a defeat for American diplomacy. It was an accomplishment of American diplomacy. The triumph of Mao was precisely what our diplomacy sought. In the view of our State Department, prompted by the British Foreign Office, communism was a kind of modernization program which would bring the masses of Asia into the twentieth century. The view of communism as an evil, retrogressive, inhuman despotism trampling western ideals of human rights and freedoms had been rejected by U.S. and British policy makers.

The powerful ruling elements of U.S. society which delivered China to communism have never wavered in their preference for a Red China. They have been waiting for the indignation of the American people to subside. Now, they think, is the propitious time. Using Richard Nixon to silence the conservative opposition, they are prepared again to champion recognition and admission to the United Nations.

The American news media were a major force in deceiving the people about the nature and significance of the Chinese Communists in the late forties. Now they are turning again to the John Fairbanks, the Doak Barnetts and the Edwin Reischauers whom they used as "experts" in the earlier debacle. There is nothing new in the sympathy of these men for the Red regime nor in the persistent bias of their media mentors.

Britain recognized Red China in 1949. Since that time its representatives in Peking have been harassed, insulted and injured as the regime demonstrated its contempt for the capitalist enemy. There was a day when Britain would not condone such treatment of its ambassadors, but that day is no more. Is the United States too now so craven that it will take such insults in behalf of a pitiful policy of peace seeking?

The eagerness of the Nixon administration to court Red Chinese favor raises doubt among our allies about the dependability of U.S. resistance to communist expansionism. Our rush to judgment suggests that U.S. policy is based not upon the realities of power but upon the vagaries of domestic politics. It is persuasive evidence that our true national interests are badly served by the policy makers of both major parties.

U.S. UNDERMINES FREE CHINA

WASHINGTON.—Pretensions of the Nixon policy makers that their gambit with Red China is exploiting divisions in the communist camp illustrate the sheer lunacy of our diplomatic judgments. That is what the poor fish said just before he took the bait.

If there is one matter on which Red Chinese and Red Russians consistently achieve full cooperation, it is the destruction of the United States. The idea that our recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations would somehow exacerbate communist frictions is absolute schizophrenia. That course would give the Red Chinese new leverage for their subversion of the western hemisphere. It would confront us with the combined opposition of Red Chinese and Red Russians in the United Nations. We are like the lamb who thought he could divert the hunger of two lions by standing between them. Of course no lamb was ever so stupid.

If you charge the Nixon policy makers with betraying the Free Chinese who have so long and loyally stood by the United States in every world crisis and who truly represent the aspirations of the Chinese people, you will be told that we are not abandoning Taiwan. We are for a two-China policy which continues our relations with the Republic of China. Because we know that Red China will not accept a two-China policy, we are in fact maintaining the status quo while appearing to bend with the international winds blowing for Red China. In this way, the administration hopes to please both the Left and the Right.

We have heard that line before. Canada used it in recognizing Red China. So also did Italy. The profession of a two-China policy by those governments was a ploy to placate domestic opposition while the wedding with Peking was consummated.

No country has the option of recognizing two claimants to the same throne. When the United States tells the world it is ready to recognize Peking, it says that it is ready to abandon the Republic of China. The footnotes are only diplomatic hypocrisy.

No policy has brought this country greater grief than did our recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. We were then a secure country unmenaced by any foreign power. The country of Lenin and Stalin had given us no trouble before we recognized it. Since then we have had nothing but trouble from the Soviet Union—from Stalin's pact with Hitler which launched World War II to our wars in Korea and Vietnam. By recognition and self-deception, the United States furthered the steady expansion of the Soviet domain.

Now President Nixon courts an equal folly in Red China. He proposes a policy of giving aid to our implacable enemy. To profess our friendship for the Chinese people is one thing but to profess friendship for their slavemasters is a negation of every principle cherished by the American people. If we are friends of the people, we must stand resolutely against their oppressors.

The honesty and justice of our rejection of the communist government of China has of course been compromised by the duplicity of our continuing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. That mistake should not be the excuse for another. History has recorded the damaging consequences of recognizing the Soviet Union. It would be insane and suicidal to repeat the error with Red China.

The Republic of China truly represents the enduring aspirations of the Chinese people. Let us be firm in adhering to its cause and to our own cherished principles. Let us reject brusquely all claims that the communist slavemasters either do or can represent the Chinese people in any relations whatsoever with the people of the United States of America.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) is a man who stands by his friends. I think this is in sum and substance what he is saying today; namely, that we ought to stand with our friends.

He made reference to an old saying they have in Missouri about lying down with or getting in bed with a rattlesnake and getting bit. A little farther south, down in Louisiana, we have a saying that if you lie down with a dog, you get up with fleas. They both mean just about the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I called attention to the fact that five Presidents had taken the position that Communist China should not, under conditions which still exist, be admitted to the United Nations. One of those five Presidents was the great and distinguished Missourian, President Truman, who I believe will be recorded in the annals of time as perhaps the most courageous American President of them all.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I never cease to marvel at those in high places in this Government who have such short memories. It was only a short two decades ago that we were fighting a war in Korea in which we lost some 35,000 American lives and another couple of hundred thousand maimed and otherwise wounded.

That war would not have been possible had it not been for the Red Chinese Government. They not only furnished a large amount of supplies, but they furnished troops to fight the Americans in that war.

How could we possibly forget in such a short time the contribution that they made to the disunity of Korea and to the deaths of so many Americans?

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman and others who have spoken here today in their protest against the action that is being contemplated and I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for taking this time.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his contribution. The gentleman asked about the short memories of Americans who could not recall the Korean war. I think it needs to be said here and now—and those of us who know him understand what I am going to say—the gentleman from Iowa is not to be lumped in with that group with a short memory. I do not think the gentleman has forgotten anything. The gentleman can read your words back to you years later sometimes and cause one to blush, because he has a memory like an elephant.

I think a further reference can be made to this effect: we would not only have had the war in Korea but the war in Vietnam today had it not been for our mistaken approach to the Communists in China when we forsook General Chiang Kai-shek and his people and changed directions in the middle of the ball game.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gen-

tleman will yield further, and when we failed to support General MacArthur who wanted to go beyond the Yalu River in dealing with the Red Chinese or serve notice upon them that we do not intend to tolerate that kind of business in the future.

This has contributed in my humble opinion to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the gentleman from Iowa is exactly right. It needs further to be said that politicians in the State Department cannot fight a war. You have to leave that to the military.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of several of my colleagues whom I know share their deep concern on this subject to join with the gentleman from Louisiana in his remarks.

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

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this discussion of the very vital question concerning Red China and our future position. In considering the post ping-pong diplomacy questions, it is fair to ask: If Red China failed to "shoot its way" into the United Nations in the past 20 years, would it be more successful by "smiling" its way into it now? This seems facetious, but in the light of what has happened since the ping-pong episode, the question compels serious thinking.

The Chinese have an adage about a sinister person who smiles habitually but concealed behind his smile is a dagger; such a person also has the sobriquet of a "tiger with a smiling face." Chou En-lai, commonly regarded as benign, affable, and replete with engaging repartee, suits such an image perfectly. Indeed, he beguiled and charmed some of our young and inexperienced table-tennis players to the point that they all but swooned over him.

In the light of the post ping-pong euphoria, a new urgency has developed in the perennial issue of Chinese representation in the United Nations. The question would be easier if one can be convinced that it is a new China, peaceful and conciliatory, that we are dealing with now, instead of the same militant and aggressive China whose admission into the U.N. has been opposed by five administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

Mr. Speaker, the speakers before me have amplified the fact that, despite important concessions made by President Nixon in easing trade and travel restrictions against China, Peking has so far failed to show positive response. Instead, the Red Chinese propaganda machine has taken advantage of favorable public reaction here to try to divide the American Government and people. There can be no doubt that Peking has no intention of coming out to meet this country halfway, and remains hostile toward our Government. In short, it is waiting for us to deliver Taiwan on a silver platter before it will condescend to talk to us. It is counting on the smiles alone, without any concession on its part, to get it into the United Nations.

This being the case, I am naturally concerned about what is going to happen when the U.N. General Assembly meets next September. The President has reassured the Nation on radio and TV on March 8 that "Taiwan could not and would not be expelled from the United Nations as long as we had anything to say about it." However, the question, as I see it, is not what we do or say on the subject, it is what other countries think our attitude is that really matters. To put it bluntly, if other free world nations were led to believe that the United States is about to recognize Communist China, every one of them would want to jump on the bandwagon before we do. The reason is obvious: What marginal value will there remain if Japan, for example, woke up one morning and found that we had recognized Peking and had neglected to let them know before we did?

In three successive radio and TV news conferences since the ping-pong games, the President has refused to speculate on the crucial question of Peking's admission to the U.N., saying it was premature and would not be helpful. His advice was certainly not heeded by the press, which has been alive with all sorts of speculations. In a way, the press could not be blamed because it is obvious to everyone that the President does not have too many options before him. Indeed, the press seems to believe that the United States is facing its most serious diplomatic defeat in the U.N., if the President continues to take a passive attitude and wait for Peking to pick up votes one by one until the magic two-thirds windup in the corner known as the Albanian resolution.

The irony of it all is that none of the reasons which barred Peking from the U.N. in the 50's or 60's has changed today. The Chinese Communists remained militant and unyielding in all their stated policy objectives. The New York Times in a report Monday said when Chou En-lai accompanied Rumanian President Nikolai Ceausescu in a tour of Nanking, the red banners hung across the boulevard read: "People of the world, unite and defeat U.S. imperialism and its running dogs." Neither is the often-cited principle of "universality," which President Nixon referred to in his TV news conference of April 30, sufficient justification for Peking to become a member. All those diplomats at the U.N. who talk glibly about universality will change the subject abruptly if one mentions Rhodesia. Whatever one might think of its policies, Rhodesia does exist; it is as much a reality as Red China is. Yet if Rhodesia is proposed for membership at the U.N., it will receive at the most two votes. In fact, if the German Federal Republic—West Germany—applies for membership today; I doubt those advocates of universality will cast their votes for Bonn which is as qualified as any member already in the world body.

The U.N. is founded as a world organization dedicated to the principle of resolving international disputes by peaceful means. Since such practical considerations as universality are really no more than alibis, the most important criterion should still be whether Peking can pass the test as a peace-loving nation. On that score, there can be no doubt. Peking cannot be considered peace-loving as long as it is obsessed with the Maoist dictum that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun, and with Lin Piao's grand revolutionary strategy of "people's wars" and "wars of national liberation." Peking cannot be considered peace-loving as long as it continues to give massive military aid to Hanoi and the Vietcong, to prolong the conflict in Indochina. And Peking cannot be considered peace-loving as long as it engages in subversions in Southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America through training of guerrillas and sponsoring revolutions to overthrow established governments.

It is unrealistic to expect Peking to play a constructive role in the U.N. once it gains admittance. One need not wait for new facts to turn up, but ample evidence of the regime's disruptive behavior is available. Red China has refused to subscribe to the nuclear test ban treaty, the nuclear proliferation treaty, and more recently to the treaty banning nuclear test on seabeds. In spite of the substandard living conditions on the mainland, it has devoted its resources to the experiment and manufacture of nuclear weapons. It has accused the United Nations as a marketplace for the collusion of big powers. It has tried to defy every major decision taken by the U.N. to settle international disputes by peaceful means, particularly the effort of that body to bring about peace in the Middle East. It has insisted that the U.N. be thoroughly transformed by expelling lawful member states as alleged lackeys of American imperialism. We can be certain that once it is seated in that august body, Peking will use its disruptive tactics to immobilize it so that it will go down the road of the defunct League of Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that in the aftermath of ping-pong, the United States seems to be making every concession and Peking is getting all the benefits without yielding anything in return. If the President does nothing to stop this trend, a seat in the United Nations seems to be the next price we are about to pay just to get Chou En-lai to smile at us. I submit this is too high a price for any nation with self-respect to even consider paying. I hope the President will recall and heed his own words spoken on March 5, 1971, that:

> When Communist China takes the position that they will have no discussion whatever until Taiwan gets out, then we will not start with that kind of proposition.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) for participating this afternoon. His contribution, I believe, will be recognized as a worthy one.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ).

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have spoken on this subject once, but since the gentleman from Missouri commented on the schizophrenic policy of boycotting friendly Rhodesia while opening the trade doors to Red China, I would like to invite him and anyone else so interested to join me in inviting the Rhodesian ping-pong team to this country. It might establish a new era of United States-Rhodesian relations. It might also get an interesting reaction from the State Department and the White House.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed of late by the sudden, irrational burst of euphoria that has taken over much of the press as a result of Communist China's "ping-pong diplomacy." I fear that Peking's vague gesture may have swept away both reason and judgment. In the past 60 days, many of our executive department officials, academic China "experts," gullible reporters—most of whom have dealt frustratedly on the fringes of Red China for the past 20 years—have swallowed whole the spurious Communist Chinese bait of peaceful coexistence. Judging by recent statements in Congress, some of my esteemed colleagues also appear to have been taken in by Peking's propaganda.

How naive can we be? How obsequious have we become as a nation that we would let ourselves be led to believe a love feast is imminent because the Communist Chinese leaders have hinted they just might want something from us?

Do these table-tennis overtures really mean that China is interested in cooperating with the United States? Peking may be opening its gates to individual Americans, but it is not changing its policies at all so far as the U.S. Government is concerned. In fact, Premier Chou-En-lai has said publicly in the last 2 weeks that—

> It cannot be stated that there has been a thaw between the governments of China and the United States.

He continued:

> It should be said that exchanges between the people of the United States and China have been renewed.

It is obvious to students of Communist tactics that Peking is attempting with its "ping-pong diplomacy" to drive a wedge between our Government and our people, between our policymakers and the American public.

At this time, Peking's chief point of contention with the United States is the Taiwan question. Chou made clear just last month that he would not discuss the one-China or two-China policy, and he has accused the United States and Japan of conspiring to promote a two-China policy.

Wise old Patrick Henry once said:

> The only lamp by which my feet are guided is the light of experience.

So, in judging the merits of a closer friendship with Communist China, let us go back beyond Chou's remarks to look at the recent history of China's relations with the world.

In 1949, the Chinese Communists subverted and took over Mainland China, with an assist from some officials of our own Government who could not distinguish between a Communist and an agrarian reformer. Mao-Tse-Tung instituted a reign of terror to fasten a totalitarian grip on the 700 million Chinese people. He destroyed what freedom existed in China, persecuted foreigners of all hues, and killed or drove into exile his Chinese political opposition. Millions of Chinese citizens were killed by Mao's clique before the last vestiges of freedom were wiped out on the mainland, according to reliable reports from inside China.

Then Peking sent hundreds of thousands of "volunteers" into Korea to attack and kill American soldiers whose only intent was to prevent North Korea from conquering South Korea and destroying freedom there. We suffered 142,000 casualties: most of them can be laid at Mao's doorstep. And do not forget that the Communist regime on Mainland China continues to hold Americans, both military and civilian, prisoner.

Now, 20 years later, we are frantically seeking ways of cozying up to Mao and Chou, and going into raptures because they throw a few kind words in among the thousands of insults they hurl daily at our President and at our Nation. Has Communist China changed? Of course it has not. The Communist regime in Peking is as antagonistic today as it was in 1950. It is the main supplier of small arms, ammunition, and food to North Vietnam—a Communist regime that is responsible for killing American men today. It serves as a rail and sea route for weapons and other supplies from Russia going into South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to destroy freedom there and kill our men and our allies.

China's proclaimed policy is to eradicate American military presence from Asia and eliminate any influence we might have in that region of the world. This is not based on supposition; it is not the rantings of a paranoid few. It has been publicly stated time and time again by China's leaders.

And what does the Maoist regime represent in China? It is still the same totalitarian dictatorship it was in 1950. The regime allows no free elections, no freely competitive political parties, no free press, no freedom of religion—no rights at all to the Chinese people that might threaten its vise-like control on the now nearly 800 million Chinese people. And it constantly blusters and boasts that it will "liberate" Taiwan and the 14 million people there who live in relative freedom, if we will just kindly remove our military presence.

Look at Southeast Asia. Peking is aiding our enemies and attacking our friends at every turn. Peking boasts of its support for "wars of liberation" in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, and in Latin America. What is more, Mao's regime is calling for the overthrow of our own form of Government right here in the United States. It encourages rebellion and revolution on the campuses and in the city streets throughout the United States today. Indeed, the correlation between the actions of Mao's "Red Guard" and the actions of some of our own demonstrators is too strong to be chalked up to coincidence. And this is the regime that wants to be friends with the American people—the dictatorship that some of our top officials are trying anxiously to placate today.

If you can believe the press reports, Communist China will possibly gain admission to the United Nations this fall. Why should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? It obviously does not qualify under article 2 of the U.N. Charter as a member willing to settle its international disputes by peaceful means and foregoing the threat of force against other states. Just remember South Korea in 1950, Tibet and India in 1962, Indonesia in 1965, and Vietnam today. Red China hardly qualifies as a "peace-loving state." Remember also that the United Nations labeled Red China as an aggressor at the time of the Korean war, a label which has been neither acknowledged nor repudiated by that nation. The U.N. Charter does not advocate universal membership, but instead establishes strict standards for new members. Some will argue that other nations have not met these standards, and they will be right. Surely no one can justify further error on the basis of past mistakes. In essence, two wrongs—or in this case, a dozen—do not make a right.

People may say that Red China's entry into the U.N. is "inevitable." I say, not at all, especially if the United States can find the courage to stand up and say no. I trust we can view this matter realistically, and do just that this September when the U.N. General Assembly votes on the issue.

In their haste to kowtow to Peking, people seem to be forgetting that the United States has an obligation to an ally dating back to World War II and before in the Republic of China on Taiwan. These people have turned a backward province, long under Japanese occupation, into a self-sustaining, relatively free country, by Asian standards. With a population of 14 million, Taiwan is one of the largest members of the United Nations. The Republic of China has consistently fulfilled all its obligations as a U.N. member and has stood with the United States on major issues. Are we going to permit them to be kicked out of the United Nations—which may well be the only condition Red China will accept? Are we going to stand idly by, and see installed in the Security Council and in the General Assembly, in the place of the Republic of China, a Communist Chinese regime dedicated to the overthrow of our Nation? I sincerely hope that we still retain better moral judgment and commonsense than to do that.

And now may I respectfully call to the attention of those who insist that the United States is standing at the door of the United Nations like some rabid, raving beast, barring the "peace-loving, friendly" Chinese, that to my knowledge at no time has that country petitioned

for membership, or even suggested it would accept membership, if it were offered. With all the problems that body faces, may I further suggest that it leave alone a discussion of membership for a country which may reject its overtures?

If I may be pardoned a digression at this point, I would add for your consideration this further thought: whatever other flaws the Chinese Communist leadership may possess, stupidity is not one of them. Red China recognizes the trend in this country toward isolationism—a trend which is stronger right now than at any time within the past 30 years. The Chinese, along with the leaders in Russia, desire to exploit that weakness. The United Nations would provide a ready platform to accomplish this.

Should Red China get into the U.N. under any pretense or formula whatever, the next obvious step taken would be pressure to grant Peking diplomatic recognition. The executive branch has already taken the first timorous and tentative steps in this direction.

All of the objections I have mentioned—and many more I have not—to the entry of Communist China to the U.N. apply even more forcefully to the folly of considering diplomatic recognition at this time. Yet, if we discard reason and logic—not to mention our own national interests—that is just what will happen if we do not fight Peking's admission to the United Nations this year and every year until she is prepared to live by the accepted rules of civilized conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress and I urge the American people to oppose this threat to what international order remains. We must not sit passively looking on while a handful of diplomats, professors, and the liberal press sneak Red China into the U.N. We must reject this movement now, and the American people must let their appointed officials know that we oppose any concession to Communist China under the conditions above outlined.

While accelerated people-to-people effort may eventually bring about better relations between our two governments, it is sheer folly to trust the Mao dictatorship to engage in any sort of exchange except that which is best for Mao.

I favor building bridges of friendship with all the peoples on earth. However, if I must walk this bridge, and if I am to invite American citizens to join me, I must first insist that its understructure be planted firmly on rockbottom reality, not on the shifting sands of Communist pronouncements.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have been talking here today about the Chinese problem but it is time to think of it as an international problem that will affect all of the international power centers of the world. We sometimes tend to think that special problems can be considered in isolation but I am convinced whatever we do in Asia will have dramatic effects all over the world.

In particular, I want to talk a little bit about the solidarity of the Chinese Communists in Peking and the Arab guerrillas who are creating havoc in the Middle East and have, through international air piracy, taken their terror throughout the Western World. We do not often make such a connection but we have to understand that China gives support to the so-called "wars of international liberation" throughout the world. We must remember that the Maoist line is the essence of such activities and that Mao's name stands for such terroristic activities. Improbable as it may seem to some Americans, the Chinese have forged a firm bond with the guerrilla movements in the Middle East. Peking rallied against what it terms "both U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism." We cannot really adopt any more cordial attitude toward Peking without also giving in to the Arab guerrillas.

According to a recent dispatch from the official Chinese Communist news agency, the New China News Agency, there was a rally of 10,000 people in Peking to support the Arab guerrillas. In fact, Peking celebrated the first week of May as "Palestine International Week." Leaders of the Palestine liberation organization attended the rally, along with high-ranking members of the Chinese Government. There were representatives there from Syria, Sudan, and other African countries.

The rally rubberstamped a message of support to the terrorists:

The Chinese government and people have consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, and forever remain their most reliable comrade-in-arms in their struggle against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors. We are deeply convinced that so long as the Palestinian and other Arab peoples heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity and persevere in struggle, they will certainly defeat U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism and win final victory.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everybody should read carefully the message which this rally sent to the president of the Palestine liberation organization, Yasser Arafat. I think that everybody should see how clearly the Peking Communists are supporting revolutions all over the world and creating unrest wherever they turn. I, for one, do not think there is anything to be gained by attempting to deal with such Communist regimes as though they were responsible, freedom-loving nations.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand translations of the releases from the New China News Agency, as well as the messages which Peking sent to Arafat, and I ask that they be included in the RECORD at this point.

PEIPING HOLDS "PALESTINE INTERNATIONAL WEEK"

(A Palestine Liberation Organization delegation was in Peiping to participate in a "Palestine International Week" beginning May 3, designed to demonstrate the Chinese Communist regime's firm support to Arab guerrillas and to condemn "the crimes of aggression by U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism." A mass rally of 10,000 was held in the afternoon of May 3 in the "Great Hall of the People", where a giant streamer declared: "People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!" Apparently, such slogans which all but disappeared from public places during the recent visit of the U.S. table tennis players have been put up again after their departure. Anyway, the rally adopted a message of support to the Palestinian people, reiterating that "the Chinese government and people have consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, and forever remain their most reliable comrades-in-arms in their struggle against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors." On the same day, the *People's Daily* published an editorial entitled "Salute the Heroic Palestinian People", exhorting that "firmly grasp the gun and recover their lost homeland through armed struggle—this is the only road chosen by the Palestinian guerrillas and people." It repeatedly rapped the Jordanian government for "acting arbitrarily and playing the jackal to the tiger," and "U.S. imperialism and social-imperialism" for colluding and at the same time contending with each other in the Middle East. "U.S. imperialism and Zionism will certainly be defeated," it concluded. A New China News Agency report on the mass rally, the text of the rally's message, and the text of the *People's Daily* editorial, all monitored in Tapei, are distributed here for the benefit of students of Chinese Communist affairs.)

PEKING, May 3.—10,000 revolutionary people of Peking gathered in the Great Hall of the People this afternoon, strongly condemning the crimes of aggression by U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism, firmly supporting the Palestinian people's homeland and firmly supporting the struggles of other Arab peoples to resist aggression and safeguard their state activities of the "Palestine International Week" beginning May 3 in Peking.

Attending the rally on invitation were Abu Ammar Sa'ad, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization delegation which has come to China to participate in activities of the "Palestine International Week" and pay a friendly visit to China on invitation; members of the delegation Abu Khaled, Abu Ali, Abu Peras, Abu Imad and Namdi Mahmoud and his wife; and Abu Nedhal, sent by the Palestine Liberation Organization to help arrange the activities of the "Palestine International Week", and his wife.

Present at the rally were Li Hsien-nien, vice-premier of the State Council; Kuo Mo-jo, vice-chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress; Wang Hsin-ting, deputy chief of the General Staff of the Chinese People's Liberation Army; Chi-Peng-fei, acting foreign minister; Wu Teh, vice-chairman of the Peking Municipal Revolutionary Committee; and Wang Kuo-chuan, leading member of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries.

Other foreign friends seated on the rostrum were:

Thiounn Mumm, minister of economy and finance of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia;

Brigadier Omer Mohamed Said, leader of the Sudanese friendship delegation and under-secretary of the Ministry of National Guidance of the Sudan;

Syrian Ambassador Youssef Shakra, representative of the Arab diplomatic envoys to China, and his wife;

Djawoto, secretary general of the Afro-Asian Journalists Association, and his wife; and

Frederik Risakotta, acting head ad interim of the Executive Secretariat of the Afro-Asian Writers Bureau.

Over the rostrum were the flag of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the national flag of China. There was a large streamer running across the hall, carrying the slogans: "Salute to the heroic Palestinian and other Arab peoples!" "People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!"

The revolutionary masses of the capital who attended the rally sang the song "People of the world are sure to win" and other revolutionary songs and shouted slogans, congratulating the Palestinian people's

armed forces on their growing strength, and the heroic Palestinian people on the tremendous victories they have won in struggle.

At three o'clock, delegation leader Abu Ammar Sa'ad and other members of the delegation, in company with Vice-Premier Li Hsien-nien and N.P.C. Vice-Chairman Kuo Mo-jo, mounted the rostrum. All the people present greeted the Palestinian comrades-in-arms from the front of anti-imperialist struggle in the Middle East with a long, standing ovation.

Wu Teh declared the rally open. Then N.P.C. Vice-Chairman Kuo Mo-jo, delegation leader Abu Ammar Sa'ad, Syrian Ambassador to China Youssef Shakra who represented the diplomatic envoys of Arab countries to China, and Liu Hsi-chang, member of the Standing Committee of the Peking Municipal Revolutionary Committee and leading member of the Conference of Representatives of Peking Revolutionary Workers, spoke at the rally. Their speechs won warm applause of the revolutionary masses.

The rally passed a message of support to the Palestinian people amid warm applause. The message states: "The Chinese Government and people have consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and forever remain their most reliable comrades-in-arms in their struggle against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors. We are deeply convinced that so long as the Palestinian and other Arab peoples heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity and persevere in struggle, they will certainly defeat U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism and win final victory."

At the end of the rally, all present rose and shouted: "Firmly support the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in their just struggle against U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism!" "Firmly support the people of the three countries of Indochina in their war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation!" "Firmly support the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in their revolutionary struggles against Imperialism!" "Firmly support the revolutionary struggles of the people of all countries!" "Long live the militant friendship between the Chinese people and the Palestinian and other Arab peoples!" "Long live the great unity of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples!" and "Long live the great unity of the people of the world!"

Present at the rally were diplomatic envoys to China of various Arab countries and some Asian, African and Latin American countries and Albania, visiting journalists from various Arab countries, and other friendly personnages.

Also present at the rally were leading members of the Chinese departments concerned including Huang Chih-yung, Chang Ming-yuan, Chou Hsi-han, Liang Pu, Yuan Hua-ping, Ting Kuo-yu, Yang Chi, Ho Ying and Chao Chun-cheng.

The rally was jointly sponsored by the Peking Municipal Revolutionary Committee and the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries."

PEKING, May 3.—Following is a message of support to the Palestinian people sent by the "rally in firm support of the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism" held here this afternoon:

President Yasser Arafat of the Central Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization: On May 3, 1971, we people of all circles of Peking are holding a solemn rally to untold activities for a "Palestine International Week". We strongly condemn U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism for their crime of aggression, firmly support the Palestinian people in their just struggle to win their national rights and recover their homeland, and firmly support the Arab peoples in their struggle to resist aggression and safeguard state sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Since World War II, Israeli Zionism supported by U.S. imperialism has launched three large-scale onslaughts against Arab countries and forcibly occupied large tracts of Arab territory, reducing over one million Palestinian people to homeless refugees. Defying the opposition of the people of the world, Israel is now still truculently hanging on in Arab territories and ruthlessly persecuting the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in the occupied areas. Innumerable facts prove that the U.S.-Israeli aggressors are the common enemies of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

The Palestinian people have a long anti-imperialist revolutionary tradition. In recent years, they have held high the banner of opposing imperialism, persevered in armed struggle, and waged valiant struggles against U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism. The Chinese people admire the Palestinian people for their spirit of defying brute force, fearing no sacrifice and fighting courageously, and extend revolutionary militant salute to them!

Unwilling to accept their failure, the U.S.-Israeli aggressors are employing the counter-revolutionary dual tactics of political deception and military suppression, in a vain attempt to strangle the liberation movement of the Palestinian people. However, in face of the awakened Palestinian and other Arab peoples, no force on earth can stop them from their victorious advance!

The Chinese Government and people have consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and forever remain their most reliable comrades-in-arms in their struggle against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors. We are deeply convinced that so long as the Palestinian and other Arab peoples heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity and persevere in struggle, they will certainly defeat U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism and win final victory.

The U.S.-Israeli aggressors are bound to be defeated! The Palestinian and other Arab peoples are sure to win!

[Signed] "Rally in firm support of the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism".

PEKING, *May 3, 1971.*

PEKING, May 3.—The *People's Daily* today published an editorial entitled "Salute the Heroic Palestinian People". Full text of the editorial reads:

Activities of a "Palestine International Week" will be held ceremoniously in Peking, China's capital, today as a resolute support to the Palestinian people in their just struggle for national rights. We hail the growing strength of the Palestinian people's armed forces and congratulate the Palestinian people on the important victories they have won in their struggle; we give our militant salutation to the heroic Palestinian people and the people of various Arab countries who stand at the anti-imperialist front in the Middle East, and warmly welcome the delegation of the Palestine Liberation Organization that has come to our country to participate in the "international week" on invitation.

The armed struggle waged by the Palestinian people is an important component part of the present struggle of the world people against U.S. imperialism and its running dogs. For several years now, the Palestinian guerrillas have fought thousands of battles against the Israeli aggressors, which thwarted the various schemes designed by U.S. imperialism and its collaborator to strangle the Palestinian revolution and inspired the fighting will of millions upon millions of Arab people in resisting the U.S. and Israeli aggressors. Today, the Palestinian guerrillas have become a staunch and active anti-imperialist revolutionary force in the Middle East.

The Palestinian guerrillas have created an excellent situation through their bitter, valiant and tenacious struggle. Since the founding of the Palestinian guerrilla units, U.S. imperialism has tried its utmost to break them up in a vain attempt to snuff them out in their very bases. Last September, U.S. imperialism instigated the Jordanian reactionaries to dispatch tens of thousands of armed troops and large numbers of aircraft and tanks in a massive onslaught on the guerrillas. The Palestinian guerrillas valiantly rose up, launched counter-attacks in self-defense and successfully passed this rigorous test by frustrating the enemy's vicious scheme. Through this event, the broad ranks of the cadres and fighters of the guerrilla units once again came to see clearly the sinister and fiendish features of U.S. imperialism and its collaborator and running dog and became all the more determined to carry their armed struggle through to the end.

Firmly grasp the gun and recover their lost homeland through armed struggle—this is the only road chosen by the Palestinian guerrillas and people.

The Palestinian guerrillas have further strengthened and developed their unity on the principle of perservering in armed struggle and carrying the Palestinian revolution through to the end. Last March, the eighth session of the Palestinian National Council, which had wide representation of its participants, adopted a "political action programme" which embodies the strong will and undaunted fighting spirit of the broad sections of the Palestinian people to foster anti-imperialist unity. This constitutes a powerful blow to U.S. imperialism and its collaborator, which are plotting to disrupt the unity of the Palestinian people.

The Palestinian guerrilla units have a profound mass basis among the Palestinian people and enjoy the extensive support of the people of the Arab countries. By acting arbitrarily and playing the jackal to the tiger, the Jordanian reactionaries have found themselves in an extremely isolated position among the Arab countries. The perverse action of the Jordanian reactionaries in suppressing the Palestinian guerrillas is countenanced neither by the Palestinian people nor by the people of Jordan and other Arab countries.

U.S. imperialism and social-imperialism collude and at the same time contend with each other in their activities in the Middle East. While intensifying the arming of Israel and engineering military suppression of the Palestine guerrillas, U.S. imperialism is actively pushing the plot for a so-called "Palestinian state." Flaunting the signboard: "For a just and lasting peace in the Middle East," social-imperialism is working in close coordination with it in many respects. Such unseemly activities of theirs boil down to one aim, i.e., to make the Palestinian people and the people of the Arab countries give up their struggle against the U.S.-Israel aggressors, submit to their will and fall victim to their activities of contending for and dividing spheres of influence in the Middle East. Such power politics pursued by the two superpowers has met with resolute opposition by the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

The great leader Chairman Mao has pointed out: "A people's revolution can triumph and imperialism and its lackeys can be defeated."

The struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors is a just one. The Chinese people and the people of the whole world side with them and resolutely support their struggle. We are deeply convinced that, despite the comparatively difficult circumstances attending their present struggle, the Palestinian people can steadily develop and strengthen their force

in struggle, overcome all difficulties on their way of advance and achieve continuous victories so long as they strengthen their unity and preserve in a protracted people's war.

U.S. imperialism and Zionism will certainly be defeated! The Palestinian people's just struggle for national rights is sure to win!

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the current euphoria of ping-pong and smiles, Americans generally received the impression that Red China is coming out of its angry shell, that Peking's bark is worse than its bite, and that they may look forward to a period of relaxed tension between the two countries. Our newspapers and television paint a picture of those nice Chinese going about their own ways, regimented maybe but not robots, thus subtly conveying the message that the Chinese though Communists, are no different from us and they could not really mean what they say.

This is, as I see it, the greatest danger. Nobody believed Hitler when he said he would rebuild Germany and chase out the Jews. And nobody believed Lenin when he said he would build in Russia the utopia of communism. The same mistakes are being repeated today, right here in this country. Nobody wants us to believe that Mao Tse-tung meant exactly what he said when he wrote, back in 1938, that:

The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

And nobody wants us to believe that Lin Piao, Mao's heir-designate, meant what he said, and I quote:

Whether the war gives rise to revolution or revolution prevents the war, U.S. imperialism and Soviet revisionism will not last long. Workers of all countries, unite: Bury U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism and their lackeys!

These were Lin Piao's words in his Political Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party on April 1, 1969. This categoric and, I think, honest statement against the two superpowers of the world was no "April fool" message. It had since been solemnly inscribed in the Party Constitution as a supreme policy. As stated in the preamble of that charter, the Chinese Communist Party is committed to—

Overthrow imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as its centre, and the reactionaries of all countries.

This was no sloganeering, or empty gestures of threat by some Mussolini. Peking's enmity toward the United States has deep ideological, geopolitical and practical roots. Indeed, if the United States does not exist, Mao would have to invent one to shoot it down. The first reason, of course, is that Mao considers himself the successor of Marx and Lenin, the orthodox leader of the world Communist movement, and therefore the arch enemy of imperialism. We just happen to be the leader, not by choice but by force of circumstances, of that degenerate and reactionary imperialist camp. Not only there is the incompatibility between communism and capitalism which separates Peking from us ideologically, but the American presence in Asia is seen by Mao as the greatest threat to his ambition. In its two decades of existence, Peking's every move to aggrandize and subvert its neighbors has been successfully checkmated by U.S. actions or influences, or both. Nor are we in any position, without sacrificing and abandoning the vital interests of the free countries in Asia, to accept Peking's terms for any basic change in our relations.

A second cardinal plank of the Chinese Communist foreign policy is its irrevocable hostility toward the Soviet Union. Because both are Communist giants, the struggle for primacy in the Communist world has always existed, and this has come into sharper focus now than ever before. The odd thing is that since Mao cannot possibly retreat in the Sino-Soviet split, he must remain frozen in his denunciation of us lest he would be guilty of the same charges that he had been leveling at first Khrushchev and now Brezhnev. He must demonstrate to the revolutionaries of the world—from Algeria to Zanzibar—that he would not compromise with the United States and sell them down the river. He must demonstrate to the Arab commandos that he would not hold them back in their holy war against Israel in order to avoid a world war. He must prove himself to the Communists, Socialists, and all manners of revolutionaries in the world that they should look to him, and not to the Russians, for leadership of and absolute allegiance to, the cause of revolution for revolution's sake.

A third cause for Peking's anti-American stance is its bid for leadership of the so-called third world. This drive dates back to Bandung when Peking began to woo the developing nations of Asia and Africa. The basic tenet—crude as it may seem to us—is that the United States heads the first world, which is capitalist and white, the Soviet Union heads the second world, which is Communist but also white, and only Communist China and Chairman Mao are qualified to be the leader of the third world, which is generally socialist but, more importantly, colored. In this new struggle for the rural areas of the world, to use Lin Piao's words, against the urban areas that are Europe and North America, an important battlefield is the United Nations.

In the 1950's and early 1960's, the smaller nations used to play the game of middlemen between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nehru, Nasser, Tito, and all the so-called nonalined leaders specialize in playing both sides of the street. They accepted American aid but denounced our policy in the Middle East or the Dominican Republic or Vietnam, as the case may be.

Now that we found it easier and less expensive to deal directly with the Russians, a subtle change has been taking place in the United Nations. There are now frequently charges of big nation chauvinism, of Soviet-American collusion in this and that. Our SALT talks were attacked as attempts at nuclear monopoly. Peking is clearly behind this orchestration, and once it sits in the United Nations, Chou En-lai will no doubt explore this feeling on the part of the small and medium states. And they in turn will look to Peking for inspiration, guidance, and motivation against the so-called collusion of the superpowers. This gives the Chinese Communists even less reason to improve their relations with us.

I have only outlined three reasons why, objectively speaking, Peking cannot and must not even appear to be warming up toward the United States. I have tried to be as dispassionate as I can, analyzing the reasons from the point of view of international politics. I only hope that our policymakers will take a hard look at the facts. I only hope they will heed the words of caution being expressed all across the land in editorials and commentaries such as these which follow my remarks:

[From the Newport, (R.I.) News, May 3, 1971]

CAUTION IS NEEDED

Not only should the United States back admission to the United Nations of the two Chinas—Peking and Taiwan—but of all nations divided in the aftermath of war—the two Germanys, Koreas and Vietnams—whenever they and Switzerland, a non-member, are in a position to join and ready to do so. This was the conclusion of the 50-member commission on the United Nations appointed by President Nixon and chaired by Henry Cabot Lodge.

Arguing that the world has "fundamentally and irrevocably changed" in the quarter century since the world body was founded, the panel cited at least 14 international wars and 24 civil conflicts, all involving substantial casualties in that time. Hence, it said the U.N. can best do its job if its membership includes all the governments in the world, "provided they subscribe to the principles of the U.N. charter."

Release of this report at the height of the new Ping Pong diplomacy initiated by mainland China is designed to help fan sentiment for diplomatic relations between China and the United States. But for China to subscribe to the principles of the United Nations and for her to observe them are two different things. Nor does bringing in East Germany, North Korea and North Vietnam sweeten the package. It could add to the Communist bloc and give them a platform to continue their militancy.

Communist China is probably turning to the United States for support in its quarrel with the Soviet Union. We must be wary of both.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Apr. 28, 1971]

THE CHINA THAW

Under the auspices of President Nixon, a new U.S. policy toward Red China appears to be evolving.

It is illustrated by the report of a special 50-member commission named by the President. This commission, headed by Henry Cabot Lodge, now envoy to the Vatican, was assigned to make recommendations about the United Nations.

But its foremost proposal is to support the ultimate admission to the United Nations of all "firmly established" governments —no matter how they got there. First of all, this includes Red China, but also North Korea, North Vietnam and East Germany.

The Lodge group took note of "awkward and discordant" possibilities in letting Red China join the United Nations and seemed to favor a play-it-by-ear policy; no instant initiative on the part of the United States along this line.

It also strongly insisted that Nationalist China, whose government in effect is in exile in Taiwan, should remain a UN member, even though both Red China and the Nationalists now say they will not sit in the United Nations with the other.

Red China probably is headed for eventual membership in any event, whether or not the United States supports admission. A majority in the United Nations voted favorably only last year—but the vote fell short of the necessary two-thirds.

We ought not forget that the Red Chinese have been substantial contributors to the communist attempt to take over South Vietnam, that the Red Chinese have been involved in ambitious schemes for mischief elsewhere in the world (Indonesia, for example) and that their total policy the last 25 years has been arrogantly anti-American.

Every friendly gesture by this country has been labeled a "fraud" and Mao Tse-tung's central thesis, widely proclaimed, has been that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

If the Reds have indeed decided on a change of course, the United States and the whole world should take advantage of this. But we need to be sure, as we go along, that there is a "thaw" in Red China as well as here.

[From the Indianapolis, (Ind.) News, April 27, 1971]

SOFTENING UP

In its recently enunciated softening of America's stance toward the government of Red China, the Nixon administration has taken a step its Democratic predecessors would have found difficult if not impossible to bring off.

Had this program of trade and travel between the United States and mainland China been attempted by John Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson, we may be certain the Republican voices raised against it would have been numerous. Now, with the partial exception of an off-the-record press session by Vice-President Agnew, the voices are muffled.

A general outcry would have been justifiable five or 10 years ago, and it would be equally justifiable today. The Peking government is unprecedented in its commitment to ferocity abroad and barbarism at home, and has given little evidence of change on either count. There is something grimly laughable about the efforts of certain elements in the media to clutch at the straw of Red Chinese civility toward a traveling troupe of Ping pong players as authentication of Peking's "mellowness."

Here we have, after all, a regime which stands condemned as an aggressor in Korea, in Tibet and India, and which has fueled the Communist war of aggression in Indochina. It is in addition a regime which has vowed its eternal hatred of America, which declares that "power grows out of the barrel of a gun," and whose agents are pledged in obedience to this rule to spreading terror and destruction in foreign societies, including our own. It is not without reason that the name of Red China has become synonymous with international terror.

In internal markets, the Peking record is if anything even more grotesque. The AFL-CIO has estimated some 14 million Chinese were murdered by the Communists when they consolidated their despotism up through the early 1950s. Author Eugene Lyons has calculated another 25 million may have died in the induced famine of a decade later. And Dr. Richard Walker, a noted China scholar, some years ago supplied an estimate, based on Peking's own statements, that some 10 million human beings had been enlisted by the regime as conscripted labor.

Over against all this we have the fact that the Communists were polite to our table tennis team—which hardly seems to balance the accounts. We can only hope that hitherto stalwart opponents of conciliation toward Red China will speak out as strongly against our softening policy as they would have done in previous years.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, before we become too engrossed in possible changes in our relationship with Red China, let us stop, look, and listen. Let us not forget that Communist China, of its own choosing, is an avowed enemy of the United States.

Let us keep in mind the documented fact that Mao Tse-tung is a tyrant whose regime has been responsible for the murder of more than 48 million Chinese people. That fact has been confirmed repeatedly. It was confirmed by Robert Loh, an escapee from Mao's grasp in 1957 who in his book, "Escape From Red China," detailed some of the massive terror which had been unleased against the Chinese people. Mr. Loh said that—

Almost everyone had some relative or acquaintance who simply disappeared.

The only real and meaningful answer to the Chinese problem is the elimination of Mao from the scene—and his cohorts and henchmen who would perpetuate his infamous policies.

This tyrant has used every strategem and intrigue to retain power, and he and his crowd are today rulers of an uneasy country rife with rebellion. Prof. James T. Myers, an authority on China, describes the situation thus:

The Maoists' grand schemes, such as the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, have wreaked havoc with the Chinese political, economic, and educational systems. One sees overall a record of squandered human resources and political resources of support both within the party and without, which if not unprecedented, must still be recorded as gross political ineptitude or outright stupidity. China still needs today, as she needed in 1949, political leaders who are able to bring internal peace, stability, and a measure of prosperity to this vast and potentially great nation and great people.

We all know that Chinese Communists are dedicated today to war and violent revolution in other countries. A lasting peace in that area cannot be expected so long as the mainland of China is directed by the Communist regime now in power. That fact cannot be ignored when a search is made for better answers to the problems which relate to Red China.

The ping-pong diplomacy recently demonstrated in Peking, the President's relaxation of trade restrictions with Mao's regime, and renewed talk of admission of that Communist-dominated country to the United Nations, have combined to arouse much understandable concern.

We must keep in mind that we are dealing with tyrants, hellbent on world revolution. I am speaking of a crowd which has repeatedly stated their goals to include the destruction of the United States of America.

The United Nations is supposed to be—supposed to be—an aggregation of peace-loving nations, and any nation which seeks admission is required to embrace that doctrine as a prerequisite for admission.

To admit Red China to the United Nations would be like adding a known, convicted criminal to a local police force.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: Let us stop, look, and listen before playing footsie with our avowed enemy—the Communist regime of Red China.

In the meantime, let us resolve to continue and strengthen our friendship with our proven friend—the Republic of China, of which that great statesman and champion of human freedom, Chiang Kai-shek, is President. He stands today as our most valuable and reliable ally in southeast Asia. His voice is the voice of hundreds of millions of like-minded Chinese people, both in Taiwan and on the mainland.

There can be no rational justification for trade with any country which supplies manpower and materials for the killing of Americans—and that is being done by Red China. Let us not compromise with such infamy.

And let us continue to resist, with all our might, the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Why weaken, or possibly destroy, the United Nations organization by such a move?

It must be assumed that if such a mistake is made, the Republic of China would withdraw its membership, and there would be other far-reaching repercussions. The Republic of China today speaks for the aspirations of the masses of people who are entrapped on the mainland by the Maoist regime.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the April 28 issue of the San Diego Union, entitled "Split-Nation Policy Peril to U.N." The editorial follows:

SPLIT-NATION POLICY PERIL TO U.N.

A spokesman for the President's commission on the United Nations hastened to point out that its decision to recommend a "two-China" policy in the U.N. was reached before the recent celebrated ping-pong tour. Thus we are assured that this proposal for an about-face on a fundamental point of U.S. policy is not a product of the euphoria of the moment.

Nine months of opinion-sampling and soul-searching by Henry Cabot Lodge and others on the 50-member commission went into the report which is offered as a pragmatic look at the United Nations and the world it seeks to represent.

The commission expresses a desire to be realistic about Communist China. After all, the mainland is there with its 800 million souls, and the government in Peking has been claiming sovereignty over them for more than 20 years. This same attention to realism is also the basis for the commission's view that there is room in the U.N. for two Germanies, two Koreas and two Vietnams.

Realism, however, hardly describes the conditions which the commission attaches to its recommendation. It proposes that Red China be admitted without disturbing the membership of Nationalist China. It is an understatement to say, as the commission does, that it may be "awkward" and "difficult" to work this out. It may be well nigh impossible without fatally compromising the principles of the U.N. Charter.

If the Peking Communists are anxious enough to gain entry to the U.N. we could expect them to give at least lip-service to the fundamental charter principles, among them a renunciation of "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence" of other states. We would expect the same, under a U.N. divided-nations policy, from the war-making regime

of North Vietnam, from the North Korean Communists who daily threaten the free government of South Korea, and from the Soviet-puppet regime in East Germany eternally rattling its sword around the free city of West Berlin.

How much of this cynicism can the United Nations stand? Its identity as a forum of peoples dedicated to peace is already tarnished, its principles stretched and tattered by 25 years of rationalization by its members.

The divided-nations policy espoused by the Lodge commission goes far beyond the problem of what to do about mainland China. It could well administer the coup de grace to the existence of the United Nations as a forum of the world's peoples. It would become, instead, a forum of governments, including governments whose claim to represent their people is based only on banditry and the suppression of the popular will.

The United States of America would have nothing to gain by following the recommendations of the Lodge commission. Neither our national security nor our moral force in the world community could be enhanced by sacrificing principle in the name of expediency.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very disturbed by the press and media coverage of President Nixon's developing China policy. It has been hailed as a "thaw," a "rapprochement," a "new era." But, to me at least, the superlatives and the catch phrases obscure the real issues and cover what is really a lack of scrutiny, a lack of sober judgment. This uncritical attitude by so many of our friends in the press is, I think, unfortunate; but even more unfortunate is what appears to me to be similar lack of analysis by men in public life, leaders who should approach major problems like this with caution. But instead of caution, we find haste—haste to pronounce the difficulties with mainland China at an end; haste to cover up or gloss over the facts and circumstances which gave rise to our present China policy.

Our present China policy was fashioned to meet the real needs and to answer genuine threats. It has served the country well. It should not be discarded on the basis of some future hope or some as yet untangible possibility of change. I am not arguing that our China policy should be bound in brass or permanently fixed in its present mold. It should certainly change when circumstances require it to change. I am concerned that we may be undertaking to make basic and fundamental changes on the basis of too little evidence, on the basis of a hope rather than reality.

What changes have in fact taken place on the mainland or in Communist Chinese relations with the outside world which can be used as the basis for a fundamental shift in our policy? We are told that the time has come for a change. I think we can be permitted to ask: "Why has the time come for such a change?" What new elements are now present which were not present 6 months ago or a year ago? I know of none, Mr. Speaker.

Are we to believe that the invitation to an American ping-pong team marks an about-face by a Chinese Communist regime which for 21 years has brutalized and tyrannized the Chinese people? And let us not forget that it is with that regime that negotiations are now proposed—the regime that only 5 years ago turned loose the Red Guards on their domestic murder missions. We are dealing with the regime of Mao and Chou—who have climbed to their present positions of power on the corpses of countless thousands of their countrymen. They are not statesmen or politicians—they are, in fact, mass murderers, and no amount of window dressing or evasion can disguise that central fact. These rulers of Mainland China have no counterparts in our own country, or indeed in the Western world since the time of Hitler. It may not be fashionable to say so, but the truth is its own justification here: the present rulers of mainland China are in fact assassins and gangsters. We cannot deal with such a regime in the same even-handed and impartial manner in which we would deal with a respectable and legitimate regime in other parts of the world. The history of Communist China is a history of aggression against its neighbors: Taiwan, Korea, Tibet, India, South Vietnam, and indeed all of what was formerly French Indochina, Mongolia, and even the Soviet Union. This is an expansionist and aggressive regime. I think frankly that some of these foreign incursions were undertaken to distract the Chinese people from the misery of conditions at home, from the repeated crop failures and from the privations and degradations of the worker's paradise. But, whatever reason we assign for this militancy, we have to accept the fact of its existence.

What new facts merit a complete reappraisal or revision of our China policy? I frankly can find none, save the invitation extended to an American ping-pong team—which by the way, finished 26th in a world competition. That is a very slender reed to support the notion that we should overnight discard a policy which five Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and until recently Richard Nixon—found suitable and desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any policy in our foreign relations should be permanently fixed or immunable. I think we have to change with the times certainly. But, let us by all means look before we leap. That is an elementary precaution.

Nonrecognition is a useful diplomatic tool. Western nonrecognition of the Soviet regime in Russia from the time of the revolution until the thirties effectively isolated the Bolshovik regime. In retrospect, I think more and more people are convinced that President Roosevelt's decision to recognize the Communist Government in Russia in 1933 was a mistake. Nonrecognition is, I admit, an essentially negative instrument, and I am aware of the argument that says we have to recognize Red China because it has a population of 800 million people and that failure to extend diplomatic recognition means we deny the existence of mainland China. That is, of course, both nonsense and a non sequitur. Nonrecognition, in diplomatic usage, is in no way equitable with the notion that we are somehow denying the existence of that nation or the vastness of its population. But, it is quite true that it is the expression of a moral judgment—a negative moral judgment about the nature of the regime that holds sway in Peking. And, on all scores and from any point of view from which we approach it, that negative moral judgment is entirely justified by the facts. It is justified by the aggression of the Chinese Communist government against their neighbors; it is justified by the brutal fashion in which the Communist government has murdered its enemies and exterminated its opposition. My general feeling is that we should approach this whole matter with the care, caution and deliberation it deserves. Let us not rush into this, or paint ourselves into a corner.

Similar words of caution have been expressed around the Nation in many of its leading and influential newspapers. A number of editorials carrying this theme have been published and I would like to bring a few of them to your attention in closing:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 16, 1971]

AFTER THE PING-PONG GAMES

If it is possible to plunge headlong toward peace, that is what the United States seems to be doing in its relations with Red China. In a matter of weeks, even days, we have seen one restriction after another discarded, affecting travel, communications, trade and shipping. There is talk of invitations to the Chinese Ping-Pong and soccer teams to visit this country, and Premier Chou En-lai has spoken wistfully about coming to North America.

In a country fatigued by war abroad and tension at home, as the United States is, there is an understandable and almost irresistible appeal to the thought that if the most powerful nation and the most populous nation on earth can kiss and make up, a new era of peace will dawn. One United States official, asked why he thought China responded so quickly and enthusiastically to President Nixon's earlier overtures, replied that China's motives don't matter; that it is the results that count.

Well, maybe. It is quite true that there can be no durable improvement in relations without preliminary steps such as these. To that extent, the sudden spring thaw in Peking is welcome. But to think that we can plunge ahead without regard to Peking's motives is to invite disappointment and very likely worse.

One can dream, of course, about how nice it would be if our relations with Red China could always be handled thru dedicated Ping-Pong players who never raised the ugly subject of politics—if our relations with Russia could be turned over to chess players, and with France to wine tasters. But as Russia has demonstrated time and again, every form of activity in a totalitarian regime is an agency of the state. Art is not art, and literature is not literature unless it conforms to the party line. And Russia's form of totalitarianism is mild, at the moment, compared with Peking's.

So when the Chinese speak ingratiatingly of friendship between the "peoples" of the two countries, we mustn't be fooled. When Mao Tse-tung talks of 100 flowers blossoming, he is talking only of differences between Peking and Moscow; within China, there is room only for one flower, and it blooms in the little red book of Chairman Mao's thoughts. The American visitors learned as much the other day when one of them asked about former President Liu Shao-chi. Liu is alive, a Chinese official replied, but his thought is dead. He is being "reeducated."

Things are very different here. The young people on our Ping-Pong team are idealistic and uninhibited, representative of millions more at home. Theirs are qualities which we prize—but which weve learned can often put them at odds with authority, and with au-

thority in Washington in particular. Our Ping-Pong players relate [if we may borrow the contemporary term] much more directly to the people at home than the Chinese players do to their people.

China's first objective, it must therefore be assumed, is to try to widen the gap between Washington and many American people—to create a craving for peace so strong, and perhaps so blind, that cooler and more experienced heads will be unable to prevail when they see our interests and the long-range outlook for peace being threatened.

Because the Bamboo Curtain is more impenetrable even than the Iron Curtain, we can only speculate on Peking's goals. They probably include the displacement of Nationalist China from the United Nations; the assumption by Peking of the Chinese membership in that body; the absorption of Nationalist China into Red China; the expulsion of all western influence [including Russian] from Southeast Asia; and the ultimate establishment of Chinese hegemony over all of East Asia, including Japan.

If these goals are correct—and there is no reason to think Red China has renounced its imperialist plans since it made war on the United Nations forces in Korea [a war which is still technically in progress]—then there are bound to be more confrontations and very likely more wars with countries that are more important to us than Korea or Viet Nam, and that we are bound by treaty to defend.

Will it then be too late to protect our interests? The question is worth keeping in mind as we are propelled, with smiles and sweet talk, toward the bar.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Apr. 24, 1971]

OLIVE BRANCH HAS THORNS

The Red Chinese are not all of a sudden good guys simply because they behaved civilly to a visiting American table tennis team—though remarks by some of the returned players make Marco Polo's enthusiastic description of the Celestial Empire seem pale by comparison.

Neither are the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan now the bad guys—though don't be surprised if the current wave of good will from Peking sweeps a lot of people as far as that conclusion.

Already a group calling itself Citizens to Change U.S. China Policy has denounced U.S. opposition to giving the Peking regime China's seat in the United Nations as "immoral, illegal and impolitic."

Even before the unexpected parting of the Bamboo Curtain, Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., had introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations as "the sole representative of China."

A similar resolution has been introduced by Sen. Mike Gravel, D-Alaska. However, another one, by Sen. Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., aims at a "two-China" policy, or perhaps a "one-(Red) China, one-Taiwan (formerly Nationalist China)" policy.

Almost forgotten in the discussion is a third party, the native Taiwanese, who comprise 85 per cent of the island's 14 million population and who are Chinese in the same sense that Americans of English descent are Englishmen. They would prefer not to be ruled by any Chinese government.

It is easy to say that 750 million mainland Chinese, and the government that for good or ill represents them, can no longer be ignored (as if we ever really ignored them). But it is not all that simple.

The recognition of Red China would of necessity require the "unrecognition" of Nationalist China, for the Reds will not be recognized any other way.

It would mean, if not U.S. support for, the end of U.S. opposition to, Red Chinese membership in the United Nations and the consequent ouster of Nationalist China from its Security Council seat, for Red China will not join the U.N. under any other conditions.

It would abrogate, or certainly call into question, American treaty commitments to Nationalist China.

A two-China policy won't work because neither Peking nor Taipei will buy that, nor will either permit an independent Taiwan governed by Taiwanese.

Recognition of Red China could open the door to numerous good things, including trade, travel and, most important of all, a lessening of tensions that could explode into war.

But welcoming another Communist nation with veto power into the U.N. and virtually abandoning an old, if somewhat useless ally, may be a high price to pay for a little good that could be turned off as abruptly as it has been turned on.

The Red Chinese are not all of a sudden acting like good guys because at heart they have always been good guys. After 22 solid years as the No. 1 enemy of the world in Peking's eyes, a little Oriental patience on our part and a wait-and-see attitude may be our best policy.

[From the San Diego Union, Apr. 26, 1971]

U.N. MEMBERSHIP IS MAO'S GOAL: CHINA'S CHARACTER UNCHANGED

It becomes increasingly clear that Communist China's dramatic invitation to the American table tennis team was not an indication that the Peking government has changed its attitude toward the United States of America. The first objective of the regime of Mao Tse-tung is membership in the United Nations. This is reflected in the selective, strategic issuance of table tennis invitations. Of the six nations invited thus far, only Nigeria already was Peking's ally in voting at the U.N. to seat Red China.

Appraisal of the significance of the Communist Chinese "Ping-Pong diplomacy" has been typical. The world, particularly the Western-oriented world, has tended to react as if this single informal gesture were a 180-degree reversal of the Red Chinese leadership in its 25 year history of bitter, militant hostility.

The discussion already has leap-frogged over basic principles to the mechanics of a two-China policy at the U.N.—of the Security Council role of each or either China, of the substantial U.N. Charter changes that would be involved, of the voting procedures, and other similar actions that would have to precede a two-China decision.

The optimism is based on nothing more substantial than a few smiles from the Chinese upon a few American citizens who enjoy table tennis. This falls far short of proof that Communist China has changed its official policy. Peking leadership still is conducting its anti-American propaganda campaign. The Warsaw talks have not resumed. No American businessman has an order for goods in hand, and supplies pour through mainland China to North Vietnam.

Nothing that Communist China has said or done indicates that it has altered its often repeated goal—the destruction of the United States of America.

Nor as a matter of fact, has Communist China applied for membership in the United Nations, which the charter stipulates is an essential prerequisite. If it did apply, no member could honestly conclude that Mainland China is a "peace-loving nation"—also a prerequisite for membership.

Certainly the efforts of the Nixon Administration to establish dialogue with the people of Communist China must be applauded and supported. It is conceivable that trade, travel and cultural exchanges can build a bridge of discussion between the people of the United States and those of Communist China.

It is, however, naive to assume that today's leadership of Communist China has in any way changed its hostility to the United States, or that it is interested in world peace. It is dynamite to give such a regime a powerful new weapon in the form of U.N. membership, particularly since this would likely mean that East Germany, North Korea and North Vietnam also would be knocking at the doors of the world body. It would be the height of irresponsibility to seat the present hostile leadership of Red China in the world association of nations at the expense of Nationalist China, which is peace-loving and an asset to the Western World.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Apr. 16, 1971]

SLOW HOPE TO CHINA

We hail the words Communist Chinese Premier Chou En-lai spoke to the U.S. table tennis delegation to Peking, but with regretted reservations.

The reservations are not for the words which said:

"In the past, exchanges between the peoples of China and the United States have been very numerous. They have been cut off for a long time. Now, with your acceptance of our invitation, you have opened a new page in the relations of the Chinese and American people. I am confident that this beginning again of our friendship will certainly meet with the majority support of our two peoples."

Those words we endorse in their entirety.

Where the reservations come in are over the mechanics of gradually widening of the crack in the door between two governments which have been building up a climate of hatred for each other for more than a decade.

Whatever further may develop—and we sincerely hope it is considerable—the going will be tedious. That view stands even in light of certain trade concessions offered by President Nixon as an obvious immediate response.

Certainly any resumption of direct relations between the two would not involve the acceptance by either of the other's concept of government or economic or political ideology.

That, however, is not necessary. We have maintained relations with Russia, with whom we generally have disagreed, since the early '30s. The diplomatic doors have been open also to rightist dictatorship in Spain, Greece and elsewhere.

So it can happen. But don't look for overnight miracles. Just go on hoping.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk recently about our establishing dialogs with and our easing travel and trade bans toward Communist China, and about the inevitability of Peking's admission into the United Nations. Our newspapers are filled with stories giving the minutest detail of American correspondents' travels in Red China, down to the banquet menu. However, one important and revealing fact—the continuing refugee influx from the China mainland into Hong Kong—has been neglected by our press, our experts on China and our decisionmakers alike. Today I wish to call your attention to the significance of the Hong Kong refugee problem.

Very few of us realize that there are more Chinese escaping to Hong Kong than East Germans scaling or tunneling under the Berlin Wall. The size of the refugee influx from Mao's land into the tiny British colony in fact reflects the degree of political instability in China. The problem dates back to the years im-

mediately following 1949 when chaos on the mainland drove large numbers of refugees to Hong Kong.

In the last 20 years, at least 1,700,000 refugees have fled to Hong Kong, accounting for over 40 percent of the island's total population.

The largest monthly mass exodus from China occurred in April and May 1962, when a total of 142,000 escapees swarmed into Hong Kong, roughly over 70,000 a month. Many of us remember the picture of a young Chinese girl who sat crying when told she had to be sent back to Red China. An estimated 90,000 refugees were turned back by the Hong Kong authorities.

Since then, the Chinese Communists have beefed-up their land and marine patrols in order to prevent the escapees from fleeing the China mainland. Orders have been given to shoot the fugitives at sight. Those caught have to face up to 10 years of "reform through labor." Nevertheless, streams of refugees keep on flowing into the British colony, averaging well over 10,000 a year.

In August and September 1968, the height of the Cultural Revolution, scores of bodies of young people, mostly those of former Red Guards, with their arms trussed behind their backs, drifted down from the Pearl River to the surrounding waters of Hong Kong. Since the British colony is 4 hours by train from Canton, clearly these were but a fraction of the persons killed in the factional strifes on the mainland.

Last month, another wave of mass exodus started on the China mainland. An estimated total of 400 escapees, all in their teens and early twenties, were arrested by the Hong Kong police. The total could be much larger since only every 1 out of 4 or 5 were caught by police patrol. Others have presumably entered Hong Kong without being detected.

These young refugees, born and bred since the Communist takeover in 1949, had to cut through or scale barbed wires to reach the shore opposite Hong Kong. Then, under the cover of night, they had to use all kinds of buoyancy aids—which were very scarce and hard to obtain because of Chinese Communist precautionary measures—such as life buoys, inflated basketballs, plastic or rubber floats to swim across the treacherous seas into the Hong Kong waters. The journey takes 6 hours by even skilled swimmers. One ingenious youth floated over on a string of ping-pong balls.

No one will ever know how many of these young freedom seekers were shot by Communist shore guards and marine patrols. Countless others were drowned. Yet hundreds more keep on risking their lives to swim to freedom in the British colony. Heart-rending stories of these daring young Chinese have been told and retold by the press in Hong Kong and elsewhere, but have mostly been neglected by the American press which prides itself for freedom to publish and to criticize.

The Nationalist government on Taiwan has been trying to help solve the refugee proglem. It has so far resettled a total of over 150,000 refugees, but that is only a fraction of the total number of escapees. It also has to keep quiet lest it jeopardize the working relationship with the Government of Hong Kong, which officially recognizes Red China.

The irony today is that when we are being fed flowing stories of Peking in our press, the influx of Chinese refugees into the British colony continues on an increasing scale. It could only testify to one fact: The Chinese Communist regime is anything but stable. The younger generation who are brought up under Communist rule are so disillusioned with it that they are voting by their feet to escape from Mao's land.

The concern which I express here this afternoon is being echoed in the Nation's press, except for the extreme liberal newspapers. Here are a few items which have come to my attention:

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Oklahoman, Apr. 20, 1971]

RED CHINA'S PING-PONG WINNINGS

In view of their political inexperience, it isn't surprising that some of the younger members of the American delegation which visited Communist China should come back singing the praises of Chairman Mao.

Some of them were Marxist-oriented to begin with, and their ideological affinity for communism may have had something to do with the invitations they received.

A more mature if less exuberant reaction to Red China's venture into ping-pong diplomacy occurs in a remark by one of the returning delegation's older members. In a disturbed reference to the anti-American posters he saw everywhere in Red China. Tim Boggan, a 40-year old teacher of English at Long Island University, said of his hosts that "they would toast you and meanwhile you'd be looking at the signs."

The signs and the underlying governmental attitudes they reflected were there before the Americans arrived and they remain now that the Americans have departed. Although it may be unduly pessimistic to suppose they never will come down, it would be unduly optimistic to suppose they will come down in the foreseeable future.

If "cultural" exchanges with Communist countries could reconcile conflicting ideologies and override basic national interests, the United States and Soviet Russia should be on the best of terms right now.

But there isn't the slightest shred of evidence that the visits of a Russian ballet or wrestling team to this country or the appearances of American musicians in Moscow have had the slightest ameliorating influence on the larger differences embroiling the world's two great nuclear powers.

Soviet Russia's growing military presence in the Middle East, its naval penetration of the Mediterranean, and its massive nuclear buildup have occurred during a period when it was participating increasingly in "cultural" exchanges with this country.

Exactly what Red China is up to now must wait on events. But visible already are limited gains for Peking from both a propaganda and a practical standpoint. Any benefits the United States may receive await the future.

One obvious propaganda dividend to Red China is the further alienation of idealistic American young people from their less susceptible elders. The widening breach is apparent in the response that Maoist-oriented 19-year-old John Tannehill, a returning team member, gave when reminded that his father, an Ohio newspaper editor, had called him "an immature kid." Young Tannehill attributed his differences with his father to the generation gap.

On the practical side, President Nixon is relaxing the American embargo on the shipment of "nonstrategic" materials to Red China. While continuing to supply this country's enemies in Vietnam, Red China thus will be eligible to receive such "nonstrategic" American products as wheat which conceivably could free "nonstrategic" Chinese rice for shipment to North Vietnam. There's a limit to the amount of hog bristles and dried eggs the United States could use in exchange.

Beyond these immediate gains, Red China has opened the prospect of eventual diplomatic recognition and admission to the United Nations, an accomplishment that could bring into question this country's continued military support of the Chinese Nationalists on Taiwan. Thus Red China's winnings only began with its ping-pong victories over the Americans.

[From the Washington Star, May 3, 1971]

FROM DOMINOES TO PING-PONG AND CHESS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

SAN DIEGO.—The student asked: How do you get away with saying that the left student movement has collapsed, in the light of the demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco a week ago?

The speaker answered: (1), Because the anti-war movement is no longer the property of students and college intellectuals; and (2) it is no longer, even among young people, the property of the left. True, there are still a great many students who side with Nixon. But a great many others, heretofore of reserved opinions, and even some of hawkish opinion, have now come around to believing that we should pull out right away. If you say a crowd of 300,000 war protestors two or three years ago, you could safely conclude that 90 percent of them were Mark Rudds, Dwight MacDonalds, or Benjamin Spocks; today they would include student athletes, Vietnam veterans, and local businessmen.

He might have added a third point. It is that the extraordinary development involving China is a crucial psychological blow to those who believe that tenacity in Vietnam is indispensable to the stabilization of Asia.

The position of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon (and of course of their secretaries of state and joint chiefs) has been the domino theory. If South Vietnam were communized by force the resistance in Cambodia, Laos, and Malaysia would cease. Surrounded, Thailand would change governments, and vote in one whose foreign policy was the instrument of China. The pressures on Indonesia's hundred million would be insupportable.

Next, of course, the Philippines, which could not easily breathe in that iron lung, as a Western oriented enclave. South Korea would logically be next, once again through the satellization of its policies. Then time for the big one, Japan.

But now the famous ping-pong development. It has weakened an indispensable plan in all the scaffolding. The reason Nixon is exchanging pleasantries with Red China is, although not spoken, quite clear: China is different from the China which was annealed into its present condition through two decades of aggression, torture, convulsion, and xenophobia; the China which was the main threat to the dominoes.

One can only assume that, if Nixon was thinking rigorously, he no longer believes quite so much about China. Granted, he hasn't yet recognized China, but he leaves us all to believe that that is mere formality.

What does that do to the domino theory? Nothing. But it does a great deal to those who believe in the domino theory. Because they have suddenly been asked to believe that we should think of Red China as merely another Soviet Union. I happen to think that is quite bad enough, but in fact the Soviet Union has not overrun any new country, nor has it (yet) satellized the politics of any contiguous country since the Czechoslovakian coup of 1948. And China has not taken any new territory since Tibet, if you don't count a little gob of India.

Why then is it necessary to contain China by fighting a surrogate war in Southeast Asia? many Americans will suddenly wonder. If Nixon and Chou En-lai are prepared to settle their differences at a negotiating table, why not let the Southeast Asian thing run its course? We are beholden, in a way, to the South Vietnamese people, yes; but we are not beholden to them except in a grander context which presupposes that if we let them down, little by little a whole tier of nations will become instruments of an enemy bent on the destruction of the United States.

I do not, myself, doubt that Nixon is playing chess with China. But he should be reminded that there are lots and lots of spectators who will not only be surprised by some of his moves, but dismayed. And if and when he is in a position to cry checkmate, he may look around him and find that there is nobody left there to applaud.

CAPITAL FAIR

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—There is of course a "Red China Lobby," just as there has been, for lo, these many years, a Nationalist China Lobby. But the new lobby is not composed of naive ping pong players and their fawning tributes to the Peking regime. It is composed of American businessmen who want a piece of the action.

This does not make General Motors or du Pont subversive. One need not embrace a government's ideology to seek the profits waiting to be made by trade with Mao's captive nation. European countries have been reaping those profits for years, with the fattest share going to our leading anti-communist client, West Germany. No one has suggested that Japan will go Marxist because it sells to Red China.

So what I suppose must be called Big Business is merely looking for a new market. Big Labor also has a stake in this search, since its primary aim is still more jobs, if only to secure the lucrative posts of members of its executive suite.

In short, there is still no strong grassroots surge demanding that the United States recognize Communist China and support its admittance to the United Nations. Sen. George McGovern's resolution favoring admission has not produced mass marches and demonstrations supporting his stand. Atty. Gen. John Mitchell has not been forced to call out the troops to put down a revolution by Maoists.

So far, indeed, all the overtures to Peking have been made by a Republican President named Richard Nixon, who can hardly be described as fellow traveler.

What Nixon has done is try to open up a serious dialogue with Peking. He believes that the cause of world peace would be served by a regularization of relations between the U.S. and Red China. But he has promised nothing, thank heaven.

Thank heaven, because there is still a long way to go. One ping pong match does not a policy make, and although Peking apparently has softened its attitude toward Washington, there is yet no reason to believe that the Mao regime is really interested in going all the way to diplomatic relations with the U.S. and accepting a UN seat.

We can be sure that if Mao is really interested in making a horse trade, he has a spavined old nag already groomed for the deal.

That is why there is a quality of both respectability and reason in the "Stop Red China" campaign launched by the Committee of One Million, headed by the respected and highly informed Dr. Walter Judd, a former Congressman from Minnesota. Like most such groups, Judd's committee tends to specialize in typerbole, painting Communist China as a nation of unregenerated barbarians. But it is a force for caution, and that is good.

For example Judd has noted "political pressures" aimed at forcing President Nixon to accept Mao's terms. As I read his words, he is not talking about Maoist kooks storming the White House, but about those pressures brought in more subtle fashion by business and labor unions. That's where the muscle is.

Some administration sources have leaked the intelligence that Nixon would like to establish diplomatic relations with Red China before next year's Presidential election. I hope they're wrong. The problem is too complex to be viewed as just another political ploy. For one thing, it involves the good name of the United States, as involved in our treaty commitments with Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan government.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1971]

EXCERPTS FROM AN INTERVIEW IN WASHINGTON WITH THE PRESIDENT BY SIX NEWSMEN

CHINA IS SUBJECT

Q. Do you think that we can anticipate an establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in your first Administration rather than your second?

A. What we have here is the result of a long process that began, in my own thoughts—even before 1968—the spring of '68, when I answered that question at this convention. I wrote an article for Foreign Affairs—in which I pointed out that we could not have, what will be by the end of the century, a billion of the most creative and able people in the world isolated from the world; and that whoever was President of the United States had to develop a policy which would bring the isolation of a billion Chinese from the rest of the world to an end.

I also pointed out that that was a long-range goal. The long-range goal of this Administration—and of the next one, whatever it may be—must be two things: one, a normalization of the relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of the People's Republic of China; and, two, the ending of the isolation of the mainland China from the world community.

WHAT ABOUT CUBA?

Q. Are we thinking also about long-range or short-range normalizing of our relations with Cuba?

A. As far as Castro is concerned, he's already drawn the line. He's exporting revolution all over the hemisphere, still exporting it. His line is against the United States—not only within Cuba, but outside of Cuba. And as long as Castro is adopting an antagonistic, anti-American line, we are certainly not going to normalize our relations with Castro. As soon as he changes his line toward us, we might consider it. But it's his move.

[From the Indianapolis, (Ind.) News, May 12, 1971]

VIOLATES CHARTER: PEKING DOESN'T QUALIFY FOR U.N.

(By Sen. Peter Dominick, Republican of Colorado)

The visit of the American table-tennis players to Red China marked the first time ordinary Americans have gone on an unofficial goodwill tour since the Communists came to power more than 20 years ago. It is not a meaningless event, but I doubt whether it constitutes any real thaw in the Arctic freeze of our relationship.

Despite the ping-pong diplomacy, it is well to remember that the Chinese leadership has not changed. The same men who smile at our ping-pong players are those who subjected Tibet to the most dangerous type of colonialism the world has ever seen, the same ones who operate such a cruel and hated dictatorship that more Chinese attempted to escape in one recent month than all the East Germans who attempted to scale or penetrate the Berlin Wall in 10 years, and the same men who continue to declare their resolute adherence not to peaceful means of settling disputes, but to the use of revolutionary force.

Only two months ago His Holiness, Tenzing Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet, now living in exile in India, reported in the New York Times that "the Chinese have launched a veritable reign of terror. Tibetians of all classes are beaten, humilitated, tortured or killed on such flimsy trumped-up charges as harboring subversive designs against the regime, possessing objects or collaborating and helping 'reactionary elements.' "

It is difficult if not impossible to relate these activities with the words in the United Nations Charter which member nations adopt on admission: "Faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, of nations large and small."

Yet despite overwhelming evidence that Red China has no intention of changing its international conduct, many in our country overlook the difference between the Chinese people and their oppressive government, ignore the fact that all trade must be carried out through a Communist government trade organization, thus strengthening that government's cruel hold over its own people, and forget the principles of the U.N. Charter which the Red Chinese have never even given lip service.

In the coming months as the admission of Red China to the U.N. is debated it is well to keep in mind that the U.N. Charter does not advocate universal membership. Rather it has specific qualifications for admission—and Red China does not meet them. It has shown a consistent and total disregard for fundamental human rights, it has disregarded the dignity of persons, and it has obliterated the rights of individuals. Freedom has been stifled; intolerance substituted for tolerance.

In the words of the China expert, Dr. Walter H. Judd of the Committee of One Million: "If, in fact, there has been some recent 'mellowing' and 'evolution' inside Communist China, has it been caused by their successes? Or by their failures? If economic and other pressures from within and without are compelling Mao and his gang of military dictators to moderate their policies, doesn't common sense dictate that we maintain those pressures rather than reduce them?"

When a Chinese government, freely chosen by its 800 million people, agrees by actions and words that it will abide by the terms of the U.N. Charter and international law, then it would help world peace to have China as a member. Until then it is not in our national interest or the interest of 800 million subjugated Chinese to strengthen their platform for violent revolution.

If we will just wait, the Chinese people will provide the answer for us. As the Chinese say: "There is a day to cast your nets, and a day to dry your nets."

[From the Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman, May 5, 1971]

PEKING CALLS U.S. FRIENDSHIP "HUMBUG"

Red China doesn't intend that playing table tennis with the U.S. will lead to a diplomatic honeymoon, judging from a blast out of Peking against the State Department and Nixon Administration. This has come in response to President Nixon's press conference remarks last week in which he frankly courted friendly relations with the Peking government and expressed the wish to visit China "in some capacity."

The New China News Agency wasn't long in replying that while closer friendship between the American and Chinese people has developed, there is no intention on the part of the Peking government to improve diplomatic relations.

"In these circumstances," the official News Agency stated, "the Nixon Administration, which is beset with difficulties both at home and abroad, hastily made various gestures with regard to its policy toward China as if it wanted to improve relations with China." But this was labelled as "all humbug" since Washington's position is in reality "intended to gain political capital in order to extricate itself from the unprecedented isolation at home and abroad."

What seems to have soured Peking is last week's report by a Presidential Commission, headed by Henry Cabot Lodge, that the U.S. should adopt a two-China policy. This would entail seating mainland China in the United Nations while allowing the Nationalist government of Taiwan to retain its seat. The News Agency referred to this report in slamming the door on a detente between the two countries.

Both Peking and Taiwan have rejected a two-China policy and neither seems willing to agree to such an arrangement even though many in this country think it fair to have separate seats for the regimes. The price of friendship with mainland China, therefore, is the same as it has always been: rejecting Peking's arch enemy, Gen. Chiang Kaishek.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier, May 11, 1971]

FROM CHINA, THUNDER STILL RUMBLES

The first flush of euphoria over the recent round of Ping-Pong diplomacy has evaporated on the old sticking point of Formosa's relationship to the mainland.

The U.S. State Department recently floated a trial balloon with a statement suggesting that the "unsettled question" of the sovereignty of Formosa might be negotiated by the rival Communist and Nationalist Chinese governments.

A few days later President Nixon seemed to shoot the balloon down himself with a press-conference remark that the negotiation idea was "unrealistic." And then Peking quickly finished the job. Its official news organ, true to type, said Chiang Kaishek's Nationalists are just a bunch of imperialist-supported bandits to be wiped off the face of the earth and that Formosa is legally part of the mainland.

And now there are reports that Red China's Premier Chou En-lai would like Peking and Washington to negotiate Formosa's fate, which means nothing less than a demand that the United States sell out its old ally—lock, stock and barrel.

So this exchange is discouraging. For years now, Washington has hoped it could break through the Bamboo Curtain with some arrangement that would preserve an independent national existence for Formosa while bringing mainland China, with its 700 million people and its blend of ancient culture and incipient nuclear technology, back into the world's mainstream. But always, Peking has demanded sovereignty over the big island of Formosa as the price for serious talks.

The latest advocacy for the "two-China" approach came in the report of the prestigious Lodge Commission, urging United Nations seating for the Communist People's Republic on terms that would allow the Nationalist Chinese to remain with the U.N., too. The stumbling block is still how to put this proposition into effect, and Peking's resort to the old rhetorical posturing now is a sharply negative sign.

But the important fact remains that Peking has decided to come out of its shell of self-imposed isolation. If the dialogue has negative tones, it is better than the past total chill of hostility.

In the past year, Peking has entered formal diplomatic relations with Canada and Italy on terms slightly different from those applied in previous cases. Both Ottawa and Rome insisted on statements of exception to Peking's territorial claim to Formosa as part of their diplomatic dealings, and Peking let this stand.

President Nixon's observation that the Ping-Pong affair broke the ice but left the water untested was wisely cautious. There has obviously been a profound change in Peking's outlook and desires, but it will take actions and not propagandistic words to reveal its purposes and direction.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, April 20, 1971]

MOVE CAREFULLY

It really should take more than a ping pong match to effect the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

We have no quarrel with the premise that even this slight opening of the door with the world's most populous nation is all to the good. And we feel that it should result in a considerable lessening of the tensions between Washington and Canton. But, the mere opening of the doors for the first time in decades should not be a signal to immediately welcome the People's Republic without deep and serious investigation into the ramifications.

Does this mean the Chinese Nationalist government will still be a member of the UN? Will both North and South Korea be admitted? Will both North and South Vietnam be welcomed? Or East and West Germany?

It is not surprising that an athletic program unlocked the first door. People throughout the world generally are able to keep their sports separated from their politics. The United States has been participating for years in sports programs which send instructors, teams or equipment to countries which are not particularly friendly. We're reminded of the world rifle matches held several years ago in the shadow of the pyramids. And the pole vaulting instructor sent to Baghdad to assist the Iraq sports program. And the dozens of sporting programs held throughout the world every year in which countries of every political pole participate.

We'd like to see increased trade, cultural, educational, industrial, social and news media visits between the United States and Red China. These can only be helpful to get both countries to better understand one another.

But we don't think the time has yet come to start suggesting a favorable vote from the Western nations when the annual move to admit China comes up at the UN.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Apr. 25, 1971]

UP THE CREEK

The voices of reason no doubt were drowned last week in the sea of liberal praise for Red China and its peace-loving ping-pong players.

Television network commentators fought amongst themselves in a ridiculous contest to see who could come up with the most superlatives for the grand and noble Communist gesture.

People can't be blamed for hoping the Communists really have become civilized and are abandoning their ruthless, dictatorial ways. But one must have a mighty big pair of rose-colored glasses actually to believe the Reds.

Columnist William Buckley, one of the reasonable commentators not swept under by the liberal waves, correctly described the foolishness of United States citizens playing games with the Communists. It would have been just as sensible, Buckley noted, for the Allies to have cancelled the Normandy Invasion had Hitler invited them to Berlin for a little badminton match!

Not for all the tea in their homeland are the Red Chinese about to make a 180-degree turn. And we fear that by the time the addle-brained liberals realize this they will be up the Commies' creek without even a ping-pong paddle.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for a decade now we have been sending "advisors" and men to fight and die in Vietnam in order to help preserve freedom in Southeast Asia.

Hopefully these men did not die in vain. Hopefully, the Nations of Southeast Asia will be able to resist the Communists, even though our presence there is being diminished.

Because so many American lives have been sacrificed in Vietnam, the U.S. Government has the obligation to these men and their families, as well as all Americans who in one way or another have contributed to the terrible cost of Vietnam, to prudently pursue any policies which might in one way or another effect the future of Southeast Asia.

Therefore, U.S. policy toward China is in the interest of all Americans, but especially veterans. How the majority of our veterans feel about U.S. policy toward Red China should be of great significance to everyone concerned with formulating our Chinese policy, especially the President of the United States.

We have seen a small minority of veterans who demonstrated against the war in Vietnam in Washington recently. They were joined by some who posed as veterans but were in fact imposters.

As usual those who have supported our policies in Vietnam have not been seen demonstrating on the streets.

But veterans who are against aiding Red China have been heard from through the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a most responsible and highly respected organization.

At their last convention in Miami Beach, the VFW passed overwhelmingly a resolution against recognizing or aiding Red China.

The VFW resolution very correctly pointed out that Red China "is responsible for the death of thousands of U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in Korea and is now engaged in ruthless and bloody aggression in Southeast Asia."

Members of the VFW know best about Red Chinese aggression. A good percentage of that organization is composed of veterans from Korea and Vietnam.

The resolution resolved as follows:

Be it resolved, by the 71st National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that the United States vigorously oppose admittance of Red China to the United Nations or any of its components; and

Be it further resolved, that we advise the Congress, the President and State Department that we are opposed to sending any food or providing assistance in any form, directly or indirectly, to our enemy, Red China; and

Be it further resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States strongly support a policy of isolating Red China by economic and, where appropriate, military means, until such time as Red China renounces by deed, as well as word, its aggressive threats, policies, and acts against other peoples and other nations.

Now it might be argued that the VFW Convention was held some 10 months ago and that since the administration is now moving toward closer ties with Red China, the VFW will soften its stand.

There is considerable evidence to the contrary. First, just 2 weeks ago the commander in chief of the VFW, Herbert

Rainwater, following an inspection trip to Southeast Asia said:

The 1.6 million war veterans of the United States will persist in their struggle against admission of the Peking regime into the United Nations and the establishment of diplomatic relations between Washington and Peking.

Secondly, I have learned that a resolution similar to the one passed at last year's convention will be offered again this year, and considering the statement of Commander Rainwater, I have little doubt that the VFW will again affirm their firm stand.

If the veterans of this Nation, who have done the actual fighting against our aggressors, are this opposed to dealing with Red China, can our policymakers be less opposed?

I urge the President to heed the voices of our veterans and their counsel that we view Communist China in the only light in which it can be viewed: As a continuing tyranny and a threat to the peace of the world. One does not fondle a rattlesnake in the hopes of pacifying it. One keeps its distance until it is defanged.

This policy of caution is advocated by the responsible press of the Nation as evidenced by this sampling of editorials.

[From the Fort Wayne, (Ind.) Journal Gazette, Apr. 24, 1971]

PING PONG DIPLOMACY

Ping pong diplomacy is going big as of now.

It has caused a slight lifting of the bamboo curtain of Red China.

The commentators and cartoonists and the politicians in the United States are having a field day.

The Kremlin is deeply concerned about the possibility that Peking has won the cooperation of Uncle Sam to an extent which they had thought impossible a few months ago.

But will the good will last? Who knows?

The Chinese Reds may get intoxicated with enthusiasm and overplay their hand and set up a reaction against them here in America.

The world has a lot of trouble spots and does not seem to be relaxed. Of course, if there could be a genuine relaxation between two of the biggest global powers, it might set a contagious example for the other troubled spots to follow.

It is much too early to tell what is going to be accomplished by ping pong diplomacy.

Everybody hopes for the best, but the hopes are diluted with reasonable doubts.

[From the Lima (Ohio) News, Apr. 22, 1971]

A PATIENT CHINA POLICY

The Communist conquest of China 22 years ago must be ranked as one of the worst catastrophes of modern times. Already, it has ushered in two Asian wars which inflicted more than 300,000 American casualties, including 100,000 dead.

For the Chinese people, the tragedy is without parallel! The slaughters of Hitler and Stalin pale by comparison with the 15 million Chinese murdered by orders of the Mao Tse-tung regime.

Moreover, the extension of communism into China has brought the entire Asian land mass under siege. The whole world soon will be threatened by hydrogen-headed missiles being incubated by Peking.

Certainly the neglect of the United States and our mistaken policies contributed to the loss of three quarters of a billion people as a firm ally.

Now America stands once again at an historic watershed with respect to China which could alter the course of history. The question is whether the United States should sanction admission of the Peking regime into the United Nations, assuming Peking is interested in U.N. membership.

Led by the flock of Senate "doves," a small but vocal element in this country would embrace the Chinese Reds because, it is argued, a quarter of mankind should not be isolated. According to this viewpoint, the Mao regime would become civilized through a "meaningful dialogue."

The time has come for the American people to do some straight thinking about China. The beginning of wisdom is the need to recognize the sharp distinction between the Chinese people and the government in Peking.

Those familiar with China today know that the Mao administration does not truly govern the people of mainland China. After having their ancient and revered family concept attacked, after suffering disastrous experiments in communal farms and backyard steel furnaces and after enduring the murderous Red Guards, the stoic Chinese masses simply refuse to carry out Peking's orders. In the face of all this, it is little wonder that the Maoist regime merely maintains the form but not the substance of power today.

We must, of course, eventually have dialogue with China but only when it is in our interest to do so.

At the present time it is not in our national interest. There is no need to dignify or help perpetuate the hapless Peking regime. There is no significant promise of fruitful trade with Red China. There is no promise of greater security.

Finally, there is no one in the Mao regime with whom we could hold a responsible dialogue. If we are patient, the Chinese people will eventually prevail and the Maoist group will be history.

Asia has a great future. The United States could have a great role in that future provided we do not repudiate our friends and embrace our enemies—provided we do not help to perpetuate the Maoists through recognition.

To paraphrase a Chinese parable, this is not the time to cast our nets; it is the time to dry them.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, April 28, 1971]

GO SLOW ON CHINA

Secretary of State William Rogers is in London to meet with representatives of the other nations who, like the U.S., are signatories to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) pact.

Rogers commented on his arrival in England that recent contacts between the U.S. and Communist China may usher in a new era in relations between the two nations and declared the U.S. policy intent to be to encourage China to play "a constructive rather than a disruptive role" in Asia.

That's all well and good, the SEATO allies seemed to be saying—but . . .

The Australian representative observed that the nations of Southeast Asia share Rogers' hopes that China will behave as a peaceable neighbor, but noted that they have detected no basic changes in Chinese policy to lend great weights to such hopes.

For the foreseeable future, he said, there will continue to be a need for this alliance.

We certainly agree, and we can imagine how our allies must be eyeing nervously not only our cozying up to Red China but the isolationist pressure which has been built up in this country by opponents of the Vietnam war.

Similarly—again, while seeing the desirability of efforts to improve relations with Red China—we would expect the President to go slow on reversing U.S. policy opposing admission of Peking to the United Nations as recommended by a presidential commission headed by former ambassador to the U.N. Henry Cabot Lodge.

It may be that further developments will justify a reconsideration of our position on this issue (although certainly not if the price for admission of Red China is the expulsion of Nationalist China). But it is much too soon to make that decision.

It will take more than a few swipes of a ping-pong paddle to convince skeptical Americans (and skeptical Asians in the nations bordering China) that Peking has suddenly decided to walk the international straight and narrow.

[From the Minneapolis, (Minn.) Tribune May 2, 1971]

CONTROL EUPHORIA

President Nixon took advantage of a question at his latest news conference to cool down the volley of enthusiasm about the future of relations with Red China that has been pingponging across the United States. He noted that some of the speculation that has occurred since the visit of the United States table tennis team "has not been useful."

Mr. Nixon then went on to spoil this diplomatic cooling effort somewhat by speculating himself about the possibilities of his visiting mainland China sometime "in some capacity." This may be useful in keeping the new opening to the Orient alive and, incidentally, perhaps in nudging the Kremlin into seeing to it that an American president visits the Soviet Union before he sips tea in Chou En-lai's parlor.

Be that as it may, Mr. Nixon's hints about an eventual visit to Communist China appear bound to stimulate dreams of normalization of relations just around the corner. It is fitting, therefore, to look at some of the obstacles that stand in the way. They are indeed enormous, and cannot—and should not—be ignored.

To begin with, there is the matter of American prisoners. Two of them have been stuck in Mao's prison for 19 years. They are John T. Downey and Richard G. Fecteau, civilian employes of the Army, who were barely old enough to vote when their plane was shot down in Korea in 1952. Also in Communist Chinese jails are Air Force Capt. Philip E. Smith, 36, shot down over the Gulf of Tonkin in 1965, and Air Force Lt. Robert Flynn, 32, downed near the border between North Vietnam and China in 1967. In addition, Navy Lt. Joseph Dunn, whose plane disappeared while on a mission over the South China Sea in 1968, is believed to be in Red Chinese hands.

Mr. Nixon has taken the eminently sound position that the US is not going to withdraw totally from South Vietnam until the American prisoners are released from the barbaric clutches of North Vietnam. Likewise, a similar position should be taken in dealing with the Red Chinese—no trade, no exchanges, no visits until there is a civilized, if not humanitarian, disposition of the matter of American citizens being held prisoner in mainland China.

Then, of course, there is the enormous obstacle of the Republic of China occupying Taiwan, the Pescadores, Matsu and Quemoy. Mr. Nixon has shown great courage in not running out on the South Vietnamese and instead giving them a chance to survive. America, through its president, is honor bound not to abandon the Nationalist Chinese to a Red takeover. To do so would be to scuttle the American integrity we have paid such a high price to maintain in South Vietnam.

Still another great obstacle is the question of the slave conditions that exist under the Red Chinees regime. America has shown great concern for internal political conditions of

other nations. Look at our refusal to recognize or deal with Rhodesia. Yet the facts are clear that Communist China is one of the most repressive nations in the world.

The Chinese tyrants, for example, have subjected Tibetans to a reign of terror. Even while Americans were playing table tennis with their smiling hosts, freedom hungry Chinese were risking their lives in six mile swims through cold water to escape from "Mao's paradise."

Certainly, America's objective should be to seek normal relations with the 800 million mainland Chinese. But, it should be kept in mind, that it is not the masses, but a relative handful of despots with whom we will be dealing and taking into the family of nations.

Indeed, Mr. Nixon is in order when he expresses some reservations about what lies ahead in normalizing relations with the Chinese nation.

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette, Apr. 16, 1971]

HOW OPEN WILL RED CHINA BE?

Nobody is certain as yet just how big a hole Red China means to chop in her "Bamboo Curtain," but it's obvious that there's even more significance to the visit of the U.S. table tennis team than first realized.

For the Communist authorities also invited four U.S. newsmen to accompany the paddlers, and they're already transmitting dispatches back to Americans without apparent restriction.

The news blackout on Red China since the 1949 revolution hasn't been total, of course.

Many foreign Communist sympathizers have written favorably about conditions there. A few unbiased reporters from the free world outside the U.S. also have been granted entry.

Still, there's no substitute for American newsmen of known objectivity, so far as U.S. citizens are concerned, to provide confidence of getting the true picture insofar as Peking will permit its viewing.

The Communists chose circumstances favorable to themselves for this exposure.

Their table tennis players are among the world's best and can make the Americans look like basement Ping Pong amateurs. There are no convulsing internal disputes in China now; much material progress has been made since the revolution, and, again, the newsmen likely will see little that Peking doesn't want them to see.

Further, the true test of openness will be how far the barriers are dropped for other American visitors, now that the United States has permitted virtually unrestricted travel of her citizens to Communist China.

The Red Chinese still insist that Chiang Kai-shek's claim to Formosa be declared invalid as a condition of their admission to the United Nations. And U.S. recognition of the Peking regime at this time would have the same effect, even if it were not spelled out.

That would be a blow to all U.S. allies on China's borders, over and above the sell-out of Chiang's government—which, for all its authoritarianism, is still a lot more democratic than Mao Tse-tung's.

A slogan seen among all the portraits of Mao summed it up bluntly: "People of the world unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!"

But another sign viewed by the table tennis team simply said: "Long live the great unity of the people of the world!" Time will tell which theme will dominate Red China's attitude toward the U.S., which in turn will determine America's own future outlook.

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my distinguished colleagues and want to join with them in expressing the feeling that we should move cautiously, very cautiously—and not at the expense of our allies in Asia—as Red China seemingly extends an accommodating hand. The phrase "ping pong diplomacy" already has become a cliche, and I wonder whether the Red Chinese hand holding the ping pong paddle actually is clad in mail rather than accommodation.

While a sincere and meaningful accommodation with Red China would be desirable, we should carefully examine events in Asia before moving in a precipitous manner. At the moment, I doubt Red China's motives and sincerity.

Most of the continent of Asia, 16 nations out of 23, is engaged in war, rebellion or civil strife, and Peking is fueling much of this flame. I would only note the following:

Red China is pressing North Vietnam to seek a military victory not a negotiated one.

In North Korea, Kim Il Sung is as "hard line" as ever, again, thanks to "guidance" from Red China.

Red Chinese military aid is being extended to Communist forces not only in Vietnam but also in Laos and Cambodia.

Mao's ideology is partly at the root of troubles in India, Ceylon and the Philippines.

Indications now are that Red Chinese arms are being smuggled to rebels in the mountains, swamps, and jungles of Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, and Indonesia.

Experts also say that a majority of Red leaders in Asia consider Peking—not Moscow—to be the center of world communism. These Red leaders in Asia apparently believe Moscow has been too "soft" in its dealings with the West, and they are looking more and more to Peking.

I think it is also interesting to point to the latest issue of "China Reconstructs," a Peking monthly which is printed in several languages, including English. In the May issue of "China Reconstruction," there is a front page statement by Chairman Mao Tse-tung which says:

People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs . . .

The same issue carries several bitter anti-American articles such as: "The World's People Fight U.S. Imperialism," and "A Small Nation Can Defeat a Big One."

Mere Red Chinese rhetoric? Maybe and maybe not.

But, Mr. Speaker, all of this leads me to believe that accommodation with Red China should be viewed realistically and by Red China's actions in her own part of the world.

Perhaps a quote from Yogi Berra sums it up:

You can observe a lot by just watchin'.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana for obtaining this time to consider recent developments in our relations with Red China and give studied consideration to the meaning and impact of these developments.

I feel it is especially important that we take a few moments to ponder the subject of "communications gaps" in this regard. We live in an age of communications gaps. Young people cannot communicate with their parents or elders. Presidents are accused of credibility gaps and the press complains they will not communicate. Federal agencies are criticized for "managing news" or classifying information which ought to be public while newspapers are accused of "manufacturing news" or saying too much about incidents which do not deserve headline coverage.

And out of concern over these "communications gaps" has grown an understandable psychology of seeking to open up communications and get a "meaningful dialog" started whenever there appears any chance of doing so.

What does this have to do with Red China? Simply this. I believe a similar psychology exists in the area of international relations and especially so in our response to the Communist bloc of nations. There is an eagerness to grasp at any straw which may "open up a dialog" and help to "thaw" relations.

There is, of course, always a desire on the part of people who sincerely want peace and understanding among men—and I think most Americans do—I certainly do—a desire to keep the lines of communication open. But there are real dangers inherent in such a stance, for, unless that desire is mutual, one party can easily be taken in by the other. His willingness to communicate can be used to damage or destroy him.

We have seen how certain "crusaders" demand an interview with someone they feel represents an obstacle to achieving their goals. If they are refused the interview, they characterize the refusal as undemocratic, closeminded, authoritarian. But, all too often, if granted the interview, they verbally abuse the individual; attempt to handcuff him or render him a prisoner in his own office as one group recently did the Selective Service Director; physically assault him, reduce the office to shambles, or in other ways violate the tacit rules which govern a willingness to engage in communication.

This, I fear, is the all-too-likely outcome of the present efforts to open trade, and thus communication, with Red China.

There are many things one could point to which warn that there has been no change in Red China's attitude toward the United States or, for that matter, the rest of the world. My colleagues have pointed to many of those warning signs. I should like, however, to refer to one in particular which has not been mentioned.

Recently, intelligence sources in the Orient obtained a copy of the "Draft of the Revised Constitution" of the Chinese Communist regime which was passed by the Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party.

Some significant changes in the political system of the Peiping regime appear in this revised "Constitution." They can be reduced, essentially to three main points:

First, the "nature of the state" is changed, the "democratic coat" is completely discarded, and the "election system" is abolished and replaced with the "consultative election," which means the representatives of the people will now be appointed instead of elected. Under the draft constitution, the so-called "peo-

ples' congresses" at various levels must consist of the deputies of workers, peasants, and soldiers as the main body, and all "state and leadership organs" must practice "the revolutionary three-in-one combination between army personnel, cadres, and masses." The purpose is to insure the absolute superiority of the military in various leadership organs.

Under the old Constitution, military troops were only a component of the Government. But now, under the draft constitution, they have been separated from the government system. Instead of belonging to the state, they now have become the property of the party. More importantly, though superficially the power of the party is supreme, in actual fact, because the influence of military men has infiltrated into the party organization and become the main body of the organization at various levels, it is the military that will now occupy the top leadership position.

This leads to the second point; namely, that Mao Tse-tung wants to make sure that the "People's Congress" is led by the central committee of the party. Under the draft constitution, the premier of the State Council is nominated by the party, and all "power organs" and the "administrative organs," including the State Council, become the tools of the party. Meanwhile, it is stipulated that the chairman of the party is also the national leader, the chief of state and the supreme commander of the armed forces, thus concentrating all party, political, and military powers in the hands of one man—Mao Tse-tung.

Third, the former local "people's councils" at various levels are replaced by the local "revolutionary committee" which are controlled by military men. These revolutionary committees not only perform the dual functions of local "power organs" and "administrative organs" but also exercise a direct control over "public security, prosecution, and trial" so that the rule of the secret police can be strengthened.

In short, these changes represent Mao's concern over the failure of the Chinese people to accept the Communist form of government that has been imposed on them and his determination to facilitate the establishment of a full-fledged military dictatorship to maintain his unstable totalitarian rule.

Further, in openly listing preparation for war as a constitutional stipulation he reveals his belligerency. United States "imperialism" is not the regime's only target. The whole free world is treated as Mao's enemy and when article 15 specifies it as the duty of the armed forces of the People's Republic of China to "guard against the subversion and agression by imperialism, social-imperialism and their lackeys," it also treats the Communist bloc headed by Russia as a target.

It seems to me there can be no doubt that Mao is determined to antagonize the whole world and is definitely bent on world conquest, not only in the Marxist-Leninist tradition, but for his own self-aggrandizement in the tradition of the Alexanders, Napoleons, and Hitlers.

This is not the kind of leadership with whom communication means anything even when it occurs. That it is being allowed to occur—or promoted—on Mao's side indicates to me that we may well be being "set up" for a national "handcuffing" or "beating" if we take the bait and "grant the interview."

This is not to say we cannot proceed. It is only to say that caution must be the order of the day and the ground rules ought to be such that "communication" does not lead us into "confrontation" with which we are not prepared to cope.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks a copy of the Draft Constitution and a table comparing it with the previous Constitution:

DRAFT OF THE REVISED CONSTITUTION OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Article 1: The People's Republic of China is a socialist state of proletarian dictatorship led by the working class (through the Chinese Communist Party) and based on the alliance of workers and peasants.

Article 2: Chairman Mao Tse-tung is the great leader of the people of all nationalities in the entire country, the Chief of State of the proletarian dictatorship of our country, and the supreme commander of the whole nation and the whole Army. Vice Chairman Lin Piao is Chairman Mao's close comrade-in-arms and successor, and the deputy supreme commander of the whole nation and the whole Army. Mao Tse-tung's thought is the guiding direction of all the work of the people of the whole nation.

Article 3: All power in the People's Republic of China belongs to the people. The organs through which the people exercise power are the people's congresses at all levels with the deputies of workers, peasants and soldiers as the main body. The people's congresses at all levels and other state organs all practice democratic centralism. Deputies to the people's congresses at all levels are elected through democratic consultation. The original electoral units and the electorate have the power to supervise and, in accordance with the provisions of law, to recall and replace the deputies elected by themselves.

Article 4: The People's Republic of China is a unitary multi-national state. All the national autonomous regions are inseparable parts of the People's Republic of China. All the nationalities are equal, and are opposed to great nation chauvinism and local nationalism. All the nationalities have the freedom to use their own spoken and written languages.

Article 5: At present, the ownership of means of production in the People's Republic of China is in these two main categories: socialist ownership by the whole people, and socialist collective ownership by the masses of working people. The State permits non-agricultural individual laborers, under the central management of urban and township street organizations and production teams of rural people's communes, to engage in individual labor provided it is within the scope permitted by law and does not exploit others. They are in the meantime to be guided gradually onto the road of socialist collectivization.

Article 6: The state sector of the economy is the leading force in the national economy. All mineral resources and waters, as well as state forests, undeveloped lands and other resources are the property of the whole people. The State may requisition by purchase, take over for use or nationalize both urban and rural land as well as other means of production on the conditions provided by law.

Article 7: The rural people's commune is an organization in which government and commune are combined into one. At present, the economy of collective ownership in the rural communes generally practices three levels of ownership, namely: ownership by the production brigade, and by the production team as the basic accounting unit. Provided that the development of the collective economy of people's communes is guaranteed and occupies absolute superiority, members of a people's commune may operate a small amount of self-reserved plots.

Article 8: Socialist public property is inviolable. The State guarantees the consolidation and development of socialist economy, and prohibits anyone from using any tactics to sabotage the interests of socialist economy and public property.

Article 9: The State practices the socialist principles of "no work, no food," "from each according to his ability," and "distribution according to one's labor." The State protects the right of citizens to own income from labor, savings, houses and other means of subsistence.

Article 10: Political work is the lifeline of all works. The State acts to grasp revolution, promote production and work and prepare for war, as well as to promote the systematic and proportional development of socialist economy, in order that on the basis of continually elevating social productivity, the material and cultural life of the people will be gradually improved and the independence and security of the State will be consolidated.

Article 11: All working personnel of state and other organs must study and apply in a living way the thought of Mao Tse-tung, stress proletarian politics, oppose bureaucratism, align closely with the workers and peasants as well as all laboring masses, and serve the people wholeheartedly. Working personnel of all organs must participate in collective labor. All state organs must practice the principle of simplified administration; their leadership organs must practice the revolutionary three-in-one combination between army personnel, cadres and masses, and between the old, the middle-aged and the young.

Article 12: The proletariat must exercise total dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure, which includes the various cultural fields. Culture, education, literature, arts and scientific research must all serve proletarian politics, serve the workers, peasants and soldiers, and unite with productive labor.

Article 13: Blooming and contending on a big scale, big-character posters, and big debates are new forms of socialist revolution created by the masses of people. The State protects the use of such forms by the people in mass movements, to create a political situation where there are both democracy and centralism, both discipline and freedom, both unified will and individual cheerfulness and active life, so as to consolidate proletarian dictatorship.

Article 14: The State safeguards the socialist system, suppresses all treasonable and counter-revolutionary activities and punishes all traitors and counter-revolutionaries. The State deprives landlords, rich peasants, reactionary capitalists, counter-revolutionaries, and other undesirable elements of their political rights for a specific period of time according to law; at the same time it gives them a way to earn a living, in order to enable them to reform through labor and become citizens who earn their livelihood by their own labor.

Article 15: The People's Liberation Army and the militia of China are the children of workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the armed forces of the whole nation. The People's Liberation Army of China is forever a combat column and, at the same time, a work column and a production column. The duty of the armed forces of the People's Republic of China is to safeguard the socialist revolution and the achievements of socialist construction, to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of

the State, and to guard against the subversion and aggression by imperialism, social-imperialism and their lackeys.

CHAPTER II. THE STATE STRUCTURE

Section I. The National People's Congress

Article 16: The National People's Congress is the highest organ of state power under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. The National People's Congress is composed of deputies elected by provinces, autonomous regions, municipalities, the armed forces and Chinese who live abroad. A number of patriotic personalities may be invited to participate when necessary. The National People's Congress is elected for a term of five years, which may be extended under special circumstances. The National People's Congress holds a session once a year, but under special circumstances the session may be convened before its due date or postponed.

Article 17: The functions and powers of the National People's Congress are: To amend the Constitution, to make laws, to appoint and remove the premier of the State Council upon the recommendation by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, to examine and approve the state budget and the final state accounts, and to exercise such other functions and powers as the National People's Congress considers it should exercise.

Article 18: The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress is the permanent working organ of the National People's Congress. Its functions and powers are: To interpret laws to the sessions of the National People's Congress, to make decrees, to appoint and remove plenipotentiary representatives abroad, to receive foreign envoys, and to ratify and nullify treaties concluded with foreign states. The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress is composed of the chairman, the vice chairmen, and other members, to be elected or recalled by the National People's Congress.

Section 2: The State Council

Article 19: The State Council is the Central People's Government. It is responsible and accountable to the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee. The State Council is composed of the premier, the vice premiers, the ministers, and the chairmen of commissions.

Article 20: The functions and powers of the State Council are: To formulate administrative measures and issue decisions and orders in accordance with the Constitution, laws and decrees; to coordinate and lead the work of Ministries, Commissions, and local organs of state administration at various levels throughout the country; to formulate and put into effect the national economic plan and the state budget; to administer the administrative affairs of the State; and to exercise such other functions and powers as are vested in it by the National People's Congress or its Standing Committee.

Section 3: Local people's congresses and local revolutionary committees at various levels

Article 21: Local people's congresses at various levels are local organs of state power. The term of office of the provincial and municipal people's congresses is five years; that of people's congresses of special districts, cities and counties, three years; that of people's congresses of rural people's communes and townships, two years.

Article 22: Local revolutionary committees at various levels are the standing organs of local people's congresses and, at the same time, people's governments of the corresponding levels. A local revolutionary committee is composed of the chairman, the vice chairmen and other members, to be elected or recalled by the people's congress of the corresponding level. A local revolutionary committee is responsible and accountable to the people's congress of the corresponding level and to the state organ of the next higher level.

Article 23: Local people's congresses at various levels and members of local revolutionary committees elected by the local people's congresses ensure the implementation of laws and decrees in the areas under their jurisdiction, stimulate the activeness of local organs at various levels to the full, provide leadership for local socialist revolution and socialist construction, screen and approve local budgets, protect revolutionary order, and safeguard the rights of citizens.

Section 4: Organs of self-government of national autonomous areas

Article 24: The organs of self-government in autonomous regions, autonomous *chou* and autonomous counties, which are all national autonomous areas, are the people's congresses and revolutionary committees. The organs of self-government of national autonomous areas may exercise, in addition to the functions and powers of local state organs as prescribed in Chapter II, Section 3 of the Constitution, autonomy as provided by law. Higher state organs at various levels should fully safeguard the exercise of autonomy by organs of self-government in national autonomous areas, and positively support the various minority nationalities in carrying out socialist revolution and socialist construction.

Section 5: Trial and prosecuting organs

Article 25: The Supreme People's Court, local people's courts at various levels and special people's courts exercise judicial authority. The people's courts at various levels are responsible and accountable to the people's congresses and their standing organs at the corresponding levels. The standing organs of the people's congresses at various levels appoint or remove presidents of the people's courts at the corresponding levels. The exercise of procuratorial and trial authority shall follow the mass line. Mass discussion and criticism are to be conducted in serious counter-revolutionary and criminal cases.

CHAPTER III: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF CITIZENS

Article 26: The most fundamental rights and duties of citizens are: To support Chairman Mao Tse-tung and his close comrade-in-arms, Vice Chairman Lin Piao, to support the leadership of the Communist Party of China; to support the proletarian dictatorship, to support the socialist system, and to abide by the Constitution and laws of the People's Republic of China. The defence of the motherland and resistance against aggression are the sacred responsibility of every citizen; and it is the honorable duty of citizens to perform military service according to law.

Article 27: Citizens who have reached the age of 18 have the right to vote and stand for election, except those deprived by law of such rights. Citizens have the right to work and the right to receive an education. The working people have the right to rest and leisure and the right to material assistance in old age and in case of illness or disability. Women enjoy equal rights with men. The State protects marriage, the family, and the mother and child. The State protects the just rights and interests of Chinese who live abroad.

Article 28: Citizens enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of correspondence, freedom of publication, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of procession, freedom of demonstration and freedom of strike. Citizens enjoy the freedom of religious belief and the freedom of iconoclasm and propagating atheism. The freedom of person and the homes of citizens are inviolable. No citizen may be arrested except by decision of a people's court or with the sanction of public security organs.

Article 29: The People's Republic of China grants asylum to any foreign national persecuted for supporting a just cause, for taking part in revolutionary activities, or for engaging in scientific research.

CHAPTER IV: NATIONAL FLAG, NATIONAL EMBLEM, CAPITAL

Article 30: The national flag of the People's Republic of China is a red flag with five stars. The national emblem is: in the center, Tien An Men under the light of five stars, and encircled by ears of grain and a cogwheel. The capital of the People's Republic of China is Peking.

APPENDIXES: I

COMPARATIVE CHART OF THE NEW AND OLD CHINESE COMMUNIST CONSTITUTIONS

Draft of the Revised Constitution		Old Constitution	
	According to available information, certain regions have submitted opinions on revising the preface. The draft evidently has a preface, but its contents are still not clear.	Preface	A short history of the establishment of the Chinese Communist regime, founding a socialist society on the new democracy. From the founding of the regime until the establishment of socialism considered a transitional period. The general mission during this transitional period is to gradually complete socialist industrialization of the country, and to gradually complete the socialist reform of agriculture, handicrafts, and capitalist industry and commerce. Interpretation of the significance of the constitution, fulfilling the function of the united front and the national minorities policy, and the achievements of the foreign policy.
Chapter 1—General Principles:		Chapter 1—General Principles:	
Article 1	The People's Republic of China is a socialist state of proletarian dictatorship led by the working class (through the Chinese Communist Party) and based on the alliance of workers and peasants.	Article 1	The People's Republic of China is a people's democratic nation based on the alliance of workers and peasants and led by the working class.
Article 2	Chairman Mao Tse-tung is the great leader of the people of all nationalities in the entire country, the Chief of State of the proletarian dictatorship of our country, and the supreme commander of the whole nation and the whole Army. Vice Chairman Lin Piao is Chairman Mao's close comrade-in-arms and successor, and the depty supreme commander of the whole nation and the whole Army. Mao Tse-tung's thought is the guiding direction of all the work of the people of the whole nation.		No provision is made concerning Mao Tse-tung, Lin Piao, or Mao Tse-tung's thought.

APPENDIXES: I—Continued

COMPARATIVE CHART OF THE NEW AND OLD CHINESE COMMUNIST CONSTITUTIONS—Continued

	Draft of the Revised Constitution	Old Constitution
Article 3	All power in the People's Republic of China belongs to the people. The organs through which the people exercise power are the people's congresses at all levels with the deputies of workers, peasants and soldiers as the main body. The people's congresses at all levels are elected through democratic consultation. The original electoral units and the electorate have the power to supervise and, in accordance with the provisions of law, to recall and replace the deputies elected by themselves.	Article 2 — No provision is made that deputies to the people's congresses at all levels are "elected through democratic consultation", or that the original electoral units and the electorate may recall and replace the deputies at any time.
Article 4	The People's Republic of China is a unitary multi-national state. All the national autonomous regions are inseparable parts of the People's Republic of China. All the nationalities are equal, and are opposed to great nation chauvinism and local nationalism. All the nationalities have the freedom to use their own spoken and written languages.	Article 3 — Discrimination against or oppression of any nationality is prohibited. Obstructing the group action of the national minorities is prohibited, but there is no phrase "and are opposed to great nation chauvinism and local nationalism".
	Article 4 of the old constitution is deleted	Article 4 — Socialist industrialization and socialist reform will be carried out through the national organs and the force of society. It is guaranteed that the system of exploitation will gradually be abolished and a socialist society will be established.
Article 5	At present, the ownership of the means of production in the People's Republic of China is in these two main categories: socialist ownership by the whole people, and socialist collective ownership by the masses of working people. The State permits non-agricultural individual laborers, under the central management of urban and township street organizations and production teams of rural people's communes, to engage in individual labor provided it is within the scope permitted by law and does not exploit others. They are in the meantime to be guided gradually onto the road of socialist collectivization.	Article 5 — The ownership of the means of production is in these four main categories: national ownership, which is ownership by all the people; cooperative ownership, which is collective ownership by the laboring masses; ownership by individual laborers; ownership by capitalists.
Article 6	The state sector of the economy is the leading force in the national economy. All mineral resources and waters, as well as state forests, undeveloped lands and other resources are the property of the whole people. The State may requisition by purchase, take over for use or nationalize both urban and rural land as well as other means of production on the conditions provided by law.	Article 6, Article 13 — Mineral resources, waters, national forests as stipulated by law, undeveloped land and other resources are the property of the whole people. Urban and rural land as well as other means of production may be purchased, taken over for use or nationalized.
Article 7	The rural people's commune is an organization in which government and commune are combined into one. At present, the economy of collective ownership in the rural communes generally practices three levels of ownership, namely: ownership by the commune, by the production brigade, and by the production team as the basic accounting unit. Provided that the development of the collective economy of people's communes is guaranteed and occupies absolute superiority, members of a people's commune may operate a small amount of self-reserved plots.	Article 7 — The economy of the cooperative is the socialist economy of collective ownership by the laboring masses, or is the semi-socialist economy of collective ownership by a part of the laboring masses.
Article 8	All persons are prohibited from using any tactics to sabotage the interests of socialist economy and public property.	Article 14 — All persons are prohibited from using private property to sabotage the public interests.
Article 9	Practice of the socialist principles of "no work, no food", "from each according to his ability", and "distribution according to one's labor". Protection of the right of citizens to own income from labor, savings, houses and other means of subsistence.	Article 11 — Protection of the right of citizens to own legal income, savings, houses, and other means of subsistence.
Article 10	Political work is the lifeline of all works. The State acts to grasp revolution, promote production and work and prepare for war. The material and cultural life of the people will be gradually improved and the independence and security of the State will be consolidated. Articles 8, 9, 10, and 12 of the old constitution are deleted.	Article 15 — Use of economic planning to guide the development and reform of the national economy, and continually elevate productivity so as to improve the material and cultural life of the people, and consolidate the independence and security of the State. Article 8 — Protection of the right of ownership of land and other means of production by the peasants, in accordance with the law. Adoption of a policy to limit and gradually do away with rich peasant economy. Article 9 — Protection of the right of ownership of the means of production by handicraft workers and other non-agricultural individual laborers. Guidance and assistance for them to improve their businesses, and encouragement for them to organize cooperative production and cooperative supply. Article 10 — Protection of the right of ownership of the means of production and other capital by capitalists, in accordance with the law. Article 12 — Protection to the right of inheritance of private property by citizens, in accordance with the law.
Article 11	All working personnel of state and other organs must study and apply in a living way the thought of Mao Tse-tung, stress proletarian politics, oppose bureaucratism, align closely with the workers and peasants as well as laboring masses, and serve the people whole-heartedly. Working personnel of all organs must participate in collective labor. All state organs must practice simplified administration; their leadership organs must practice the revolutionary three-in-one combination between army personnel, cadres and masses, and between the old, the middle-aged and the young.	Article 16 — Labor is an honorable undertaking for all citizens capable of working. The State encourages the citizens to be active and creative in labor.
Article 12	The proletariat must exercise total dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the superstructure, which includes the various cultural fields. Culture, education, literature, arts and scientific research must all serve proletarian politics, serve the workers, peasants and soldiers, and unite with productive labor.	The old constitution has no provision for the contents of Article 12 of the draft of the revised constitution.
Article 13	Blooming and contending on a big scale, big-character posters, and big debates are new forms of socialist revolution created by the masses of people. The State protects the use of such forms by the people in mass movements.	The old constitution has no provision for the contents of Article 13 of the draft of the revised constitution.

Draft of the Revised Constitution		Old Constitution	
Article 14	The State safeguards the socialist system, suppresses all treasonable and counter-revolutionary activities and punishes all traitors and counter-revolutionaries. The State deprives landlords, rich peasants, reactionary capitalists, counter-revolutionaries, and other undesirable elements of their political rights for a specific period of time according to law; at the same time it gives them a way to earn a living, in order to enable them to reform through labor and become citizens who earn their livelihood by their own labor.	Article 19	The State safeguards the people's democratic system, suppresses all treasonable and counter-revolutionary activities and punishes all traitors and counter-revolutionaries. The State deprives feudalist landlords and bureaucratic capitalists of their political rights for a specified period of time according to law; at the same time it gives them a way to earn a living, in order to enable them to reform through labor and become citizens who earn their livelihood by their own labor.
Article 15	The People's Liberation Army and the militia of China are the children of workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the armed forces of the whole nation. The People's Liberation Army of China is forever a combat column and, at the same time, a work column and a production column. The duty of the armed forces of the People's Republic of China is to safeguard the socialist revolution and the achievements of socialist construction, to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of the State, and to guard against the subversion and aggression by imperialism, social-imperialism and their lackeys.	Article 20	The armed forces of the People's Republic of China belong to the people. The mission of the armed forces is to protect the people's revolution and the achievements and national construction, and to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of the State.
Chapter 2—The State Structure: Section 1—The National People's Congress:		Chapter 2—The State Structure: Section 1—The National People's Congress:	
Article 16	The National People's Congress is the highest organ of state power under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. The National People's Congress is composed of deputies elected by provinces, autonomous regions, municipalities, the armed forces and Chinese who live abroad. A number of patriotic personalities may be invited to participate when necessary. The National People's Congress is elected for a term of five years, which may be extended under special circumstances. The National People's Congress holds a session once a year, but under special circumstances the session may be convened before its due date or postponed.	Article 21	The National People's Congress is the highest organ of state power The old constitution is without the phrase "under the leadership of the Communist Party of China."
		Article 22	The National People's Congress is the sole organ to exercise national legislative power.
		Article 23	The National People's Congress is composed of deputies elected by provinces, autonomous regions, municipalities, the armed forces and Chinese who live abroad. The old constitution is without the provision that "A number of patriotic personalities may be invited to participate when necessary."
		Article 24	The term of the National People's Congress is four years. This is one year less than the draft of the revised constitution.
		Article 25	"The National People's Congress holds a session once a year, and is summoned by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. If the Standing Committee deems it necessary, or if upon proposal of ⅓ of the deputies, the National People's Congress may be provisionally convened." The draft of the revised constitution deletes this provision entirely, with the exception of the National People's Congress holding a session once a year, and of placing the convening of the National People's Congress by the Standing Committee under Article 18 in the functions and powers of the Standing Committee.
		Article 26	"When the National People's Congress holds a session, the presidium to conduct the session will be elected." The draft of the revised constitution is without this provision.
Article 17	The functions and powers of the National People's Congress are: To amend the Constitution, to make laws, to appoint and remove the premier upon the recommendation by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, to examine and approve the state budget and the final state accounts, and to exercise such other functions and powers as the National People's Congress considers it should exercise.	Article 27	In addition to the functions and powers as stated in the draft of the revised constitution, there are also the stipulations that the National People's Congress will also elect the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the People's Republic of China, determine the selection of members of the State Council, determine the selection of the vice chairman and commissioners of the National Defense Council, elect the president of the Supreme People's Court and the procurator-general of the Supreme People's Procuratorate, decide on the national economic plan, approve provincial, autonomous region, and municipal divisions, general amnesty, war and peace. The draft of the revised constitution gives no provisions for these functions and powers.
		Article 28	The National People's Congress has the right to remove the chairman and vice chairmen of the People's Republic of China, the premier and vice premiers of the State Council, the heads of the various ministries, the directors of the various commissions, the secretary-general, the chairman and commissioners of the National Defense Council, the president of the Supreme People's Court, and the procurator-general of the Supreme People's Procuratorate. The draft of the revised constitution deletes all of these, with the exception of the premier of the State Council.
		Article 29	The constitution may be amended by a 2/3 majority vote of the entire National People's Congress. Laws and other resolutions may be passed by a simple majority vote of the entire National People's Congress. The draft of the revised constitution is without this provision.
Article 18	The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress is the permanent working organ of the National People's Congress. Its functions and powers are: to interpret laws to the session of the National People's Congress, to make decrees, to appoint and remove plentipotentiary representatives abroad, to receive foreign envoys, and to ratify and nullify treaties concluded with foreign states. The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress is composed of the chairman, several vice chairmen, and other members, to be elected or recalled by the National People's Congress.	Article 30	The Standing Committee of the National People's Congress is composed of the chairman, several vice chairmen, a secretary-general, and other members.
		Article 31	The functions and powers of the Standing Committee in the old constitution are the same as in the draft of the revised constitution, with the exception that in the case of "receive foreign envoys", "appoint and remove plenipotentiary representatives abroad", and "ratify and nullify treaties concluded with foreign states", the original "power to decide" has been changed to the "power to carry out". In addition, the old constitution also stipulates: supervise the work of the State Council, Supreme People's Court, and Supreme People's Procuratorate; revoke the resolutions and orders of the State Council that are contrary to the constitution, laws, or decrees; change or nullify the inappropriate resolutions of the organs of state power at the provincial, autonomous region, or municipal level; to appoint and remove the vice premiers, the ministers, the directors of commissions, and the secretary-general of the State Council; to appoint and remove the vice-president and other judges of the Supreme People's Court; to appoint and remove the deputy procurator-general, procuratorate members and procuratorate commission members of the Supreme People's Procuratorate; to stipulate the titles of military and diplomatic corps and other special titles; decide on special amnesty; decide on the declaration of war; decide on national or local mobilization; and decide on national or local martial law. The draft of the revised constitution deletes all of these functions and powers.
		Articles 32 to 38	The National People's Congress has the power to remove members of the Standing Committee, and establishes the minorities committee, the bill committee, the budget committee, and the deputy qualifications committee. Deputies to the National People's Congress have the right to interrogate the various ministries and commissions under the State Council. The draft of the revised constitution deletes all these provisions.

APPENDIXES: I—Continued

COMPARATIVE CHART OF THE NEW AND OLD CHINESE COMMUNIST CONSTITUTIONS—Continued

Draft of the Revised Constitution	Old Constitution
The draft of the revised constitution deletes the provisions on the "President of the People's Republic of China" in Chapter 2, Section 2 of the old constitution.	Chapter 2—"President of the People's Republic of China": Articles 39 to 46—The President of the People's Republic of China is elected by the National People's Congress for a term of four years, he issues laws and decrees decided upon by the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee, issues orders of general and special amnesty, issues orders of martial law, declares a state of war, issues orders of mobilization, receives foreign envoys, appoints and removes plentipotentiary representatives abroad, ratifies treaties concluded with foreign states, serves as chairman of the National Defense Council, convenes highest meetings of the State Council; in case of vacancy of the office of the president of the People's Republic of China, the position will be filled by the vice president.
Section 2—The State Council: Article 19—The State Council is the Central People's Government. It is responsible and accountable to the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee. The State Council is composed of the premier, the vice premiers, the ministers, and the chairman of commissions.	Section 3—The State Council: Article 47—The State Council is the Central Peoples's Government, the highest executive organ of state power, and the highest administrative organ. The draft of the revised constitution deletes the phrases "highest executive organs of state power and the highest administrative organ". Article 48—In addition to the provisions on composition of the State Council in the draft of the revised constitution, the old constitution also includes the secretary-general. Article 52—The State Council is responsible and accountable to the National People's Congress and its Standing Committee.
Article 20—The functions and powers of the State Council are: To formulate administrative measures and issue decisions and orders in accordance with the constitution, laws and decrees; to coordinate and lead the work of Ministries, Commissions, and local organs of state administrative at various levels throughout the country; to formulate and put into effect the national economic plan and the state budget; to administer the administravtive affairs of the State; and to exercise such other functions and powers as are vested in it by the National People's Congress or its Standing Committee.	Article 49—In addition to the stipulations of the draft of the revised constitution, the old constitution also provides administration of external and internal trade, affairs of culture, education, and sanitation, minority affairs, foreign affairs, and leadership in building the armed forces. The draft of the revised constitution deletes these powers and functions.
The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 50 and 51 of the old constitution.	Article 50—The premier leads of the affairs of the State Council and presides over State Council meeting; the vice premier assists the premier. Article 51—The chairmen of the commissions and the ministers may issue orders and directives within the scope of their powers, in accordance with the laws, decrees, and the orders of the State Councils.
Section 3—Local People's Congresses and Local Revolutionary Committees at Various Levels: Article 21—Local people's congresses at various levels are local organs of state power. The term of office of the provincial and municipal people's congresses is five years; that of people's congresses of special districts, cities and counties, three years; that of people's congresses of rual people's communes and townships, two years.	Section 4—Local People's Congresses and Local People's Committees at Various Levels: Article 55—Local people's congresses at various levels are local organs of state power. Article 57—The term of office for provincial people's congresses is four years; that of municipal, county, city, minorities, township, and village people's congresses is two years.
Article 22—Local revolutionary committees at various levels are the people's governments of the corresponding levels, and composed of the chairman, the vice chairmen, and other members, to be elected or recalled by the people's congress of the corresponding level, and is responsible and accountable to the people's congress of the corresponding level and to the state organ of the next higher level.	Article 62—Local people's committees at various levels are the people's governments of the corresponding levels, and the local executive organs of the people's congresses of the corresponding levels, and the local administrative organs of the corresponding levels. Article 63—The people's committees at various levels are composed of one provincial governor, city mayor, municipal mayor, regional head, village mayor, or township mayor, plus a certain number of deputies of each of these positions, and other committee members.
Article 23—Local people's congresses at various levels and members of local revolutionary committees elected by the local people's congresses ensure the implementation of laws and decrees in the areas under their jurisdiction, stimulate the activeness of local organs at various levels to the full, provide leadership for local socialist revolution and village revolutionary order, and safeguard the rights of citizens.	Article 58—Local people's congresses at various levels guarantee the observance and implementation of laws and decrees in the areas under their jurisdiction, plan local economic construction, cultural affairs, and other public undertakings, screen and approve local budgets protect public property, maintain public order, safeguard the rights of citizens, and safeguard the equal rights of national minorities.
	Article 64—The local people's committees at various levels manage the administrative affairs within their administrative districts in accordance with the provisions of law, and implement the resolutions of the people's congress on the corresponding level and the resolutions and orders of the state organ on the next higher level.
The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 56, 59, 60, 61, 65, and 66 of the old constitution.	Articles 56, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66.—Provisions for the election, recall, and limitations on the people's national congresses below the provincial level, and the functions and powers of the people's committees above the county level.
Section 4—Organs of Self-Government of National Autonomous Areas: Article 24—The organs of self-government in autonomous regions, autonomous chou and autonomous counties, which are all national autonomous areas, are the people's congresses and revolutionary committees. The organs of self-government of national autonomous areas may exercise, in addition to the functions and powers of local state organs as prescribed in Chapter II, Section 3 of the constitution, autonomy as provided by law. Higher state organs at various levels should fully safeguard the exercise of autonomy by organs of self-government in national autonomous areas, and positively support the various minority nationalities in carrying out socialist revolution and socialist construction.	Section 5—Organs of Self-Government of National Autonomous Areas: Article 67—The organization of self-government organs in autonomous regions, autonomous chou, and autonomous counties should be based on the stipulations for organization of local organs of state power as provided in Chapter 2, Section 4 of the old constitution. Article 69—The organs of self-government of autonomous regions, autonomous chou, and autonomous counties shall exercise the functions and powers of local organs of state power as stipulated in Chapter 2, Section 4 of the old constitution. Chapter 72—Higher state organs at various levels should fully safeguard the exercise of autonomy by autonomous regions, autonomous chou, and autonomous counties, and assist the various minority nationalities in the development of political, economic, and cultural construction.

	Draft of the Revised Constitution		Old Constitution
	The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 68, 70, and 71 of the old constitution.	Articles 68, 70, and 71	In multi-national autonomous regions, autonomous chou, and autonomous counties, each of the nationalities must have the appropriate number of representatives in the organs of self-government. These organs shall exercise autonomy within the limitations as prescribed in the constitution and laws, administer local budgets, organize local security forces according to the national military system, and formulate unilateral and self-government policies according to the special political, economic and cultural characterists of the local nationalities. In the execution of functions and powers, the local nationalities may use their own spoken and written languages.
Section 5—Trial and Prosecuting Organs:		Section 6—People's Courts and People's Procuratorates:	
Article 25	The Supreme People's Court, local people's courts at various levels and special people's courts exercise judicial authority. The people's courts at various levels are responsible and accountable to the people's congresses and their standing organs at the corresponding levels. The standing organs of people's congresses at various levels appoint or remove presidents of the people's courts at the corresponding levels. The exercise of procuratorial and trial authority shall follow the mass line. Mass discussion and criticism are to be conducted in serious counter-revolutionary and criminal cases.	Article 73	The Supreme People's Court, local courts at various levels and special people's courts exercise judicial authority.
		Article 80	The people's courts at various levels are responsible and accountable to the people's congresses and their standing organs at the corresponding levels.
	The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 74 to 79 of the old constitution.	Articles 74 to 79	The president of the Supreme People's Court and the heads of the people's courts at various levels have a term of office of four years. The jury system will be implemented in judicial trial cases. The citizens of the various nationalities have the right to use their own spoken and written language in litigations. The Supreme People's Court oversees the judicial affairs of the local people's courts and the special people's courts. Higher level people's courts oversee the judicial affairs of lower level people's courts.
	The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 81 to 84 in the old constitution.	Articles 81 to 84	Provisions on the functions and powers of the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the local people's procuratorates, and the special people's procuratorates. Terms of office of the procurator-generals.
Chapter 3—Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens:		Chapter 3—Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens:	
Article 26	The most fundamental rights and duties of citizens are: To support Chairman Mao Tse-tung and his close comrade-in-arms, Vice Chairman Lin Piao, to support the leadership of the Communist Party of China: to support the proletarian dictatorship, to support the socialist system, and to abide by the Constitution and laws of the People's Republic of China. The defense of the motherland and resistance against aggression are the sacred responsibility of every citizen; and it is the honorable duty of citizens to perform military service according to law.	Article 103	Defense of the motherland is the sacred responsibility of every citizen. It is the honorable duty of citizens to perfofm military service according to law. These are identical to the latter part of the draft of the revised constitution. The old constitution does not contain the former part of the draft of the revised constitution.
Article 27	Citizens who have reached the age of 18 have the right to vote and stand for election, except those deprived by law of such rights. Citizens have the right to work and the right to receive an education. The working people have the right to rest and leisure and the right to material assistance in old age and in case of disability. Women enjoy equal rights with men. The state protects marriage, the family, and the mother and child. The State protects the just rights and interests of Chinese who live abroad.	Articles 86, 91, 94, 96, and 98.	In general, identical in contents with the draft of the revised constitution, except that the latter section of Article 91 stipulates "Through the planned development of the national economy, the State will gradually expand employment and improve working conditions and wages so as to guarantee that citizens can enjoy these rights." The draft of the revised constitution lacks this provision.
Article 28	Citizens enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of correspondence, freedom of publication, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of procession, freedom of demonstration, and freedom to strike. Citizens enjoy the freedom of religious belief and the freedom of iconoclasm and of propagating atheism. The freedom of person and the homes of citizens are inviolable. No citizen may be arrested except by decision of a people's court or with the sanction of public security organs.	Articles 87, 88 and 89	Partly similar to the contents of Article 28 of the draft of the revised constitution, except that Article 87 does not contain the provisions "freedom to strike", "freedom of iconoclasm", or "the freedom of propagating atheism"; Article 90 stipulates that "secret correspondence has the protection of law", which the draft of the revised constitution is lacking. The old constitution stipulates that "No citizen may be arrested except by the decision of a people's court or with the sanction of the procuratorate", while the draft of the revised constitution changes "or with the sanction of the procuratorate" to "or with the sanction of public security organs".
Article 29	The People's Republic of China grants asylum to any foreign national persecuted for supporting a just cause, for taking part in revolutionary activities, or for engaging in scientific research.	Article 99	In general, identical in contents with Article 29 of the draft of the revised constitution, except that the draft of the revised constitution changes the phrase "taking part in peace movements" in the old constitution to "taking part in revolutionary activities".
	The draft of the revised constitution deletes Articles 85, 95, 97, 100, 101, and 102 of the old constitution.	Articles 85, 95, 97, 100, 101 and 102.	All citizens are equal before the law; safeguard for the freedom of citizens to engage in scientific research, literary and artistic creation, and other cultural activities; citizens have the right to submit writtin and oral accusations against the working personnel of state organs in any case of negligence of duty; citizens must observe the Constitution, laws, working discipline, and public order, and must have a sense of civic pride; to love and protect public property is the duty of every citizen; citizens have the duty to pay tax in accordance with the laws etc.
Chapter 4—National Flag, National Emblem, Capital:		Chapter 4—National Flag, National Emblem, Capital:	
Article 30	The national flag of the People's Republic of China is a red flag with five stars. The national emblem is: In the center, Tien An Men under the light of five stars, and encircled by ears of grain and a cogwheel. The capital of the People's Republic of China is Peking.	Article 106	Identical in contents with Article 30 of the draft of the revised constitution.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, while I cannot entirely share the views of some of my colleagues on the question of the changing policy of the United States toward mainland China, I do have some misgivings about undertaking so fundamental a change on such short notice and with, at least as far as I am concerned, such a sketchy and incomplete analysis of the situation.

I am prepared to stipulate that we, as a nation, are encumbered by the paraphernalia of the past; we, I will admit, have an unfortunate tendency to think in terms of catch phrases and shopworn cliches. The great utility—and danger—of slogans lies in the fact that, once uttered, we feel we no longer have to give the subject of the slogan any thought. Slogans preclude and eliminate the need for thought and, therefore, are a most dangerous commodity and something we should carefully avoid in the formulation and implementation of our foreign policy.

I am prepared to admit that sloganeering has often as not been substituted for thought in our China policy over the last two decades. We have but to mention Red China or the Bamboo Curtain or Red Guard to trigger a knee jerk—therefore, involuntary-reflex action. All this, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to admit is unfortunate and something to be avoided.

But, I must admit that I have a very uneasy feeling that the slogans of the past have been replaced by new slogans—up-to-date granted, but to my way of thinking, no less dangerous.

The new slogans are familiar to us: "You cannot indefinitely deny the existence of 500 million human beings;" "Mainland China must be brought into the councils of the world—the U.N.—if we are ever to hope for a peaceful settlement of international problems;" "Let us play off Red China against communism in the Soviet Union;" "Let us think in terms of reality and not legal fictions—Nationalist China is a legal fiction."

While I feel that we should properly condemn the slogans of the past, I think we should condemn with equal vigor the slogans of the present. Let us stop posturing and give this vital matter the deliberation and the thoughtful consideration it deserves.

It seems to me that it is preposterous to presume that the leopard has changed its spots overnight, more suitably that the dragon has ceased to breathe fire. I would like to think that mainland China is a reformed country which could truthfully declare, as the United Nations Charter requires, that it is a peace-loving country; that it has become tolerant of domestic critics, and its oppressive ways have ended. I would like to believe that but candidly, Mr. Speaker, I can find no evidence to support such conclusions. It has been and continues to be an aggressor nation, an outlaw nation.

It can be agreed, I suppose, that our initiatives will have a tendency to restrain mainland China's aggressive nature and will in the long run, if diligently pursued can bring about a change in attitudes. Lavishing love and understanding on the juvenile delinquent, we are told, sometimes brings salutary results but I am not sure that this treatment can have similar results when applied to an international delinquent.

I think it might be well to recall the British experience in recognizing mainland China. Very early in the game, in 1951 I believe, Great Britain extended diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime. For their trouble, the British were ridiculed and humiliated—their chargé d'affaires in Peking—was physically abused, kept under house arrest and no Ambassadors were exchanged for many years. Nor did the presence of a British diplomatic mission in Peking have any discernible effect on the manner in which British nationals were treated on the mainland. British nationals visiting or doing business on the mainland were continually harassed and intimidated. In several flagrant cases they were arrested and imprisoned on trumped-up spying charges.

I do not think we want to repeat that sorry experience with American nationals.

My feeling is that the burden of demonstrating good faith and a reformed disposition lies, not with the United States, but with the Chinese Communists themselves. And we should properly insist upon hard evidence of a change on the part of the Chinese Communists before we act. As far as I can see that evidence is yet to be produced. We should base our policy on facts not hopes. Too often, in the past, Mr. Speaker, reliance on "hopes" has proven illusory and has operated to our disadvantage. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, go off on an excursion into fantasy again.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to consider the Chinese question from a little different angle. While world attention is focused on how the Soviet Union supports the Arabs in the Middle East and suppresses Jewry in Russia, probably few notice that the most militant, rabid anti-Semitic stand in the world is taken by Communist China.

Peking is the sole supporter and supplier of the most radical arms of the Arab guerrillas—the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine—PDF—headed by Maoist Nayef Hawatmeh, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine—PFLP—led by Marxist Dr. George Habash.

PDF's newspaper in Beirut, Al-Horriya—Freedom—last October openly admitted that arms shipments the Palestinian guerrillas had been receiving were from Communist China. The shipments were unloaded at "Arab ports adjacent to Iraq," it disclosed.

The New York Post, quoting reliable Asian diplomatic sources, reported last October 5:

> Chinese supplies consist mainly of small antitank guns, rocket launchers, and machineguns.

Denis Warner, respected Australian writer, formerly with the Reporter, reported in a special dispatch October 4, last year that—

> Chinese-made weapons and Chinese instructors appeared in the camps of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine as earch as March, 1968 . . . Chinese influence has increased substantially in recent months. Al Fatah guerrillas can be seen on the hillsides of Jordan with the Little Red Book, and Chairman Mao's benign portrait smiles down from the walls of most Al Fatah camp headquatres.

Publicly, Peking recognizes Al Fatah, largest of the Arab guerrilla groups, as representative of the Palestinian people and accords its permanent mission in Peking full diplomatic status. Not even Egypt or Soviet Russia goes piece after piece of anti-Semitic articles. Israel was referred to as aggressor, stooge, running dog, flunkey, lackey, jackal, and Zionist bandits. Mass rallies were held in major mainland cities to "support the heroic Arab people" and denounce "Israeli aggession."

During the Middle East war of 1967, the People's Daily published an editorial on June 11 which called on the Arab people to "unite, make efforts, and fight imperialism and Zionism to the end." The struggle of the Arab people against U.S. imperialism and its lackey has merely suffered a temporary setback; its flames have not died out and never will," it said:

> Arab people, be united and make sustained and redoubled efforts! Plunge into long term fierce struggles! The 700 million Chinese people are behind you!

Such anti-Israeli fervor has not shown any sign of cooling down. Taking any Chinese Communist propaganda piece at random, one can usually find whole paragraphs or at least passages of anti-Semitism. For example, of the 32 "slogans" for May Day this year proclaimed by the Chinese Communists, No. 9 was:

> Firmly support the Palestinian people in their just struggle for national rights!

A lengthly anti-American article entitled "U.S. Imperialism in Throes of Death-bed Struggle" published by NCNA on May 25 also declared:

> U.S imperialism is heavily hit by the . . . struggles of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against U.S. imperialism and Zionism.

These support-Palestine and anti-Zionism sentiments reached its pinnacle on the mainland when a "Palestine International Week" was staged beginning May 3 this year. To condemn "crimes of aggression by U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism," a mass rally of 10,000 was held in Peking's "Great Hall of the People" in the afternoon of May 3. A message of support to the Palestinian people was adopted, reiterating that—

> The Chinese government and people have consistently supported the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and forever remain their most reliable comrades-in-arms in their struggle against the U.S.-Israeli aggressors.

On the same day, the People's Daily published an editorial entitled "Salute the Heroic Palestinian People," exhorting that "firmly grasp the gun and recover their lost homeland through armed struggle—this is the only road chosen by the Palestinian guerrillas and people." It declared:

> U.S. imperialism and Zionism will certainly be defeated.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, if the United States moves to recognize or further support Red China, it must do so with the knowl-

edge that Communist China is the most blatantly anti-Semetic nation in the world. This alone is cause for prolonged thought and extreme caution in dealing with Peking.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, lately there has been a lot of talk about "two Chinas." Little known to most of us here is the fact that there is a third China—the 19.5 million "overseas Chinese," scattered all over the world, with the majority of them in Southeast Asia.

These overseas Chinese, many of whom are already citizens of their host countries but retain their unique Chineseness, usually play such key roles in local finance and economy that it is safe to say the problems of Southeast Asia cannot be solved without first solving the local Chinese problem. An example is Singapore's Lee Kuang Yew, who has been hailed as one of the most promising leaders of the third China. There are thousands of others like him who are less well-known but no less talented leaders of their own Chinese communities.

These nearly 20 million Chinese, usually with closely knit organizations and exerting enormous influence in many Asian countries, are a force which simply cannot be ignored in considering any question concerning China. At present, these Chinese are overwhelmingly loyal to the free Chinese Government on Taiwan despite efforts by the Chinese Communists to woo them.

Only last month, 503 delegates from Chinese chambers of commerce of 52 countries and areas gathered in Los Angeles for the Eighth World Chinese Traders Convention. They came from virtually every corner of the world, from Hong Kong to South Africa, Costa Rica and the Republic of Khmere. The discussions stressed the promotion of trade, capital investment, and technical cooperation among free areas.

After the convention, 25 delegates were appointed to call on the White House. They were received by Mr. Peter Peterson, special Presidential assistant for international trade. They presented a letter to President Nixon, in which they expressed concern with American efforts to seek more contacts with Communist China. The letter came out in the New York Times Sunday as a paid advertisement:

> We earnestly hope, Mr. President, that in initiating limited contacts and trade with the Chinese mainland, serious consideration will be given to the fact that the dogma and policies of the regime there are in direct contradiction with the principles of freedom and equality, which form the prime and essential foundation of free society and free enterprise—

The letter appealed—

> We also pray that you will give your continued support to the Government of the Republic of China with its temporary seat in Taiwan, which is the repository of the Chinese culture and the point of rally for all the Chinese people and the people of Chinese extraction who cherish freedom.

Similar opposition to the Peking regime and pledge of loyalty to the Nationalist Government has been voiced many times before. Each year before the vote on the Chinese question in the U.N. General Assembly, full-page advertisements would appear in the New York Times and the New York Daily News, sponsored by overseas Chinese all over the world, to express their opposition to seating Peking in the world body.

The ad published last November 10, signed by 385 overseas Chinese organizations of the world, declared:

> Knowing the Chinese Communist regime as we do, we sincerely believe that legally and morally it is not qualified to represent our 700 million brethren now under enslavement. . . . The admission of this regime will deal a blow to the moral stature as well as the functional capability of the U.N. as an international agency for peace-keeping and to the security and welfare of the countries on the periphery of the Chinese mainland.

Overseas Chinese rally behind the national government not only in words, but also in deeds. Each year thousands of them return to the free Chinese government seat, Taiwan, for visits, for trade, and for investment. Special delegations are dispatched to take part in the October celebrations of the Double Tenth National Day on the 10th, the Taiwan Retrocession Day on the 25th, and President Chiang's birthday on the 31st. Last year alone, more than 60,000 overseas Chinese went to Taiwan for sightseeing or family visits, and for business or resettlement.

Overseas Chinese demonstrate their confidence in the economy and political stability of Taiwan by investing there heavily. Between 1952 and 1970, a total of 712 overseas Chinese investment cases with an aggregate capital of U.S. $164 million were approved by the Chinese Government. Most of the capital went into tourist hotels, food processing, textiles, papermaking, and such manufacturing enterprises as electronics and plastics.

Being a people taking great pride in their time-honored culture, the Chinese insist on receiving an education in their native language even away from home. Schools are sponsored by the overseas Chinese communities but assisted by the national Government. In school year 1969–70, such schools numbered 4,332, including colleges, middle schools, vocational schools, and elementary schools. Young people are also encouraged to attend schools on Taiwan. As of June 1970, over 9,000 overseas Chinese students were enrolled in Taiwan schools. Each year some 2,000 graduate from colleges in Taiwan and return to serve their native communities.

The Peking regime has also been trying to woo the overseas Chinese, so far with little success. They have learned through bitter experience that returning to the mainland often means ideological reform, slave camps, confiscation of capital, or general harassment.

Such persecution was especially severe during the height of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" in 1966–67. Overseas Chinese returning for family visits, investments or studies fell victim to charges of spying, ideological backwardness, or the indiscribable crime of being a counterrevolutionary. They were subject to political reindoctrination, forced labor, or jail sentences. Businessmen had their capital confiscated. Some 3,000 young overseas Chinese students in four high schools of Fukien Province alone were sent to work in communes. Scores of overseas Chinese charged with more serious crimes were tortured or openly executed.

Even overseas Chinese with relatives back on the mainland are constantly the target of Peking extortion or blackmail. They receive letters pleading for money, food, or clothing. Each year Chinese in Hongkong and Macao send millions of food parcels to the mainland, but how many reach their hungry folks remains a mystery. Recently, there is a trend developing that food parcels are discouraged in favor of direct cash remittance. Hong Kong reports indicate that many such letters are phony ones made up by Communist authorities designed to gain sorely needed foreign exchange.

For considerations of their own personal and financial security, the overseas Chinese have always had to adapt their stand to be policy of the local government despite their own secret aspirations. With the gradual withdrawal of U.S. influence from Asia, many Asian governments are being forced to revise their firm anti-Communist stand, which in turn is casting an adverse impact on the overseas Chinese communities. As we pursue this very important matter, Mr. Speaker, I would urge our Government, in reassessing its China policy, to not forget the welfare and future of over 19.5 million overseas Chinese scattered throughout the world.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) for bringing this before the House.

Important steps in the morass of diplomacy have been achieved by the United States in our relations with mainland China. While these achievements have received widespread acceptance in this country, I feel it important to interject a word of caution. The brutal and bloody takeover by the Chinese Communists and the ensuing totalitarian government that has enslaved 800 million persons should remind us that the ruling faction in China is not going to reform overnight. The ready acceptance by the United States of the Chinese overtures illustrates our great desire for peace. This desire should not, however, blind us to the revolutionary aims of the Communist regime. This is especially true in light of the revolutionary rhetoric and public denunciations of the United States by the Communists since the visit by our table tennis delegation to China.

We must enter into any negotiations with the Chinese Communists with an objective outlook devoid of emotionalism. Mainland China is anxious to play the reduced tensions with the United States against the growing tensions between the U.S.S.R. and China. China believes that reduced tensions between that country and the United States will lessen the chances of armed attack by the Soviet Union against Chinese border positions. While President Nixon has disavowed any interest in capitalizing on tensions between the U.S.S.R. and China, we must not allow Chinese leaders to use the United States as a pawn in their maneuverings within the Communist bloc.

There is a great need for the United States to confront the diplomatic question of the one-China theory. Certainly,

President Nixon has demonstrated that he is becoming increasingly anxious to recognize the mainland Chinese. While it is hard to ignore the existence of a country with the largest population in the world, we must not walk away from our commitments to the Taiwan people. There can be no capitulation on any measure that would exclude the Nationalist Chinese from the United Nations.

President Nixon should proceed cautiously in the discussion of relaxed trade with Communist China. The mainland Chinese have been firmly committed to a balanced payment of trade and the limited market that that country could provide would play a limited part in our foreign commerce.

President Nixon should be applauded for his efforts in lessening the tensions between mainland China and the United States, and I strongly encourage him to proceed with these negotiations. Our participation should, however, be directed by caution. The Chinese leaders have given us little reason to believe otherwise.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, for having arranged a time during which we might review some facts of political life as regards the so-called Peoples Republic of China and, perhaps, create a climate of somewhat more caution and reflection than appears presently to exist with respect to increasing trade, travel, and diplomatic dealings with Mao Tse-tung's Communist, totalitarian regime.

I found most interesting a recent "news analysis" by Lee Lescaze in the Washington Post of May 21, 1971, entitled "China's Foreign Policy Stresses United Front." Mr. Lescaze's article was not so startling in terms of the information it contained as for the fact that such an article could appear, given the present developments in "ping-pong diplomacy," without creating even the slightest ripple of concern or reassessment of where we are headed with our favorable response to Mao's "people-to-people" diplomacy.

Lescaze pointed out that China continues officially to espouse the Communist principle of a "united international front" against its imperialist enemies and quotes Mao as stating recently:

> The danger of the new world war still exists . . . but revolution is the main trend in the world today.

To Red Chinese leaders revolution "is not confined to internal struggle against a government, but also includes the effort of one nation to free itself from domination by another," wrote Lescaze.

Against this background the article makes several points which, though they should be recognized as elementary by anyone who knows anything about the goals and philosophy of international communism, are nevertheless significant in their indication that China is consistently pursuing Communist goals and Communist philosophy.

For one thing, Lescaze points out, some revolutions get more Chinese rhetorical support than others. China interprets its own foreign policy guidelines on a case by case basis, which led it to support the Pakistan Government against East Pakistan's efforts to achieve independence.

China is also capable of working to improve its relations with a government even while it encourages revolutionaries to overthrow that government. For instance, Peking exchanged Ambassadors with Rangoon but is still supporting the Communist Party of Burma in its guerrilla war against General Ne Win's government.

Last month China agreed to send a trade delegation to Malaysia after having hosted a trade group from Kuala Lumpur. A Philippine trade delegation was also in China in May. Yet, less than a week after the agreement with Malaysia, the New China News Agency issued a lengthy article welcoming the development of armed struggle by the revolutionary movement in Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia over the past year.

In short, China's foreign policy is entirely pragmatic, in the most unprincipled sense of that term, aimed entirely at promoting international Communist subversion and revolution.

Near the end of his article Lescaze makes his most significant observation. He says:

> China's new endorsement of armed insurrection will undoubtedly cause some dismay among Southeast Asian leaders who have been advocating closer ties with Peking, but if the pattern of the past year holds, it will be far from fatal to China's image in the area.
>
> The mood in Southeast Asia as well as elsewhere seems to be so strongly in favor of improving state-to-state relations with China that Peking's words are likely to be discounted.

And, I might add, her actions will be discounted as well.

What is the charisma of Mao Tse-tung that world leaders are so willing to fall at his feet while he sticks knives in the backs of their nations?

Both Canada and Italy have recently extended diplomatic relations with Peking. Taking advantage of an obvious opening, Peking has sent as Ambassador to Canada a close and trusted associate of Chou En-lai, Huang Hua. According to reliable sources, the Ambassador, born into a bourgeois family in Kiang Sou Province in 1915, is a life-long Communist who, at age 20 had organized Communist student groups in 20 universities and had instigated 10 riots at Yen Ching University where he was a student. Arrested for these activities he went into hiding in 1935 in Edgar Snow's apartment in Peking. He served as interpreter for Snow while he was writing his book "Red Star Over China" and, in that capacity, developed a close association with many of China's leading Communists.

He spent the entire duration of the Second World War in Chungking with Chou En-lai working for the New China News Agency.

In 1949, he was appointed to an office in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in 1953 was China's representative at the Korean peace talks in Panmunjon. In 1954, he was on the staff of Chou En-lai's mission to the Bandung Conferences in Indonesia and was at the Geneva Conference with Chou En-lai as press spokesman for China.

From 1960 to 1965, he served officially as Ambassador to Ghana but was, in fact, Ambassador at Large promoting Red China and Communist revolution throughout Africa and was an important factor in the Brazzaville takeover in 1964.

From 1966 to 1970 he was Ambassador to Cairo and was the only Red Chinese Ambassador who was never recalled or purged during the Cultural Revolution. In 1970, he returned to Peking at the opening of China's new diplomatic offensive to participate in planning new policies before taking up his duties as Ambassador to Canada.

It is clear, from his background, that his selection as Ambassador to Canada is not happenstance. In opening diplomatic relations with China, both Italy and Canada have not only done serious injury to the free world's position of opposing totalitarianism enslavement but have opened their own countries—and their neighbors—to the danger of stepped-up Chinese Communist infiltration and subversion.

Huang Hua was doubtless sent to Canada to play much the same role in North America that he earlier played in Africa and is being groomed for the day when China is admitted to the United Nations or the United States follows Canada's lead in granting diplomatic recognition.

Then he will be able to encourage and promote revolution in the United States with one hand while, in keeping with China's two-faced foreign policy, he superficially promotes trade and travel and "better relations" with the other.

Since we have already demonstrated we are blind to the involvement of international communism in the riots and marches that have kept us in turmoil the past several years, we may stand in danger of being just as supinely submissive to such double dealing as are the nations of Southeast Asia to whom Mr. Lescaze refers in his article.

If we are to avoid such an eventuality, it behooves us to see Mao's present smiling visage behind the ping-pong table as the smile that it is—of a tyrant who is up to no good and knows it.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a copy of the full text of Mr. Lescaze's article:

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1971]

CHINA'S FOREIGN POLICY STRESSES UNITED FRONT

(By Lee Lescaze)

HONG KONG, May 20.—China's foreign policy in the past year has been not only Ping-Pong and the establishment of diplomatic relations with eight nations, but also the refinement of world view based on the desire for united international front against its enemies—principally "U.S. imperialism." Chairman Mao has always spoken of the importance of having a correct world view, and his statement of May 20, 1970—whose anniversary is being celebrated by Peking today—has become the core of the approved Chinese outlook.

This outlook exists alongside China's three guidelines for conducting foreign policy, first laid down in 1963 and most recently reiterated on May 1.

They call for close cooperation with socialist countries, friendly relations with non-

socialist countries on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, and support for revolutionary movements. Clearly, the latter two can often conflict and cause, or permit, Peking some very flexible maneuvering.

Mao's statement was the first appearance of the key phraseology, but the world view has been embellished and given an even more permanent form as "a program for anti-imperialist struggle" in a Peking editorial marking the anniversary today.

"MAIN TREND" IS REVOLUTION

"The danger of new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared," Mao said in his rare public pronouncement. "But revolution is the main trend in the world today."

For revolution to succeed, Peking's editorial stressed, the people of the world must unite. International unity makes it possible, in Peking's view, for weak forces to overcome stronger ones, and is "an important magic weapon."

While the most important phrase of China's world view came from Mao, Peking picked up another constantly used term from statement by President Nixon.

In a television interview last July 1, President Nixon described the Middle East as more dangerous to world peace than Vietnam because "the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, could be drawn into confrontation . . ."

Four days later, addressing a banquet in Peking, Premier Chou En-lai was sharply critical of President Nixon's remarks, but it was not until July 30 that an article by the official New China News Agency picked up the word "superpowers."

Since that article, China has repeatedly attacked the superpowers for allegedly colluding in the Mideast and throughout the world.

"More and more small and medium-sized countries have risen to oppose the power politics of the superpowers," today's editorial in Peking's three leading journals said.

For its part, China has pledged that no matter how strong it becomes, nor how many friends and allies it makes, Peking will never behave as a superpower. Not all the powerful become superpowers, China believes, only those that try to dominate other, weaker nations.

Peking uses the themes of Mao's year-old statement and opposition to the superpowers consistently in its diplomacy around the world.

In the Middle East which gave rise to the term superpower, China's vocal support has been for "the Palestinian and other Arab people" who in Peking's view are struggling against U.S.-Soviet efforts to deny them their national rights.

LATIN AMERICAN ISSUES

In Latin America, China has seized on Peruvian and Ecuadorean demands for 200-mile territorial waters, and extols their efforts to defend their national interests against pressure from the United States.

In similar fashion, China attacks the United States for "domination" of the Organization of American States and for its trade and investment policies in Latin America, which in Peking's eyes are the actions of a superpower.

NATO and American economic policies have been China's major targets in Western Europe over the past year, Peking quotes with approval French attacks on NATO, and has occasionally portrayed the Common Market as a commendable attempt by smaller nations to unite against the giants.

In Eastern Europe, China has damatically improved its relations with Romania, and will receive a visit from Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu next month. Peking congratules Romania on its independence from the Soviet Union.

In seeking to wean nations away from one or another superpower, China has been willing to ignore ideological differences, and has thus been able to make friendly overtures to revisionist Yugoslavia and to bless the rapprochement between its own close ally, Albania, and Yugoslavia.

INDEPENDENT OR A PUPPET

In the Chinese lexicon, the alternative to being independent and joining China in supporting the worldwide revolutionary trend is to be a superpower's puppet.

For revolution as the Chinese define it is not confined to internal struggle against a government, but also includes the effort of one nation to free itself from domination by another.

The dual and overlapping nature of revolution was summed up today in the English-language edition of Hong Hong's Ta Kung Pao.

"The revolutionary struggles of the people of various countries against foreign aggression are merging with their revolutionary struggles against domestic reactionaries," the newspaper said.

The most important example of this, it added, is that "the world people's struggle against U.S. imperialism is linked with the struggle of the American people against the reactionary U.S. policies of aggression, war and racial suppression."

But some revolutions get more Chinese rhetorical support than others.

Over the past year, China has interpreted its three guidelines on foreign policy on a case-by-case basis, and has decided, for example, to support the Pakistan government against East Pakistan's effort to achieve independence.

China has often also found it possible to improve relations with a government without totally abandoning its encouragement for revolutionaries trying to overthrow that government.

Peking exchanged ambassadors with Rangoon recently, after a hiatus, but is still supporting the Communist Party of Burma in its guerrilla war against Gen. Ne Win's government.

The New China News Agency today issued a lengthy article praising the armed struggle of revolutionary movement in Southeast Asia.

The article began by quoting Mao that "revolution is the main trend in the world today," and welcomed the development of armed struggle over the past year in Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia.

VOLUME REDUCED

In recent months, China had reduced the volume of its public statements supporting these Communist insurrections, apparently in favor of improving diplomatic relations.

Last week, for example, China agreed to send a trade delegation to Malaysia after having hosted a trade group from Kuala Lumpur. A Philippine trade delegation was also in China this month.

China's new endorsement of armed insurrection in their countries will undoubtedly cause some dismay among Southeast Asian leaders who have been advocating closer ties with Peking, but if the pattern of the past year holds, it will be far from fatal to China's image in the area.

The mood in Southeast Asia as well as elsewhere seems to be so strongly in favor of improving state-to-state relations with China that Peking's words are likely to be discounted.

For its part, China seems confident that its support for revolution will not drive off any of the new friends made in the past year, or dissuade others from seeking friendship.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for reserving this time to discuss some of the implications of giving diplomatic recognition to Red China, and admission of that country to the United Nations.

It seems incredible to me that this administration would encourage any forum to accept in full partnership with free nations a country such as Red China which is dedicated to the destruction of human freedom. While I am no fan of the United Nations, everyone must agree that the U.N. through its Charter, is committed to peace, stability, and friendliness among nations. Red China has never shown such a commitment.

The regime of Mao Tse-tung, on the contrary, has been involved in Communist antipeace activities around the globe. It was the real aggressor in Korea in 1950. It is today the main supporter of Communist aggression in South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand.

Communist China has been instrumental in spreading the flames of war. It has illusions of ruling the world. If Communist China has ever manifested a desire to promote peace and tranquillity, it has escaped my notice.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, Red China has many Americans in prison which it refuses to release or provide any information about their health and welfare. Some Americans have been illegally detained since 1952. Why should the United States accord recognition to a Communist nation which has no respect for a civilized society?

A game of ping-pong does not alter man's political philosophy. Red China has continually maintained a philosophy and policy of subordinating human values to the welfare of the state. Nothing could be more antidemocratic or anti-American.

Mr. Speaker, the United States was founded on a belief that man God-given rights of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of determining his own destiny, freedom of each individual to attain heights of achievement limited only by his ability and never limited by government. Red China does not recognize these freedoms. In that Communist country, man exists not as a man but as a servant of the Government.

I would like to make one more observation. The national administration, which seeks to destroy the faith of liberty-loving Americans in their own system of government by supporting the ambitions of a slave nation such as Red China, will have no success at the next election. I say this because I believe the American people are more intelligent and have better judgment than theory-bound, superinternationalists who promote such an ignoble cause.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

RODEO STOCK PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, rodeos are one of the traditional forms of entertainment for millions of Americans. Not only do rodeos entertain people in our Western States; numerous tours are made, as well, of the East, including my own city of New York. In many respects, these performances are enjoyable entertainment, are based on intentionally inflicted cruelty upon the animals used.

The Humane Society of the United States has been particularly active in attempting to stop these practices. On March 19 of this year, the society filed a petition for rulemaking with the Federal Communications Commission, the full text of which I am including at the end of my statement. The purpose of the petition is to have the Commission prohibit the broadcasting of rodeos, or, alternatively, prohibit such broadcasting unless it includes full disclosure of the various methods and devices employed to cause the animals used in rodeos to buck, act wildly, or otherwise appear "unbroken." A portion of the society's petition pointedly depicts the cruelty inflicted:

> Rodeo performances are portrayed to the viewing public as a form of contest, pitting the skill and courage of a lone cowboy against the cunning and strength of a naturally wild, dangerous animal. The audience is led to believe that the horse endeavors to buck its rider because it is a "wild" "unbroken" horse following its natural instinct to buck. Thus the spectacle is presented as a dramatic contest between the wild forces of nature and the civilizing forces of man.
>
> The truth, sadly, is quite the opposite. The old frontier has vanished, and the herds of naturally wild unbroken horses have vanished with it. Most rodeo horses have never been "wild" and have long since been broken. A genuinely wild, unbroken horse is as rare as a quiz show contestant with a genuine photographic memory and a total knowledge of every field.
>
> The sad but true facts are that the horses and steers used in rodeos would not "perform" well when saddled with a rider unless the animal is artificially prodded in sensitive parts of its body, often with an electric prod, and with a bucking strap pulled tightly around its groin. The horse or steer begins to buck when the strap is tightened, and ceases to buck when the strap is removed—quite regardless of the presence or absence of the rider.

The shocking fact is that in some rodeos—not all—animals are victimized by devices specifically used to inflict pain, so that the viewing public will get their money's worth.

Similarly, methods are used—such as in calf roping and steer busting—which inflict cruelty upon animals, again with the aim being entertainment. For example, in the calf roping event, small calves are made to bolt from chutes at top speed due to being egged on with electrical prods. The calf is roped by a cowboy on a horse many times the calf's weight. When the horse is halted suddenly by his rider, the calf hits the end of the rope with tremendous speed; the noose tightens and chokes him; his feet are whipped out from under him; and he is violently slammed to the ground. Frequently he is seriously injured, with a broken neck or back resulting; invariably, he is subjected to pain, at the least.

In steer busting—another common rodeo event—the cowboy's aim is to get the steer to the ground so that it can be tied up. To achieve this, a running steer is roped around the horns, with the cowboy then bringing the rope around behind the animal and riding off at an angle from the running beast. When the steer hits the end of the rope his head is violently wrenched backward along his shoulder at the combined speed of his own momentum and that of the running horse—something approaching 50 miles per hour. As his head is pulled around, his body follows in the same direction, his feet are tripped up, and the animal is slammed to the ground with sufficient force to knock the wind out of him or to stun him, if he is not already dead of a broken neck. The steer that cannot subsequently get up after being tied and then released are loaded on a sled and dragged from the arena. The ones that can still run will be used again until injury or death releases them from the "sport."

I do not think we can countenance this cruelty. Not all rodeos are guilty of these practices. But these practices do exist, and the need to ban them therefore exists. Some efforts in that direction have been made. An act passed by the 1959 session of the Texas State Legislature bans steer busting in Texas. An act passed in 1965 by the Ohio State Legislature prohibits the use of devices such as bucking straps, snaffle wires, flank straps, and electric or other prods in conjunction with animals used in rodeos.

As I said, the Humane Society of the United States has filed a petition for rulemaking—RM–1768—with the Federal Communications Commission. Should the rule requested be adopted, hopefully this will force at least some diminution in the number of rodeos employing pain-inducing devices, and using cruel methods such as calf roping. In addition, the society has requested the Federal Trade Commission to institute an investigation of alleged deceptive acts and practices by the rodeo industry, and to issue a cease-and-desist order with regard to these practices. The gist of this action is to draw a comparison between the way in which rodeos are presented to the public, and the actual cruelty employed to produce "wild" animals and thereby entertaining performances.

However, none of these actions is assured of producing complete relief. Even should both Commissions act affirmatively, rodeo animals could still be victimized. I believe, therefore, that legislative action is in order to stop this cruelty and inhumane treatment of animals. Certainly such action is consonant with the Congress' own endeavors in the last session. The Animal Welfare Act of 1970, Public Law 91–579, was concerned with "the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation" of animals used for research purposes. The Horse Protection Act of 1970, Public Law 91–540, was aimed at outlawing the cruel practice of soring horses.

Unfortunately, neither of these laws protects rodeo animals. Nor does any other law. Consequently, I am today introducing the Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971. This bill makes it unlawful to transport in interstate commerce any animal which is used or intended to be used for the purpose of steer busting, calf roping, steer wrestling, or which is subjected, or to be subjected, to the various pain inflicting devices such as bucking straps. In addition, the Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971 makes unlawful the buying or transporting in interstate commerce of these devices, when the buyer or transporter has reasonable cause to believe they will be used in the course of a public performance, such as a rodeo. The act empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out its provisions.

Cruelty cannot be condoned. It is particularly unconscionable when it is inflicted upon animals solely for the purpose of providing entertainment for people. The Rodeo Stock Protection Act of 1971 is aimed at stopping the cruelty being inflicted upon rodeo animals in many instances. I urge its careful consideration, speedy hearings, and quick enactment.

Following is the petition for rulemaking filed by the Humane Society of the United States with the Federal Communications Commission on March 19, 1971. I call particular attention to the appendix of the petition, detailing the various cruelties inflicted upon rodeo animals.

[Before the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.]

RM–1768

In re: Petition for rulemaking prohibiting the deceptive broadcasting of rodeos.
To: The Commission.

PETITION FOR RULEMAKING

Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. Section 1.401(a), the Humane Society of the United States hereby respectfully petitions the Commission to adopt as part of its Rules and Regulations a requirement prohibiting the broadcasting of rodeos or, alternatively, prohibiting such broadcasting unless it includes full disclosure of any and all artificial methods or devices used to cause the rodeo animals to buck, act wildly, or otherwise appear to be "wild," "unbroken," or "dangerous."

SUMMARY

The Humane Society of the United States is a Delaware non-profit corporation having approximately 10,500 members. It is currently, and has for many years, been prominent in the field of, and devoted to, the prevention of cruelty to animals.

The broadcasting of rodeos without full disclosure of the methods and devices used to create the appearance of "dangerous" or "wildness" of rodeo animals constitutes the broadcasting of a known misrepresentation calculated to deceive the public. It is therefore contrary to the public interest and F.C.C. policy.

The broadcasting of rodeos is also contrary to the public interest because it violates the overriding public policy against cruelty to animals, and violates accepted standards of broadcasting regarding such cruelty.

The Commission has a responsibility to require that licensees adhere to the public interest standard in broadcasting. Therefore, consistent with the Commission's demonstrated authority to act in this area, Petitioners request the Commission to prohibit misleading and deceptive practices in

the broadcasting of rodeos, or alternatively, to prohibit such broadcasting altogether.

I. RODEO BROADCASTS ARE MISLEADING AND DECEPTIVE, IN VIOLATION OF FCC POLICY

Rodeo performances are portrayed to the viewing public as a form of contest, pitting the skill and courage of a lone cowboy against the cunning and strength of a naturally wild, dangerous animal. The audience is led to believe that the horse endeavors to buck its rider because it is a "wild" "unbroken" horse following its natural instinct to buck. Thus the spectacle is presented as a dramatic contest between the wild forces of nature and the civilizing forces of man.

The truth, sadly, is quite the opposite. The old frontier has vanished, and the herds of naturally wild, unbroken horses have vanished with it. Most rodeo horses have never been "wild" and have long since been broken. A genuinely wild, unbroken horse is as rare as a quiz show contestant with a genuine photographic memory and a total knowledge of every field.

The sad but true facts are that the horses used in rodeos would not "perform" when saddled with a rider unless the animal is artificially prodded in sensitive parts of its body, often with an electric rod, and with a bucking strap pulled tightly around its groin. The horse begins to buck when the strap is tightened, and ceases to buck when the strap is removed—quite regardless of the presence or absence of the rider. The rules of the Rodeo Cowboys Association themselves refer to the use of electric prods, bucking straps, and spurs to incite the animals. (See e.g., *Rodeo Cowboy Association Official Rodeo Rules*, 1967 ed., pages 47, 64, 71 and 74.) The methods and devices used, and the way in which they are deceptive and misleading, are set forth in detail in the Appendix to this Petition.

Thus, the entire "contest," as portrayed to the viewer, is a mere sham. It is not at all a contest between man and the wild dangerous forces of nature. Rather, it is a contest pitting man against the effectiveness of his own implements of torture. But this the viewing public doesn't know and isn't told—it is deceived into believing the contrary.

Most of the reprehensible torment of animals incident to rodeo production takes place beyond the view of the camera or without the knowledge of the viewing audience. The inevitable conclusion is that the producers of these spectacles realize that they would lose their audiences if the true facts were known. Civilized people would turn off their sets if they knew that the calf bolting from the chute had been induced to this speedy performance by a vicious rectal prod. They would turn away in disgust if they knew that the horse was not in fact a naturally "wild" horse, but was bucking because of the pain and sheer terror induced by a bucking strap. And even if he were not disgusted, the average viewer would rapidly lose interest in the "contest" if he knew it was an artificially contrived sham. It thus appears that these rodeo "contests" require deception in their production.

Both the Federal Trade Commission and this Commission have long condemned deceptive practices in trade and in broadcasting. The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(1)) specifically forbids "deceptive acts or practices in commerce." The mutual interest of these two agencies has frequently been focused upon deceptive advertising practices.[1] This Commission has consistently construed the public interest standard as prohibiting the broadcast of deceptive programs, and requiring that licensees avoid deceptive practices in the conduct of all their affairs.

The Commission's concern with deception in all aspects of programming is broadly summarized in its *Network Programming Inquiry, Report and Statement of Policy*, July 29, 1960 (FCC 60-970), 20 R.R. 1901, 1904:

"In fulfilling its obligation to operate in the public interest, a broadcast station is expected to exercise reasonable care and prudence with respect to its broadcast material in order to assure that no matter is broadcast which will deceive or mislead the public."

This broad concern has found expression in many areas. Thus, the Commission's regulations provide that mechanical reproductions must be announced as such so the public will not be misled to believe that they are live broadcasts (47 C.F.R. 73.653). Both the statute and the regulations require that sponsored programs be announced as such to avoid public misconception concerning the person who is persuading the public (47 U.S.C. 317; 47 C.F.R. 73.654). In this regard, see *KSTP, Inc.*, 17 R.R. 533 (1958), requiring that there be no deception concerning the source of programming.

The Commission on one occasion considered charges against the Columbia Broadcasting System regarding the staging of "false fouls" in a televised soccer game, by having the referee instruct the players to "feign injury, protest his decisions or kick the ball out of bounds in order to halt play," thus misleading the viewing public in the scheduling of time-outs for commercials. The Commission accepted CBS's assurances (that it had "not particiapted, directly or indirectly" in those deceptive practices) "as consistent with the responsibility of licensees not to mislead the public as to the reason why play is interrupted to permit the insertion of announcements." *Commission Letter to CBS on Sports Time-Outs for Commercials*, August 2, 1967 (Nos. 3940, 3955).

It is in the area of deceptive contests, moreover, that the Commission has most vigorously condemned practices which mislead the public. Thus, in *KWK Radio, Inc.*, 25 R.R. 577, 34 F.C.C. 1039, 1041 (1963), involving a fraudulent treasure hunt, the Commission held that the "perpetration of deliberate frauds upon the public is patently and flagrantly contrary to the public interest and cannot be countenanced . . ." and found such conduct grounds for license revocation. See also *Eleven Ten Broadcasting Corp.*, 33 F.C.C. 706, 22 R.R. 699 (1962), which Pike and Fischer summarizes *inter alia* as holding that the "broadcasting of fraudulent contests in the sense that knowingly deceptive clues were broadcast, is not compatible with responsible station operation, whether or not any listener was shown to have been deceived or misled." (22 R.R. at 699). And the Commission advised NBC in a letter, dated October 9, 1968 (14 F.C.C. 2d 976) that "no indication has been broadcast that celebrities have been furnished with questions or answers in advance, and your failure to apprise contestants and viewers of this fact has, under the circumstances here present, led them falsely to believe that the guest celebrities had no foreknowledge of the questions they were attempting to answer."

Deception in a rodeo is no less reprehensible than deception in a quiz show. Petitioners contend that the verbal and visual portrayal of animals as "wild", "unbroken", and "dangerous" when they are in fact often tame and docile, and buck or act "wild" and "dangerous" only because they are tormented by unseen and unannounced bucking straps and electric prods, is fully as misleading and deceptive as feeding questions or answers to quiz show contestants and celebrities.

The deceptive contest scandals of the late 1950's resulted in extensive Commission action, including recommendations for legislation providing criminal penalties for rigged contests in the 1960 amendments to the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 509). These scandals prompted a report from the Attorney General to the President containing many conclusions and statements that are particularly applicable to problems of deception in rodeo telecasts:[2]

"Measures which eliminate deception and corruption will, of necessity, have beneficial effects upon program service generally." (at 1903)

"The principal conclusion of this report, I wish to emphasize, is that the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission appear to have authority adequate under existing law to eradicate most, if not all, of the deceptive and corrupt practices which have been disclosed." (at 1904)

"Whatever the limitations upon the Commission's authority to deal with the programming may be, the prevention of deceptive contests does not appear to approach that limit. There is no question here of interference with taste, religious views, or views on public or any other issues." (at 1921)

"It appears clear that the Federal Communications Commission has authority to consider deceptive programs and deceptive advertising in connection with its licensing procedures." (at 1922)

The Commission unquestionably has authority to act in this area. It must be emphasized that the problem of deception is a particularly vital one, affecting the basic fabric of the broadcasting industry. In the report to the President on deceptive practices, the Attorney General quoted an editorial from the New York Times of November 3, 1959, summarizing the problem (19 R.R. at 1910):

"The Van Doren episode, bad as it is, is but symptomatic of a disease in the radio and television world that frequently permits things to be represented not quite as they are—a disease that can touch the whole gamut of programs from public speeches to private advertising.

It is difficult to distinguish among material deceptions. Is it more reprehensible to secretly test or prepare a contestant in a rigged quiz show than to secretly put a horse or calf into a frenzy? Both contribute to the disease that can infect the whole gamut of broadcasting. Both must be condemned.

II. RODEO BROADCASTING VIOLATES THE NAB CODE ON DECEPTION

The Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters represents a responsible and enlightened expression of acceptable broadcast standards. In pronouncing its general program standards the NAB Code specifically prohibits deceptive program practices:

"The intimacy and confidence placed in television demand of the broadcaster, the network and other program sources that they be vigilant in protecting the audience from deceptive program practices." *NAB Television Code*. (14th ed., 1959) § IV(1).

The Code goes so far as to state that:

"No program shall be presented in a manner which through artifice or simulation would mislead the audience as to any material fact." § IV(23).

Certainly representation by announcers and promoters (directly or by implication) that the animals are naturally wild and are not ill treated go further than a mere simulation in misleading the audience. The secret and deliberate torturing of docile animals to make them appear to be wild is the cruelest of "simulations."

---

[1] See, e.g., *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Colgate-Palmolive Co.*, 380 U.S. 374 (1965), condemning the undisclosed use of a prop or mock-up as a deceptive practice; *Licensee Responsibility with Respect to the Broadcast of False, Misleading or Deceptive Advertising*, November 1, 1961, (F.C.C. Public Notice 61-1316).

[2] *Deceptive Practices in the Broadcast Media*, Report of December 30, 1959, 19 R.R. 1901 (1960).

III. RODEO BROADCASTING IS CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST BECAUSE IT VIOLATES AN OVERRIDING PUBLIC POLICY AGAINST CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

The Congress of the United States has clearly established that it is the public policy of this nation to require humane treatment of animals. See, for instance, 7 U.S.C. 1901, *et seq.*, which provides that "needless suffering" is to be avoided in animal slaughter, and that it "is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that the slaughtering of livestock and the handling of livestock in connection with slaughter shall be carried out *only by humane methods.*" (emphasis added) Aside from a special exception based on religious grounds, the sole method of slaughter authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1901 as humane is as follows:

"In the case of cattle, calves, horses, . . . and other livestock, all animals are rendered insensible to pain by a single blow or gunshot or an electrical, chemical or other means that is rapid and effective, before being shackled hoisted, thrown, cast or cut."

Contrast this carefully restricted, civilized prescription for fulfilling man's basic need for food with the barbaric practices utilized in rodeos in the guise of "entertainment." Nothing is done to reduce the pain felt by rodeo animals—in fact, pain (and the resulting "wild" appearance and response of the animal) is the deliberate object of the treatment. Horses are artificially induced to buck, so that they can be ridden and "busted." Calves are "thrown" and "shackled" in the calf roping contest—their ribs may be fractured, and they may be so mauled that they are dragged from the arena in excruciating and mortal pain.

See also the Congressional statement of policy in 7 U.S.C. § 2131, requiring "humane care and treatment" in the use of animals for research purposes.

The latest Congressional expression against cruelty to animals is the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (PL 91–540, 84 Stat. 1404), which makes it illegal to train a horse by means of affecting his gait through use of burns, cuts, lacerations, or chemical agents, applied upon the feet, legs, ankles, or any other part of the horse. The language of the act makes it clear that Congress will not tolerate the mistreatment of a horse for entertainment purposes: "The Congress hereby finds (1) that the practice of soring horses for the purposes of affecting their natural gait *is cruel and inhumane treatment* of such animals." (§ 3(1)) (emphasis added)

Virtually every State legislature has enacted an anti-cruelty to animals statute. The objective of these statutes is to end needless cruelty which may arise in man's domestication of animals. This public policy against cruelty is logically amplified when instead of man using animals to provide his basic needs he looks to animals for "entertainment," as in rodeos.

IV. RODEO BROADCASTING VIOLATES THE NAB CODE ON CRUELTY

The Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters explicitly prohibits cruelty to animals:

"The use of animals, both in the production of television programs and as part of television program content, shall at all times, be in conformity with accepted standards of humane treatment." *NAB Television Code*, § IV(11).

The NAB Code also provides, in § IV(25), that the detailed presentation of brutality or physical agony by sight or sound are not permissible." Presumably, this provision is included to reflect the Code's concern that programs should not accustom the viewing audience to brutality. This seems particularly important because of the impact of television on children. A child who has just seen a calf roped, thrown, and shackled—who has just seen a calf cruelly "busted" by a cowboy who leaped on the calf with both knees in his chest to stun him—who has seen a steer's horns broken—who has just witnessed an animal dragged from the arena in agony—all in the spirit of good fun on a national television network—is a child who has been taught brutality in the "public interest."

REMEDY SOUGHT

Petitioners respectfully request the Commission to grant this Petition and initiate a rule making proceeding to adopt as part of its Rules and Regulations a requirement prohibiting the broadcasting of rodeos. Alternatively the Commission is requested to prohibit the broadcasting of rodeos unless such broadcast contains full disclosure of the artificial methods and devices used to cause the rodeo animals to buck, act wildly, or otherwise appear to be "unbroken," "wild," or "dangerous."

HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES,
MURDAUGH STUART MADDEN,
General Counsel.

VERIFICATION

I, Murdaugh Stuart Madden, do hereby certify as follows: that I am the General Counsel of the Humane Society of the United States; that I have read the foregoing Petition; and that I believe all the facts stated therein are true.

MURDAUGH STUART MADDEN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 19th day of March, 1971.

PATRICIA A. DEAVERS,
Notary Public.

I. BAREBACK BRONC RIDING, SADDLE BRONC RIDING, BRONC BUSTING

A. As promoted and advertised

The unfair and deceptive practice is to advertise this act as one involving an unbroken horse which explodes from the chute and is bucking because of the rider upon his back in an attempt to throw off or dislodge the rider. These horses are frequently advertised as wild, mean or explosive and the act is labeled as "bronco busting". The event is frequently advertised and promoted as a procedure whereby horses are being broken, and this is promoted as part of the saga and tradition of the "Old West" and the "working ranch" and "working cowboy".

If the rider manages to stay on the horse for the required ten or so seconds, two horsemen approach him in the arena—one to take the rider off the horse and one to release the bucking strap—so that the appearance is that the removal of the rider rendered the horse docile and calm. If the rider is thrown, another horseman comes to the still thrashing horse and releases the flank strap which generally makes him absolutely docile and calm. This is done at a time when all spectators' eyes are supposed to be on another event, the next rider, the clowns, etc.

B. As it is

Generally the horses used in these bucking horse events are neither wild nor unbroken. They are not bucking in an attempt to dislodge the cowboy. They are thrashing and writhing in fear, frenzy and agony because of the "bucking strap" that has been pulled tight against the horse's groin just as the horse leaves the chute. The more appropriate expression would be that the horse is "expelled" from the chute since simultaneously with the opening of the chute door the flank strap is pulled tight, the horse is frightened, tormented, kicked and frequently assaulted with an electric prod, all of which causes and creates the frenzied thrashing that is called "bucking".

The majority of these bucking broncs were "broken" many years ago and would not "buck" without the artificial and deceptive devices which are described above. It is clear that what is done to a horse in a rodeo ring is the opposite of the way a horse was "broken" in the old West on the old ranches. There the goal was to teach the horse not to buck. Today these so-called wild and unbroken "bucking" horses are tormented into bucking time and time again. In the few instances where a horse has become truly mean and wild, it would be fair to compare him to a human who had been tormented beyond all endurance and had gone crazy.

II. BULL RIDING

A. As promoted and advertised

The bull riding event is promoted and advertised as a contest between man and beast, full of extreme danger to the man, where he pits his talents and skills against a mean, vicious animal, i.e., in most cases, the Brahma bull.

B. As it is

Frequently the bull would not even leave the chute unless he were tormented and frightened out by the use of any and all conceivable means including the frequent use of the electric "hot shot" to frighten and prod him. Once out of the chute there is little reason to believe that he is bucking simply in order to throw off the rider since he, too, is being tormented with a flank strap, and in addition, he must have a bell tied around his stomach to assist in tormenting and annoying him and to keep him bucking, thrashing, and twisting. As far as the bull being vicious and mean, usually these qualities have been instilled in him.

The Brahma bull is the same animal seen pulling plows and carts throughout India and Pakistan. The precise nature of the tormenting that goes into making these docile beasts of burden become angry, tormented, "vicious," "killer" animals should not be withheld from the paying public.

III. CALF ROPING AND STEER BUSTING

A. As promoted and advertised

These events are frequently advertised as coming directly from the tradition of the "Old West". It is said that they are frequently harder on the cowboy than on the animals, that the animals are not mistreated and few are hurt. When they are hurt seriously, the promoters and the announcers invariably divert the crowd's attention from the animal and make a statement such as "He just got the wind knocked out of him, folks," as the animal is hauled from the arena on a sled.

B. As it is

In the calf roping event, a small calf is roped by a cowboy on a horse many times the calf's weight, and when the horse stops suddenly the calf is thrown up into the air and comes crashing to the ground. Frequently he is seriously injured; he is always hurt in the normal sense of the word. The calf's sudden exit from the chute is generally the result of tail twisting, kicking and jabbing which frightens him into the arena.

In steer busting, animals are often injured or killed. In two-man steer roping this is also true. The animals are stunned and unconscious, frequently dead or dying, as they are dragged out of the arena while the announcer or promoter assures the crowd that they have simply had the wind knocked out of them.

The danger to the animal and the incidence of injury to the animal is fraudulently and deceitfully covered up and kept from the public. In addition, the number of animals injured as a cowboy learns to rope calves and to ride "bucking horses" and "wild bulls" probably far exceeds those tormented and injured in the rodeo performance themselves, and nowhere is this frightful toll explained to the purchasing public.

IV. WILD HORSE RACES

A. As promoted and advertised

This event, by its title, would indicate a race involving "wild" horses.

B. As it is

More often than not horses in a "Wild Horse Race" are not really "wild".

When wild horses are used, it is customary for them to be mounted by one cowboy with the assistance of a second cowboy in the following manner: The assisting cowboy often sinks his teeth into the ear of the horse in order to hurt the horse sufficiently to distract him from noticing the other cowboy mounting from the opposite side. It is false and deceptive not to explain this most important facet of the "Wild Horse Race" to the consumer and paying audience.

V. THE HERITAGE AND TRADITION OF THE OLD WEST

A. As promoted and advertised

Rodeos are consistently advertised as a portrayal of the heritage and tradition of the "Old West" with the events presumably representative of the day to day routine of "working cowboys" on "working ranches."

B. As it is

The consuming public is being deceived into thinking that they are viewing a re-enactment of the "Old West" through false and deceptive advertising, when in fact the following is true:

1. Horses were not "broken" by tormenting, frightening or agitating them. Just the opposite was and is true, since the horse was being taught to accept the saddle and rider rather than to be frightened or enraged when saddled and ridden.

2. No calf was ever intentionally roped in a manner which would even possibly, much less probably, injure and hurt him, or in any way detract from his value for food or breeding stock.

3. No steer was ever intentionally wrestled in a manner which would even possibly, much less probably, injure or hurt him.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Gorham Dummen Abbott, a native of Maine, was active in early American education. He established the Spingler Institute in New York City.

AMERICA'S POSTURE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND OUR RELATIONS WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TERRY) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, lest the sound of a ping-pong ball drown out the cells for realism, I rise today to express my concern about our posture in Southeast Asia and our relations with China. We are moving toward a conclusion of our involvement in Vietnam and most of Southeast Asia. The American people have grown tired of the endless reports of battles and casualties from jungles of the southern part of Indochina.

But we have committed too many resources to that area to now precipitously embrace Communist China. The admission of the American table tennis team to Communist China does not mean we are about to sign an eternal mutual defense pact with the mainland.

What it does mean, is that an element of reason has finally prevailed in Peking which is moving it toward a more open policy to the international community. I believe we would all like to see such a policy succeed as long as Communist China is willing to accept the responsibility of working with other nations.

The very important question of membership in the United Nations will undoubtedly come up this fall. There has been some evidence that the United States may shift its policy and work for representation in the U.N. by both Nationalist China and Communist China.

But the Government in Peking is a wily adversary. They have shown they are singularly interested in the expansion of communism. When we talk of peaceful coexistence, I am often concerned that this means no conflict until we are in such a weakened state, that the other side can easily overwhelm us.

We are all interested in improving relations with any nation which is willing to support negotiation over confrontation as a means for settling international disputes. As long as there are nations on this earth, we will have international differences. But we must be aware of the very real danger of working with a nation whose recent history is clouded with bellicose statements and actions which threaten our very existence.

MEETING THE NATION'S HEALTH MANPOWER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has completed its deliberations on the Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971. These two bills were reported to the full committee as H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630. The full committee reported the bills out favorably on June 2, 1971.

As one who has the honor and pleasure to serve on the subcommittee, I would like to comment on the outstanding work performed on this legislation by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS). Many long hours of hearings were conducted on the vital, but complex, subject of the Federal role in the training of health professionals in this country. As a physician, I was extremely impressed with our chairman's grasp of the intricate problems involved in this area of legislative endeavor. Great consideration was given throughout the deliberations to the concerns of the individual members of the subcommittee, and the final new bills reported out have been co-sponsored by myself and nearly all the other members of the subcommittee.

I am confident that H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630 are excellent vehicles for coping with the U.S. health manpower crisis, and I sincerely hope that they will receive favorable attention from the House.

I am very concerned, however, that sufficient funds to make this legislation effective once it is passed may not be appropriated. The Committee on Appropriations is currently considering the HEW budget for fiscal year 1972, the first of 3 years covered by the health manpower bills just reported. The Administration's requests for fiscal year 1972 health manpower programs are clearly inadequate to meet the needs. We on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment have carefully considered the problems involved in the health manpower area and the authorizations contained in our newly reported bills reflect the actual needs as we see them. I would urge the Committee on Appropriations to approve a bill adequate to fully fund H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a comparison of the administration's requests for health manpower appropriations for fiscal year 1972 with the authorization levels contained in H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630:

[In thousands]

Item	Fiscal year 1972 administration request	Authorization, fiscal year 1972, H.R. 8629	Authorization, fiscal year 1972, H.R. 8630
Medical, dental, and related health professions:			
Institutional support	$260,358	$372,800	
Direct loans	18,750	40,000	
Scholarships	28,887	20,000	
Construction	98,000	225,000	
Educational grants and contracts and direct operations [1]	17,050	[2] 80,000	
Loan guarantees and int. subsidies (const.)		8,000	
Subtotal	423,045	745,800	
Nursing:			
Institutional support	$18,200		$78,000
Direct loans	9,610		20,000
Scholarships	17,000		17,000
Traineeships	11,470		20,000
Construction			30,000
Educational grants and contracts and direct operations [1]	10,720		[2] 1,500
Loan guarantees and int. subsidies (const.)			1,000
Subtotal	67,000		167,500

[1] Includes: project grants for training; grants to hospitals for family medicine training; and health manpower education initiative awards.

[2] Annual authorizations not required; permanent authorization contained in title III of Public Health Service Act.

[3] Full utilization grants.

I also want to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent remarks Chairman ROGERS made at a press conference on May 20, 1971, when we introduced the Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 and the Nurse Training Act of 1971:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS PRESS CONFERENCE, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1971

When we began to consider amending the Health Manpower Professions bill this year, we knew we did not want to continue a program which was not goal-oriented. We were determined not to simply extend present legislation because we knew from statistics and personal experience that we were not, indeed, meeting the health manpower needs of this nation.

The problem in numbers was: 50,000 physicians needed/150,000 to 200,000 nurses needed, and with all other health worker categories, the present total shortage is close to a half-million.

The forecast for progress if we followed a simple extension was that we would never see the line of need cross the line of available doctors and nurses. During hearings, Secretary Richardson gave credence to this by admitting that HEW had no goal, no plan to achieve the proper ratio of doctors and nurses to our population.

Gentlemen, this sub-committee is today introducing a clean bill, which if fully enacted, will eliminate that gap between need and physicians by 1978.

We have developed a new formula for capitation which will accomplish two goals—it will accelerate the production of physicians and at the same time offer economic incentives to medical colleges to in turn accelerate their programs. The capitation formula will at the same time have the greatly needed spinoff benefit of helping many medical schools which are presently in dire financial straits.

We have included in the legislation, incentives to develop new categories of health personnel, including assistant physicians. And this is part of our overall premise that in this manner we can more fully utilize the highly trained physician while allowing lesser-trained personnel to do work which now burdens the physicians. So better utilization of personnel is a major point in our bill.

The bill requires each medical school to enroll five percent more students or 10 students, whichever is greater. This figure is also in the Nurse Training Bill.

I would like to make a very important point about the overall concept of these two bills in relation to the entire health delivery system.

When this nation embarked on the twin program of health insurance called Medicare and Medicaid, we made a very serious mistake. With very good intention we set out to bring millions of our citizens into contact with health services which most would have otherwise not have had available. Seventeen million citizens are now using Medicaid.

But we did not consider adequately the burden which we would be creating on the entire health service spectrum—personnel and institutions. The result is obvious. We have overburdened every aspect of health services and have a tremendous need for resources. In addition, this shortage fed the continuing fire of inflation in the health field, producing an annual rise of between 15 and 17 percent in costs over the past four or five years.

We are today offering legislation long overdue to help solve the crisis of need. And we will make every effort in the coming year to return to this legislation to prepare for any form of national health program which might develop in the Congress. We do not intend to see a heightened crisis develop in manpower as a result of bringing in a new form of health care.

We are constructing through this legislation a goal-oriented system of producing physicians, osteopaths, dentists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, veterinarians, pharmacists, and other health professionals. For this, the lack of health personnel, is at the core of our existing health crisis. Additionally, we have made provisions to improve the situation in health manpower shortage areas, and have provided a new program for the development of new medical schools.

WORK AND LIFE OF R. E. McNEILL, JR., SERVED MANKIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the 1970 annual report of Manufacturers Hanover Trust of New York carries a statement about a man.

An institution, wrote Ralph Waldo Emerson in one of his essays, is the lengthened shadow of a man.

That statement kept coming to mind as I reflected on what I wanted to say about a man I greatly admire and respect upon his retirement for an official capacity with a great banking institution—R. E. (Jeff) McNeill, Jr.

Because we are both Floridians, because he came from the area which I am now proud to represent, I wanted to say something about a man who has been a powerful force for the good of this Nation through his lifelong service as a banker.

For there are few areas in American life which are more critical to the success of our free enterprise system than a healthy and dynamic financial industry.

And, I submit that few men who have ever entered into the demanding life of the banker have ever been as successful, or made a greater contribution than has Jeff McNeill. And if there is one thing that can be said, it is that he always cared about the problems of individuals and people.

Because of his service, this Nation is richer—the profession of banking is richer because of accomplishment and example.

I have a number of friends who have known Jeff McNeill all of his life.

Born and raised in Live Oak, Fla., many of his classmates and family reside in the area and are my constituents and friends. They told me of a young man who was constantly on the move, doing things, with an intense interest in learning about people and if there was a task to be done—getting on with that work.

He was the president of his graduating class of 1924 and I remarked to a classmate of his at the accolade paid him in the Suwannee High School annual of that year:

And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
That one "red" head could carry all he knew.

At 19 he entered the naval stores business as manager of a Florida plant which extracts gum from pine trees to make resin and turpentine. He had himself declared legally of age so he could make contracts. He bought an interest in the business on credit, managed it successfully, and sold out at a profit.

At night he was studying both law and accounting, working with a lawyer and an accountant. This was no desultory booklearning. Rather, it was intensive work with practical men several nights a week. Out of this experience came the realization that banking was his chief interest.

Silver has replaced the red in his hair, and today upon his retirement, the leaders in financial institutions of this Nation express that same regard expressed in that high school annual for his keen judgment.

There are few areas of banking in which he has not had personal experience, from the teller cage to the highest official of the fourth largest bank in these United States.

His first experience in banking came in a small bank in Okeechobee of which he was an officer at the age of 22. In 2 years, 1929, he moved to the Central Farmers Trust Co. of West Palm Beach—and from a clerical position there worked his way up, becoming successively assistant secretary, secretary, vice president, trust officer, and then president at the age of 31.

It was during these years that the depression, which struck our Nation so hard, hit local businesses. Mr. McNeill added a new chapter to his banking experience when the bank took over numerous enterprises, including running hotels, apartment houses, and even the famous Everglades Club of Palm Beach.

Out of those experiences came an awareness of the vital role of banking that has carried him forward in a fantastic career of service.

Central Farmers Trust Co. was the only bank out of nearly a dozen in the area which survived. It had been organized jointly by The Hanover and City Bank Farmers Trust Co., both of New York City, and controlled a large share of the banking business in the locality.

When it became necessary to voluntarily liquidate this branch, it was Jeff McNeill who was given the responsibility for another difficult task. The deposit accounts were transferred to the Atlantic National Bank of West Palm Beach and the Central Farmers delivered cash, U.S. Government bonds and other assets to match all deposits.

Central Farmers was put in voluntary liquidation in 1938 and 2 years later its trust business was wound up. By this time, Mr. McNeill was president of the Atlantic National.

The president of the Hanover Bank had watched this dynamic young man and asked him to come to New York to compete in the world of financial giants—and typical of Jeff McNeill, every challenge was another exciting mountain to climb, but more importantly, an opportunity to serve.

He came on as a vice president of the Hanover Bank in 1940 and by 1950, he was president and a trustee. During the 9 years preceding his election as president, he had devoted most of his time to out-of-town divisions, supervising war financing, term loans, general credits and other special matters.

Perhaps the most difficult task he has ever faced began on September 8, 1961,

the day that the Hanover Bank and Manufacturers Trust Co. merged.

In this merger, Mr. McNeill was successful in bringing together two giants of the industry—but two of the most dissimilar institutions in that field.

Hanover was a wholesale bank—one that dealt with big corporate customers while Manufacturers Trust was everything that Hanover was not. It started out in Brooklyn—a borough where Manufacturers Hanover is still the No. 1 bank today—had relatively little big corporate business, and never quite lived down a reputation for being rather seedy. But, it was New York's No. 5 bank in terms of deposits, its No. 1 bank in terms of branches.

Hanover Bank had the customers—Manufacturers Trust the money.

It was the conviction of Mr. McNeill that by merging these divergent institutions, a new institution could emerge which could serve better in every area and while that was difficult task enough, it became a corporate nightmare when suit was filed by the Justice Department to dissolve the merger on antitrust grounds the date the merger was completed.

There is much to be critical of in the way the suit was initiated on the part of the Government. In my opinion, it was an example of attacking an institution because it might be politically popular, rather than on the merits of the merger.

Many of my colleagues remember the determination with which Jeff McNeill met this challenge. Almost singlehandedly he sat down to reason with every reasonable Member of Congress he could talk with.

Gradually, many Members understood that the question which he was discussing was larger than one single financial institution, and that the final resolution of this question would have a profound effect on the future of the Nation's financial institutions.

In 1966 the Congress passed the Bank Merger Act which set aside the antitrust suit and McNeill's new challenge was to move the bank forward to catch up with other institutions that had moved forward during the period of litigation.

An article in Business Week summarized the problem that faced Manufacturers Hanover with the comments that:

Because no one knew how the find would end, the bank had to beg, persuade, plead and bleed to keep old customers.

That article also stated that the bank has been moving at double-time since 1966.

Mr. McNeill had become president of the merged institution in September 1961 and chairman of the board in 1963, retiring from the latter post at the end of January 1971.

Beta Gamma Sigma is an honorary commerce fraternity which honors, at its convention, a very select list of men they consider to be the truly great leaders of American commerce.

In 1951, R. E. McNeill, Jr., was an honoree.

I think a portion of his acceptance address says a great deal about the man:

I am profoundly grateful for the honor that you have paid me here tonight, and I thank every one of you.

The credit, however, is mine only to share. There are many to whom I owe my thanks.

My case is not one of "owing so much to so few", to use a well-known phrase. I owe not much, but everything, to many—to many people, and to one principle.

The principle, of course, is our American way—the principle of free enterprise, the foundation of American business. Under any other system, I would not be speaking to you now, if I were allowed to speak at all. This is our heritage, to have, to hold, and to pass on. We may not find it today as easy to preserve as it was to receive.

The people to whom credit is due are many. It would be wonderful if my mother and father could be here tonight. This evening would give them much happiness. I would be proud to have them share it with me. Dad was, with me, a very patient teacher. His pupil, I know, was often hot-headed, stubborn, and unwilling.

To my wife, for her love, patience, sacrifice, and faith, I shall be forever grateful. She is with me tonight. I offer her my thanks.

There are others so very important. My friends along the road leading this way. My associates of many years. Some have now gone—others are retired—and many others are still carrying more than their share of day by day business burdens.

It has been my privilege to know and work with true business statesmen—George W. Davison, whom you have similarly honored, my senior associates at the Hanover, who are to me the personification of American business as it should be. Besides them, I think of and pay tribute to the many who have worked with me from a teller's cage to the corner office. For their attitude and for their continued help and cooperation, I am and shall always be grateful.

You understand, I hope, why I feel, as I accept this honor, that I must not fail to give the credit where it is so properly due. Alone, I would be very small. I can only hope to be big enough to appreciate what so many have done—and still do.

Typical of the man, the text of his address was his profound concern for the need for trained, dynamic and honorable men in the banking profession—and how important a sound system is for every area of this Nation's life.

Here is one portion of that speech, which I wish could be read and understood by the leaders of business and industry, and more especially by the people of our Nation:

For the good of America and to preserve our economic system, sound commercial bank management is a "must." Laws alone will not—and have never—served to evolve a safe and serviceable banking system. I can today comply with the law and still run a very, very, poor bank. Political planning never has been, and never will be, a substitute for training, knowledge, experience, and integrity. Judgment and experience must determine the right course at any given state of an economic situation.

What is the solution? The answer, in my opinion, is education—"classroom training and education". Properly handled, it is our one great tool and our only solution. Straight thinking, however, will not tolerate unproven theories and experimentations, or trial balloons cast aloft, to land, explode and cause alarm, in strange places.

This thought may—and I hope will—instill confidence and create courage in the graduates of the School of Commerce, Accounts and Finance. The value of their background is greater today than ever. They perhaps might like to ponder whether or not experience in banking is not approaching the mechanical, rather than the mental processes.

A moment ago I referred to banking as a "profession". That it is. Unless students are willing to accept such a conclusion, as would a doctor or a lawyer, then they should pass up the banking business. It is not glamorous—it is not quick success—but it is romantic, and to the hardworking young man or woman it offers a great future.

Jeff McNeill has been handed many responsibilities, challenges and burdens in life.

He is a director of Chrysler Corp. He has served as a director or an official of the American Smelting & Refining Co., American Title Insurance Co., Continental Corp., Continental Insurance Co., and certain subsidiaries, Florida Power and Light Co., and Union Carbide Corp.

There have been a large number of civic and professional endeavors which he has given of himself tirelessly and selflessly—all with the same quiet and unassuming manner which has typified his life.

Manufacturers Hanover is a great institution. There are over 11,000 people who are members of its working family. Assets today are around $13 billion with another $6 billion in its trust department.

But, what I wanted to do when I started on this address was to tell something about a man. One can read about these accomplishments in a hundred or more publications, but I am more impressed with the fact that he never lost that touch with people.

I remember a Greek immigrant who was returning to his native land for a visit and had collected some money to give to his home village to commemorate that visit. Mr. McNeill helped him get his American dollars exchanged and sent a large basket of fruit to the ship on which the late Mike Tsacrios and his wife were to sail.

It impressed me that the late Mike Tsacrios, who was my friend, never forgot that simple act of kindness.

And these type stories could be repeated again and again.

In having known many of his friends for many years, I know that there are two people who have made everything worthwhile.

When he and Florence Stevens were united in marriage, he found the perfect helpmate for an exacting career.

I know this lovely lady and only a short time ago, my mother talked with her at a Florida Garden Club meeting. Mrs. McNeill has been president of the New Jersey Garden Clubs and has made a great contribution in her own right.

They have one daughter, Bama, now Mrs. Arthur William Steinman of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. She has been a great source of pride and a daughter who is very close to her father.

His own father is a man who inspired a boy from a moderate background in Live Oak, Fla., to scale the heights. His mother encouraged him in his pursuits and greatly influenced her son.

His brother, Dave, is a fine man who still makes his home in Live Oak.

We could say a great deal more about his career and his accomplishments.

But, the thing I think I will always remember about Jeff McNeill is a statement that an employee of the bank of many, many, years made about Jeff re-

cently. This employee is retiring shortly himself.

He told a member of my staff that when you stood in the presence of Mr. McNeill, you knew you were in the presence of something great.

Nothing I could say could improve on that.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL—PART III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit today the third in a series of articles and testimony concerning the Defense Authorization bill. The testimony was given by Mr. Joseph S. Clark in open hearings before the Armed Services Committee.

As a former Senator, serving as a member or chairman of subcommittees on manpower employment and poverty, education, housing, and foreign relations, and a former colonel in the Army Air Force in World War II, and currently the president of the World Federalists, U.S.A., and chairman of the Task Force of the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy, Mr. Clark is well qualified to comment on defense spending. Looking at defense spending in the light of competing domestic needs and military capability in the context of foreign policy objectives and security needs, Mr. Clark poses some penetrating questions which challenge some of the assumptions underlying the authorization bill and the budget request for fiscal year 1972. But these are the kinds of questions to which constituents throughout the country are increasingly seeking answers.

Such a perspective as Mr. Clark outlines is of utmost importance to the debate on the authorization bill and the consideration of my amendment to hold the fiscal year 1972 authorization to the amount authorized for the current year:

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF JOSEPH S. CLARK, CHAIRMAN OF TASK FORCE ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT OF THE COALITION ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND MILITARY POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Gentlemen, I appreciate your willingness to hear me for no more than five minutes this morning. I shall be guided by your restriction on time, but am filing with you a somewhat longer statement than I will have time to present orally.

I appear before you in connection with H.R. 3818 wearing several different hats. First I am Chairman of the Task Force of the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy. I am filing with my statement several copies of the brochures of the Coalition indicating our purposes and activities. We now have 37 nation-wide civic and religious groups who are members of our Coalition.

Second, I am President of World Federalists, USA, a national civic organization dedicated to the cause of World Peace Through World War. I am filing with the committee several copies of our brochure entitled "Our Work Is Peace . . . It Should Be Yours."

Third, I am a former U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania who served for some years as a member or as Chairman of sub-committees on manpower employment and poverty, education, housing and foreign relations. In the latter capacity it was my privilege to travel on behalf of the committee to Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, Israel, Egypt, Indonesia, New Zealand and Vietnam in the interest of studying the foreign policy of our country, and reporting in writing to the Foreign Relations Committee and the public, the result of my studies in those countries.

Fourth, I appear before you as a former member of the Army Air Force who served for two years in the China-Burma theater in World War II as a Colonel, and saw firsthand, the impact of our foreign policy in Asia.

OBLIGATION OF THE COMMITTEE

We suggest that you gentlemen, in considering this Military Procurement Bill, have a far greater obligation to your constituents and to the country than merely to pass on the specific requests of the Department of Defense for particular military expenditure authorizations.

We suggest that in the interest of our country you must ask yourselves and answer a number of specific questions involving where our country is headed, what should our foreign policy be, how large a military establishment do we need, and can we afford to sustain it?

We must keep America safe and free for all of our citizens in the years immediately ahead. This involves considering Federal expenditures to meet domestic needs, as well as funding requests from the Department of Defense for military expenditures. It is accordingly not enough for you to conclude that we do not need this additional aircraft carrier, or that the Defense Department has not asked for enough money for research and development, or whether the average manpower strength of our armed forces is fixed at an acceptable figure.

You must ask yourselves, and answer, not only to the House of Representatives, but to your own constituents, and to the country, much larger, far more searching questions. Among them are:

1. Is U.S. Military policy obsolete in the light of the international and domestic situation which confronts us? To this we give an unqualified yes.

2. What are the real requirements of our national security? We suggest they do not call for the enormous expenditures set forth in this Bill and in the requested military appropriations for which this Bill is a preliminary requirement. We suggest this is not a Bill for the defense of the U.S. but rather a Bill to enable us to carry on offensive military operations all over the world.

3. Who is the "real enemy" of the U.S.? Is it the Russians? Is it the Chinese? Is it the North Vietnamese? Or is it the Pentagon and its industrial allies who are tearing this country apart for no sensible reason affecting our national security. I suggest we have all been brainwashed by skillful propaganda paid for at taxpayers' expense for year after year, and that the foreign threat to our national security has been grossly exaggerated.

4. Is there justification for sacrificing our needs at home to feed the hungry, to educate the young, to clear our streams and air of pollution, to re-build our cities, to the demands for even greater national military offensive expenditures? We say no.

5. Are we content to have the U.S. case by the military and their contractor allies in the role of policemen of the "free" world? Are we engaged in a holy war against godless communism? We say no. There is room in this world for all people to live together in cooperation and harmony without the need for this constantly escalating arms race.

6. What are these excessive military expenditures doing to our country? We say they are tearing it apart, both our economy and our relationships with each other.

7. Where does the major thrust of inflation come from? We say it comes from our military budget which requires Federal deficit after Federal deficit, and makes the stabilization of wages, profits and the cost of living impossible.

8. And finally, how can we stop this nonsense? We say the first step is to cut our overall military budget from the 76 billion dollars requested by the President for fiscal 1972, to no more than the 60 billion which competent civilian students of the problem believe is adequate for our national security.

So far as H.R. 8687 is concerned, the following reductions in the authorizations requested by the Department of Defense should be made. Our recommendations are based in large part on the 400 page "Counter Budget—a blueprint for changing national priorities," recently published by the National Urban Coalition after a year of study by competent experts.

It is also based on a report of the panel of inquiry issued after "Citizen's Hearing on an Alternate Defense Budget for the U.S." sponsored by the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy conducted on March 25th, 1970. Members of the panel were Dean of the Georgetown Law Center and former deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Adrian S. Fisher, W. Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor and myself. These two studies were conducted independently of each other. They reached almost the same conclusions. To be more specific:

1. We should stop further expenditures for MIRV—we don't need it. We have presently enormous overkill which rules out a first strike by the Russians. They have no defense against our present nuclear capability.

2. We should stop further expenditure for the B1 bomber. It is obsolete for effective nuclear airfare. The B.52 gives completely adequate bombing power for conventional war.

3. We should stop further expenditures on the ABM. It won't work anymore than the Soviet ABM will work. It merely stimulates the USSR to further efforts through the SS.9 to assure a swamping of the ABM defense.

4. With regard to nuclear or strategic weapons, it is obviously necessary pending the results of the SALT talks, to maintain an adequate nuclear deterrent. But a first strike on our part should be ruled out. And there is no need to produce or stockpile nuclear war-heads in excess of our present inventory. While invulnerability of the deterrent is important, there is no need to build competing offensive systems to gratify the vanity of one or more of the Armed Services.

5. We should cut back average military manpower for the coming fiscal year from 2.6 million dollars to no more than 2 million at the most. Actually, 1.5 million would be enough to provide for our national security if we are to have no more Vietnams. This committee should frame its budget in the light of a withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam by the end of fiscal 1972 at the latest.

6. Conventional military forces and hardware should be cut back to a level adequate to defend territory of the U.S. against attack, and to participate on an appropriate basis with other countries with peacekeeping or peacemaking efforts in the Middle East, Europe and elsewhere.

7. There are a number of obsolete or at least obsolescent or ineffective offensive and defensive systems which could be phased out without prejudice to national security. Among these are:

(a) The SAFE early warning system.

(b) The proposed 15th nuclear carrier. Actually, we do not need the 14 attack carrier task forces we now have.

(c) Further purchase of the very expensive C–5A troop carrier airplane of which we have presently enough for foreseeable emergencies.

(d) Further large expenditures for anti-submarine warfare which has proven it is ineffective.

(e) We should stop all expenditures for chemical, biological and radiological methods of warfare.

(f) We could cut back on expenditures for anti-aircraft artillery since there is no reasonable prospect of a sophisticated air

attack against U.S. forces engaged in defending our country.

(g) Nor do we need more attack tactical aircraft. Our present 22 wings are far more than we need.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion the committee should rid itself of the "worst case" psychology which the Pentagon uses to brainwash members of Congress and the general public. The Russian threat to our country's legitimate foreign policy objectives, is vastly over-estimated by the Pentagon. The Chinese threat is non existent. Our appraisal of the dangers to our national security should be based not on the most malevolent of intentions nor on an excessive appraisal of the capabilities of our alleged enemies. In the light of our critical domestic priorities it should be based on a reasonable appraisal of threats to the national security of the U.S. assuming we are determined to have no more Vietnams, to stay home and mind our own business, and to contribute in any reasonable way to peace-making or peace-keeping forces under the auspices of the U.N.

I do not consider myself an expert in the field of weaponry capable of passing final judgment on the necessity for either building or maintaining these sophisticated weapons, or on maintaining so large an armed force in uniform. I merely raise questions propounded by experts far more competent than I as to the necessity for these enormous expenditures, in the light of our domestic requirements and any rational security needs.

However, substantial cuts totalling many billions of dollars must be made promptly in our military budget in order to assure a proper re-ordering of our national priorities. The Federal government must play a larger role in meeting our domestic crises. The military budget is the only feasible place to find the money, and this committee has a heavy responsibility for meeting the challenge thus propounded.

RED CHINA, PRISON OF 600 MILLION CHINESE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now told by our leaders presently in power that they find the Communist regime of Red China mellowing and are in the process of authorizing trade and tourism to that country.

The flimsy excuse being suggested is that the Communist power structure of Mainland China imprisons so many human beings—600 million, but trade and recognition of the Red Chinese regime can only be used as political propaganda to continue the Chinese Bolsheviks in power and to prove that the free world has been wrong all along.

The 600 million captive lives in Red China cannot be accepted as the reason for friendly relations with that Communist party; rather, they are all the more reason to continue our trade and travel prohibitions. This is not a time for world politics or world business as usual. The proposals by the administration, if carried out and tolerated by the American people, can only result in 600 million Chinese citizens finding themselves forever hopelessly enslaved and with less hope of ever overthrowing their captors or achieving self-determination.

To those who ignore the realities of life and to those who forget and forgive so readily, I insert the United Nations Resolution 498(V), adopted February 1, 1951, which found the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China guilty of aggression in Korea.

There has been no peace in Korea to this date, 20 years later. There remains only shaky cease-fire where American boys continue to become United Nations casualties whenever it is to the cadistic political satisfaction of the Communists of North Korea, the puppet ally of Red China.

The resolution follows:

The General Assembly,

Noting that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea,

Noting that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has not accepted United Nations proposals to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement, and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large-scale attacks upon United Nations forces there,

1. *Finds* that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there has itself engaged in aggression in Korea;

2. *Calls* upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;

3. *Affirms* the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression;

4. *Calls upon* all States and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea;

5. *Calls upon* all States and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea;

6. *Requests* a Committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee referred to in the following paragraph reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

7. *Affirms* that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this end.

In order that our pro-Red Chinese advocates in the United States can have the detailed U.N. text of the Red Chinese aggression against Korea, I include portions of the report as contained in the Yearbook of the United Nations for 1951 at this point in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM THE YEARBOOK OF THE UNITED NATIONS—1951

B. CONSIDERATION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN PLENARY SESSION

The report of the First Committee (A/1770) containing the draft resolution was considered by the General Assembly at its 327th plenary meeting on 1 February 1951. It was decided, by 32 votes to 5, not to discuss the report.

In explanation of their votes, the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR stated that the would vote against the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee because the whole sense of that draft resolution was to prevent agreement. The nucleus of that proposal—a false and completely unfounded accusation that the People's Republic of China had committed aggression—was necessary to the United States as a point of departure for the extension of further aggression both in Korea and against China.

In the First Committee there has been definite opposition to the aggressive course of the ruling circles of the United States; that fact, they maintained, could not be ignored. The attempt of the twelve Powers to find a possibility of a peaceful settlement by negotiations had been unsuccessful because of the crude and open pressure, blackmail and threats against those who intended to support the twelve-Power proposal. Many countries economically or otherwise dependent on the United States had thus been compelled to fall in line, they stated; adoption of the draft resolution would defeat the fundamental principles of the Charter and violate the sovereignty of many nations which had been forced to support it.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government supported the proposal because it attached primary importance to the work of the good offices committee. It was the United Kingdom's hope that the group would first study the various communications from the Peking Government in order to see what light they shed on the possibilities of peaceful negotiation and what further clarification was required.

The programme outlined by the representative of Canada, he said, also contained many valuable ideas which might form the basis of an eventual settlement. The emphasis he suggested, should be on peaceful settlement rather than on potential sanctions, which might be dangerous, double-edged or merely useless.

The representative of Syria stated that the means of achieving a peaceful settlement had not been exhausted and that there was still a strong possibility of establishing a cease-fire, even at the first meeting of the seven-nations conference suggested by the twelve Asian Powers Adoption of the United States proposal, he said, would not end the war, but would be more likely to extend it. Were the war to be extended, the United Nations would have to fight against a population of about 800 millions. He would, he said, abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, but his abstention did not signify approval of the behaviour of the People's Republic of China or opposition to the draft resolution. It only meant that the twelve-Power draft resolution should have been adopted first so as to exhaust the possibilities of peaceful discussion.

The representative of India stated that he would vote against the proposal because it would prolong hostilities in Korea indefinitely and might expand the conflict into a global war. By combining condemnation and negotiation in one proposal, that proposal lost its moral force and negotiations their best chances of success. So many mistakes had been made against the People's Republic of China in the last twelve months that the resolution did not seem to be quite fair in its condemnation.

The representative of Egypt explained that, although he agreed that it was the duty of the United Nations to set up and maintain, and even to put in action, the system of collective security envisaged by the Charter, he saw no reason to overlook the essential concept of the Charter that peaceful means of resolving questions must first be exhausted. The peaceful means, he considered, had not been exhausted in the present case.

At the request of the representative of Israel, the sixth paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution of the First Committee was put to the vote separately and was adopted by 43 votes to 7, with 8

abstentions. The remainder of the draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then voted upon by a roll-call and adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions, as follows:

In favor: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Against: Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, India, Poland, Ukrainian SSR and the USSR.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

On a statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia that he was not participating in the vote, the President ruled that if a delegation did not participate in the vote, it thereby abstained. However, he said that the Saudi Arabian representative's statement that he did not participate in the vote would be recorded.

The resolution (498(V)) adopted by the Assembly at its 327th plenary meeting on 1 February 1951 read:

"*The General Assembly,*

"*Noting* that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea,

"*Noting* that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has not accepted United Nations proposals to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement, and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large-scale attacks upon United Nations forces there,

"1. *Finds* that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there has itself engaged in aggression in Korea;

"2. *Calls* upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;

"3. *Affirms* the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression;

"4. *Calls upon all* States and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea;

"5. *Calls upon* all States and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea;

"6. *Requests* a Committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee referred to in the following paragraph reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

"7. *Affirms* that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this end."

In a statement (A/1782) made on 2 February, regarding resolution 498(V), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China said, *inter alia*, that the majority of the nations in the United Nations, under the domination and coercion of the United States Government, had rejected the twelve-Power draft resolution and had adopted the United States draft resolution, which slandered China as an aggressor in Korea, in order that the United States might further extend its aggressive war. This, the statement continued, proved clearly to the peace-loving peoples and nations of the world that the United States Government and its accomplices had blocked the path to a peaceful settlement. It was further stated that the Assembly, encroaching upon the powers of the Security Council, had acted illegally in adopting the resolution without the participation of lawful representatives of the People's Republic of China. Consequently, the resolution must be considered null and void.

2. Additional measures to be employed to meet aggression in Korea

a. Report of the Additional Measures Committee

On the proposal of the Bureau, a sub-committee of five members was constituted on 8 March to consider practical measures and to study priorities. The sub-committee, consisting of Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Venezuela, unanimously recommended that, when the Committee pursued the examination of additional measures against the Central People's Republic of China, it should give priority to the study of economic measures. The Committee adopted this recommendation at its third meeting on 3 May 1951. On 14 May it approved a draft resolution by the United States for submission to the General Assembly (see A/1799).

Under the draft resolution, the General Assembly would note, *inter alia*, that the Additional-Measures Committee had reported that a number of States had already taken measures designed to deny contributions to the military strength of forces opposing the United Nations in Korea, and that certain economic measures designed further to deny such contributions would support and supplement the military action of the United Nations in Korea and would assist in putting an end to the aggression. It would recommend that every State should:

(1) Apply an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and of the North Korean authorities of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war;

(2) determine which commodities exported from its territory fell within the embargo, and apply controls to give effect to that embargo;

(3) prevent by all means within its jurisdiction the circumvention of controls on shipments applied by other States pursuant to the resolution;

(4) co-operate with other States in carrying out the purposes of this embargo;

(5) report to the Additional Measures Committee, within 30 days, and thereafter at the request of the Committee, on the measures taken in accordance with the resolution.

The draft resolution would further request the Additional Measures Committee to report to the General Assembly, with recommendations on the general effectiveness of the embargo and on the desirability of continuing, extending or relaxing it. It would also request the Committee to continue its consideration of additional measures to be employed to meet the aggression n Korea and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee was authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee (constituted under resolution 498(V)) reported satisfactory progress.

The draft resolution would reaffirm that it continued to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and would request the Good Offices Committee to continue its efforts.

In clarification of its recommendations, the Additional Measures Committee noted in particular that circumvention of controls might take place through trans-shipment or re-export of commodities. The primary responsibility for guarding against such circumvention, it stated, must rest with the States in which the goods originated, and this responsibility could be discharged by obtaining assurances about end-use prior to shipment. Other States would be expected to give every assistance to the country of origin in obtaining and checking such assurances; each State should, moreover, avoid any such expansion of its trade with China and North Korea in items embargoed by other States as would nullify or impair the effect of the controls applied by the latter to those items.

b. Consideration by the First Committee

The report (A/1709) of the Additional Measures Committee containing its draft resolution was considered by the First Committee at its 443rd and 444th meetings on 17 May 1951.

An amendment (A/C.1/662/Rev.1) to the draft resolution recommended by the Additional Measures Committee was submitted jointly by Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Venezuela. It would add "transportation materials of strategic value" to the proposed embargo list.

At the outset of the debate in the First Committee, the representative of the USSR stated that he could not participate in the discussion of measures such as those proposed. According to Article 24 of the Charter, the Members of the United Nations had placed the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the Security Council, and had agreed that, in carrying out its duties under this responsibility, the Council was acting on their behalf. The measures to be taken by the Council in the accomplishment of that task were stipulated in the Charter, particularly in Chapter VII. The imposition of an embargo was one of the measures covered by that Chapter. Moreover, any action of that kind belonged, according to Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter, exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. Consequently, he held, the General Assembly was not entitled to adopt decisions on such questions.

From the very outset of events in Korea, he added, the ruling circles of the United States had taken the path of flagrant violation of the Charter and had done all in their power to prevent a pacific settlement of the Korean question. In order to disguise its aggression, the United States had already foisted upon the United Nations a number of illegal resolutions, he said. By its rude pressure on the members of the "North Atlantic bloc", and on the Latin-American countries, the United States had forced upon the General Assembly the disgraceful resolution of 1 February 1951, branding the People's Republic of China as aggressor.

It would be preposterous to assert that the United States, which had seized Chinese territory, namely the island of Taiwan, and which had invaded Korea up to the very frontiers of China, was the party defending itself, and that the Chinese People's Republic, which was defending its frontiers and was trying to regain the island of Taiwan seized by the Americans, was the aggressor. The new draft resolution, in which the United States called for the imposition of embargo measures against the People's Republic of China, made it evident, in his opinion, that the text was designed to bring about the continuation and the extension of the war in Korea. The ruling circles of the United States continued, in fact, to drag

the United Nations with them on a course which involved violation of the Charter and the adoption of illegal measures, the USSR representative said.

The representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR agreed with the representative of the USSR that the question of applying an embargo was exclusively within the competence of the Securtiy Council. They stated that, consequently, they would not participate in the discussion.

The representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Ecuador, France, Greece Haiti, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Thailand, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States and Venezuela, among others, supported the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee. They considered that, because the Chinese Communists and the North Korean authorities were pressing their attacks against the Republic of Korea, it had now become necessary to consider how best to support the United Nations forces fighting in Korea, to help end aggression and to bring about a peaceful settlement.

The draft resolution took into account the actual situation in Korea as well as the objectives laid down in General Assembly resolution 498(V) of 1 February. They felt that, had the Chinese Communist Government had any inclination to negotiate, ample opportunity had been given it to make its wishes known. Moreover, opportunities for a peaceful settlement were still clearly available under the present draft resolution. That draft represented, in their view, an implementation and elucidation of the Assembly resolution 498(V), and to support it would be a logical reaffirmation of the stand taken by most Members in support of the Security Council's decision on Korea. The Additional Measures Committee, they felt, should continue to examine the situation in Korea so as take other appropriate measures if necessary.

Those representatives maintained that the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee was not inspired by a spirit of vengeance; it was intended merely to protect the United Nations forces which were resisting aggression in Korea. The measures suggested related only to supplies of raw materials or of materials of a strategic value which might contribute to an extension of the area of hostilities.

They stressed the fact that adoption of the draft resolution and of the amendment would not only be valuable in itself but also an effective demonstration of United Nations determination to make use of the means available under the Charter to bring the aggression in Korea to an end. There could not be two views as to the principle involved: no Member could object to a resolution requesting it not to give aid to the enemies of the Organization.

Adoption of the draft resolution, those representatives felt, would also give formal recognition to a policy already applied individually by Member Governments, and would provide for the United Nations machinery through which all Government could work together to make the restrictions more effective.

The representative of India stated that the draft resolution was based on General Assembly resolution 498(V) which the Indian delegation had opposed, and, therefore, it could not vote in favour of this draft resolution. The recommended embargo, he said, had already been applied by the States, so that the adoption of the draft resolution could not mean any reduction in the supplies entering China. On the other hand, he felt, it might create additional obstacles in the way of a peaceful solution of the problem. The proposed embargoes, however, did not concern India which did not send any war materials to foreign countries and did not propose to do so. The Indian delegation, he said, would therefore sustain in the vote.

The representative of Iraq indicated that, though voting for the resolution, his country could not assure co-operation in implementing it with one State in the Middle East because no relations existed between Iraq and that State.

The representative of Syria stated that, consistent with the attitude his country had taken on Assembly resolution 498(V), he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution although his abstention should not be construed to mean that his Government would not comply with the provisions of the resolution. A similar statement was made by the representative of Sweden.

The Committee adopted, by 43 votes to none, with 11 abstentions, the preable of the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee. The joint amendment (A/C.1/662/Rev.1) was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by a roll-call vote of 45 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

c. Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly

The resolution (500(V) adopted by the General Assembly at its 330th plenary meeting on 18 May read:

"*The General Assembly,*

"*Noting* the report of the Additional measures Committee dated 14 May 1951.

"*Recalling* its resolution 498(V) of 1 February 1951,

"*Noting that:*

"(*a*) The Additional Measures Committee established by that resolution has considered additional measures to be employed to meet the aggression in Korea,

"(*b*) The Additional Measures Committee has reported that a number of States have already taken measures designed to deny contributions to the military strength of the forces opposing the United Nations in Korea,

"(*c*) The Additional Measures Committee has also reported that certain economic measures designed further to deny such contributions would support and supplement the military action of the United Nations in Korea and would assist in putting an end to the aggression,

"1. *Recommends* that every State:

"(*a*) Apply an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and of the North Korean authorities of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war;

"(*b*) Determine which commodities exported from its territory fall within the embargo, and apply controls to give effect to the embargo;

"(*c*) Prevent by all means within its jurisdiction the circumvention of controls on shipments applied by other States pursuant to the present resolution;

"(*d*) Co-operate with other States in carrying out the purposes of this embargo;

"(*e*) Report to the Additional Measures Committee, within thirty days and thereafter at the request of the Committee, on the measures taken in accordance with the present resolution;

"2. *Requests* the Additional Measures Committee:

"(*a*) To report to the General Assembly, with recommendations as appropriate, on the general effectiveness of the embargo and the desirability of continuing, extending or relaxing it;

"(*b*) To continue its consideration of additional measures to be employed to meet the aggression in Korea, and to report thereon further to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Commitee reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

"3. *Reaffirms* that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the Good Offices Committee to continue its good offices."

3. Communications received by the Security Council relating to the Korean question

The representative of the USSR, by a letter dated 9 March 1951 (S/2034), transmitted a report from the Commission of the Central Committee of the United Democratic National Front of Korea charging the United States troops with the perpetration of atrocities at Seoul and Inchon.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea sent the following communications: two cablegrams dated 11 February 1951 (S/2012) and 15 April (S/2092), charging the United Nations forces in Korea with the perpetration of atrocities; a cablegram dated 8 May (S/2142/Rev.2), charging United Nations Forces in Korea with the use of bacteriological weapons; a statement dated 18 May (S/2167/Rev.1), denying the authenticity of the documentation contained in the special report of the Unified Command, transmitted by the representative of the United States on 2 May (S/2112), to the effect that the attack on the Republic of Korea on 25 June 1950 had been planned in advance by North Korea; a cablegram dated 29 June 1951 (S/2221), charging the Unified Command with the forcible deportation, to the South, of the civilian population of the districts of North Korea occupied by United Nations forces.

The representative of the USSR, in his capacity as President of the Council, submitted two letters, dated 11 June 1951 (S/2203) and 21 June (S/2212), from the Women's International Democratic Federation, transmitting a "Report of the women's international commission for the investigation of atrocities committed by United States strength of its unit operating in Korea.

In a letter dated 15 July (S/2232), the representative of the United States denied the charges contained in this report. He observed that the International Committee of the Red Cross was the proper organization for carrying out investigations regarding such charges.

In a cablegram dated 14 July 1951 (S/2231) the representative of Greece advised the Council that his Government had dedecided to double the strength of its unit operating in Korea.

In a cablegram dated 11 August 1951 (S/2296), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea charged that United States aircraft had dropped bombs containing poison gas on localities in the People's Republic.

With a letter dated 29 August (S/2317), the representative of the USSR transmitted a letter from the Women's International Democratic Federation requesting that this communication (S/2296) be transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration and that a delegation of the Federation should be admitted to the Assembly during the discussion of that question.

In a letter dated 24 November (S/2418), the representative of the United States charged that a United Nations bomber, which had not returned from a weather reconnaissance flight over the Sea of Japan on 6 November, had been intercepted and attacked by Soviet fighter planes without warning while over international waters.

In a letter, dated 4 December 1951 (S/2430), the representative of the USSR denied those charges, stating that the bomber had violated the USSR frontier and had opened fire on two Soviet Fighter aircraft which had attempted to compel it to land on a Soviet

airfield. The fighters had returned the fire and the bomber had flown toward the sea and disappeared.

These communications were not discussed by the Council during 1951.

7. Reports of the United Nations Command [39]

Reports of the United Nations Command operations in Korea were submitted regularly by the representative of the United States to the Security Council, in accordance with the Security Council resolution of 7 July 1950 (S/1588). The following information on the progress of operations is taken from the reports.

a. Military Operations [40]

(1) Ground operations

On 1 January 1951, it was stated, the enemy launched a general offensive employing twenty Chinese Communist divisions and on 4 January occupied Seoul.

On 7 January new United Nations defensive positions were established along a line extending north-east from Pyongtaek to Wonju. From January 8 the enemy made strong efforts to drive the United Nations Forces [41] our of the Wonju area, but met stubborn assistance in the form of United Nations counter-attacks and suffered extremely high casualties.

By 28 January, the enemy, unable to continue the general offensive, withdrew to positions about three miles north of Hoengsong. United Nations forces advanced eight to ten miles between 16 and 31 January, twenty to 25 miles along the entire front between 1 and 15 February, and again seven to sixteen miles on a 90-mile front between 16 and 28 February. By 28 February, the United Nations lines were relatively straight and unbroken over the entire front. By this time, also United Nations action had, it was reported, reduced the over-all strength of guerrilla forces in South Korean to about 30,000, representing a decline of about 15 per cent during the first two months of the year.

In March the United Nations Command reported that its strategic plan, involving constant movement to keep the enemy off balance with a corresponding limitation upon his initiative, remained unaltered. The selection of the battle area, it was stated, had forced the enemy to fight far from his base and had permitted greater employment of the seapower of the United Nations Command, which resulted in continuous and exhausting attrition upon both the enemy's manpower and supplies. During the period 1–15 March, the enemy, suffering heavy casualties, conducted vigorous delaying actions, as steady United Nations pressure forced him northward six to eight miles on the central front extending about 70 miles from the Pukhan River area east of Seoul to Hajinbu, near the east coast.

Vigorous United Nations action in this period, it was stated, reduced guerrilla strength in the rear areas. In particular, the large guerrilla force built round the Tenth North Korean Division suffered severe losses between 4 and 7 March, in the area fifteen miles west of Uichin, near the east coast.

In the latter half of March, the United Nations Command reported, the enemy was driven northward about fifteen miles over the entire front, except in the Seoul area, where the United Nations forces advanced 25 miles. During this period, the depleted Chinese units were replaced by three or four rehabilitated Chinese armies, and the enemy built up a powerful reserve force, including four fresh North Korean Corps totalling twelve divisions, the equivalent of five fresh Chinese armies totalling fifteen divisions and four Chinese armies recently withdrawn from combat totalling twelve divisions. Enemy forces during this period were estimated by the United Nations Command to total 60 divisions, including reserves.

In the period between 1 and 15 April, the United Nations command reported only sporadic resistance by the enemy until 8 April, when all regular Chinese Communist and North Korean forces to the east of the Imjin River had been driven out of the Republic of Korea. Thereafter, enemy forces on their main line of resistance bitterly contested United Nations advances. In his defensive efforts, the enemy showed increased strength in artillery and mortars. During the period United Nations forces advanced from eight to fifteen miles across the front west of Chongong.

On 11 April 1951, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur relinquished the command of the United Nations forces to General Ridgway.

Front lines at the close of the period ran generally north-east along the Imjin River to Chongong, east to Hwachon and Inje, and thence to Hapchiri on the east coast. During the period guerrilla activity in the United Nations rear areas declined to the lowest point since the outbreak of the Korean conflict, it was stated.

During this period the United Nations Command also noted enemy efforts to renew air attacks against United Nations forces in areas other than north-west Korea. Intelligence reports, it was stated, indicated much air training activity in various areas of China and Manchuria.

For the period 16–30 April, the United Nations Command reported that, following artillery preparation, fresh Chinese troops, massed along the western half of the front, launched initial assaults of a general offensive on the night of 22–23 April, their main effort being concentrated on the 25-mile front between Yonchon and Sachang. Simultaneously, to the west and south-west of this sector, the enemy bridged the Imjin River north-east of Seoul. In the east, he drove a salient five miles deep into United Nations lines east and south-east of Inje.

The United Nations forces made an orderly withdrawal, inflicting maximum casualties on the enemy. In no instance during the period, it was stated, was the enemy able to achieve a significant penetration in force.

By 30 April, ignoring very heavy casualties, the enemy carried an advance up to 35 miles on a 40-mile front from the immediate vicinity of Seoul to the Hankchon area in Central Korea. Smaller gains were made by the enemy east and west of this sector. It was stated that the enemy during this period, had employed 30 to 44 divisions on the extreme western flanks, including four North Korean divisions, and twelve to fourteen divisions, Chinese and North Korean, on the 50-mile front from Hwachon to the east coast. The total enemy strength at this period was estimated to be 70 divisions.

Front lines at the end of the period ran due east from the Han River, passing three miles north of Seoul, to Munye, and thence north-east through Songdong, Chaun, and Sori to Habong near the east coast.

Enemy guerrilla strength, mainly on the defensive, was estimated at that time to be 12,000.

From 1–15 May, United Nations ground forces carried out aggressive patrol activities designed to gain and maintain contact with the enemy, to determine the enemy's intentions and to inflict the maximum casualties. On the extreme eastern front from Umyang to the coast, United Nations forces advanced five to seven miles against variable resistance. On the western and east-central fronts, enemy covering forces were driven northward five to twelve miles by strong United Nations combat patrols, which employed close air support, artillery and tank fire to inflict heavy enemy casualties.

The line of contact at the close of the period ran generally from Suyuhyon eastward through Uijongbu to Chunchon, and thence north-east through Umyang to Hupchi.

Enemy forces were mainly arrayed on the 55-mile front to the west of Chunchon, totalling, it was estimated, more than 40 divisions. In the central portion of this sector, a dense concentration of seven to nine Chinese Communist Force armies was poised on a 22-mile front about fifteen miles to the north and north-east of Seoul.

During this period, guerrilla resistance was nearly eliminated in the United Nations rear area, it was reported.

The enemy launched the anticipated second phase of his spring offensive on 16 May, committing 21 Chinese Communist Force Divisions on the 75-mile front from Tokohong to Nodong. By 21 May, the attack had generally passed its climax as United Nations forces exacted heavy casualties at a relatively small cost. On 19 May, a counterattack was launched by forces on the left of the United Nations line, followed two days later by the counter-attack of the remaining United Nations forces on the right, thus initiating a powerful counter-offensive which, by the end of the month, had thrust the exhausted enemy forces northward fifteen to 30 miles. By the end of May, enemy resistance had stiffened and the opposing forces were arrayed in positions approximating those of 1 January, in the vicinity of the 38th parallel. The enemy suffered extremely heavy casualties, Chinese soldiers surrendering in large numbers for the first time, and lost substantial quantities of weapons and supplies.

The hostile effort was made in two major sectors. Six Chinese divisions attacked on a 25-mile front in the Yongyang-Kapyong sector in the western part of the front. Having penetrated to a line passing about three miles south of Masogue and Munye by 20 May, the enemy drive was contained and then converted into a retreat by counter-attacking United Nations forces. Chinese Communist Force units fought fairly strong delaying actions near Yonyang on 24 and 25 May, and in the Chiam area, about 25 miles north of Munye, from 25–28 May.

The most desperate fighting of the Korean campaign, the United Nations Command said, developed in the east-central part of the front, in the vicinity of Hangyi. On 16 May, six Chinese Communist Force divisions launched a powerful attack against strongly held United Nations lines on a twenty-mile front to the north of that town. Though United Nations units were thrust southwards about twenty miles by 22 May, combat elements equivalent to three enemy divisions were destroyed. The remainder of the attacking force was hurled back eighteen miles to the 38th parallel. By 28 May, the trapped enemy units were attempting to escape past the west end of the Hwachon reservoir.

In an eastward extension of the above action, three enemy divisions made a strong effort on a twelve-mile front from Inje to Nodong, near the coast. In this sector, the enemy scored numerous penetrations in the United Nations lines, forcing a series of withdrawals which carried defending forces about 30 miles southwards. The situation stabilized by 22 May, a few miles to the north of Changdong and Hajinbu. In this action, fighting was particularly intense in the vicinity of Komsan, Changdong and Kusang. However, it was reported, the enemy's losses on other parts of the front completely neutralized this temporary success, and he resisted only moderately as the United Nations counter-offensive forced him back toward the 38th parallel.

Front lines at the end of May ran generally north-east from Munsan, along the Imjin River to Chongong, thence eastward through

---

[39] Reports Nos. 13 to 36 of the United Nations Command operations in Korea: S/2021, S/2053, S/2096, S/2107, S/2156, S/2170, S/2204, S/2217, S/2246, S/2265, S/2277, S/2333, S/2377, S/2408, S/2410, S/2412, S/2432, S/2469, S/2507, S/2514, S/2541.

[40] See map, p. 208.

[41] For the armed forces of Member States participating in the action in Korea see list in Annex I to this chapter.

Hwachon to Inje, south-east to Sori and north-east to Yongchon.

Between 1 and 15 June, the enemy, depleted by losses suffered in the preceding period which amounted to more than 100,000 casualties and 12,000 prisoners, continued a slow withdrawal under continued United Nations pressure. Offering heavy resistance, the enemy was forced to relinquish the southern reaches of the Kumhwa-Chorwon-Pyonggang triangle by 12 June. Relatively heavy fighting took place along the entire 90-mile front from the vicinity of Yonchon through the Hwachon reservoir area, north-east to Kansong, it was reported.

In the west-central zone, enemy forces resisted stubbornly as United Nations troops drove across the Hanton River toward Chorwon and Kumhwa. By 11 June, United Nations forces controlled both of these vital communications centres; by 13 June they had advanced more than ten miles to the north of Hwachon.

Enemy forces of approximately 80 divisions were now reduced to 70, of which sixteen were seriously depleted. The southern limits of the enemy's Chorwon-Kumhwa-Pyonggang complex were now in United Nations hands, thus depriving the enemy of an excellent communications net in this area. His once-formidable guerrilla force, it was stated, was now reduced to 7,000 and was mainly concerned with its own security.

At the close of this period, front lines ran generally along the Imjin River to Yonchon, thence north-east to Chorwon, eastward through Kumhwa and Yulmok to the vicinity of Sohwa and thence north-east to a point eight miles north of Kansong.

During the period of truce negotiations (see below), little aggressive action took place on either side but the enemy showed increased resistance to United Nations advances.

Front lines at the close of the period were nearly identical with those of 16 June, except on the extreme flanks, where the United Nations forces advanced about four miles. They ran generally north-east of Changdan to Chorwon and Kumhwa, eastward of Songhwangdong and north-east of Pohang.

There was a slight increase in guerrilla activity and a considerable increase in guerrilla contacts in the Tanyang area of South Central Korea during June. Expanded enemy operations to mark the anniversary of the war, however, failed to materialize on 25 June, although they had been called for repeatedly in North Korean propaganda broadcasts.

(2) Naval operations

During the year, constant patrol and daily reconnaissance operations by United Nations Naval Forces continued to deny Korean waters to enemy warships and shipping. Surface units provided gunfire support to United Nations ground force units along the east coast of Korea and in the Inchon area. Check minesweeping operations were regularly undertaken along the Korean coasts particularly in those areas in which gunfire-support ships operated. United Nations naval forces continued to cover and protect the constant stream of shipping employed in moving personnel and material to United Nations forces in Korea.

As part of co-ordinated interdiction operations directed against enemy lines of communications, United Nations carrier-based aircraft, in daylight and night attacks, destroyed scores of bridges, attacked tunnels and constantly harassed moving transport.

In July, the surface units pounded enemy railroads, highways and supply concentration in the Wonsan-Songjin-Chongjin areas. Enemy shore batteries were active in the Wonsan area, but continued efforts of naval gunfire and rocket ships of carrier-based aircraft succeeded in silencing them without material damage to United Nations Command forces.

In October, the United Nations Command reported, United Nations naval units bombarded enemy coastal positions and traffic arteries along the Korean seaboard from the front lines far to the north. On the west coast gun positions within 30 miles of the mouth of the Yalu river were shelled while twenty miles up the Han River concentrations received continuous pounding. On the east coast, surface ships methodically hammered bridges and rail and highway junctions from Kosong north to Chongjin.

Also in October, surface striking forces delivered the heaviest attack of the year on Hungham harbour. The 36-week-old siege of Wonsan was continued and a task group struck the Kojo area. In spite of increasing return fire from enemy coast artillery, no major casualties or damage to ships was received from this source although the United States destroyer *Ernest G. Small* was damaged and suffered 27 casualties when she struck a mine. An enemy jet strafing and bombing attack on the destroyer *Twining* resulted in no damage, but was notable as the first air attack on a naval unit in many months.

(3) Air operations

Throughout the year, the close support given to ground forces by all elements of United Nations tactical aircraft continued to be a decisive factor in each day's operations. The reports stated that the United Nations continued to retain control of the air despite repeated challenges by an increasing number of enemy Russian-built MIG jet planes. Despite the advantage of the protection north of the Yalu River, the Chinese-North Korean losses were heavy compared to those of the United Nations forces.

One of the largest airborne operations took place on 23 March 1951, when thousands of paratroopers were successfully dropped behind enemy lines fifteen miles south-west of Seoul. The drop included bulky items like jeeps, weapons carriers and howitzers. Evacuation by air of wounded personnel saved countless numbers of soldiers who would have died or been captured. It was reported that soldiers wounded in the field had a better chance of recovery than in any other war because of accessibility by air to major medical installations.

The United Nations Command reported that combat cargo aircraft during the first half of October lifted over 35,000 personnel, evacuated 4,500 sick and wounded personnel, and moved 4,500 tons of freight and supplies. In the latter half of the month, they lifted more than 5,600 tons of cargo and 48,000 personnel, including 6,234 sick and wounded. This average was continued in the later months.

On 9 May a concentrated air attack on enemy installations was delivered by approximately 300 United Nations fighters and bombers, as part of a continuing air campaign to keep enemy-held Korean airfields inoperable.

The employment of a new radar technique permitted close support attacks by medium and light bombers during periods of inclement weather or darkness with an accuracy which compared favourably with that of visual bombing. Night sorties by light bombers and fighters concentrated upon transport attempting to sustain the enemy's drive.

In June, to meet increased enemy air activity, emphasis was placed on counter-air operations. Medium-bomber daylight operations were, therefore, conducted against North Korean airfields to deny their use to the enemy. This resulted in rendering temporarily unserviceable all but three of the 22 enemy airfields south of the 40th parallel.

An interdiction programme designed to reduce to a minimum the forward flow of enemy supplies, continued to be given a high priority and was carried out on a round-the-clock basis. Hundreds of fighter bombers and light and medium bombers joined in the programme by attacking supply dumps, marshalling yards, vehicle parks, bottlenecked traffic, and rail and highway bridges, as well as rail lines, rolling stock and vehicles.

In December, the United Nations Command reported that the cumulative damage done to the enemy railway lines under the rail interdiction programme undertaken by the air forces exceeded the repair capability of the enemy labour pool. The main enemy line from Pyongyang south to Sariwon was abandoned and the main west coast line from Sinanju to Sukchon was only occasionally serviceable. It was noted, however, that enemy opposition to deep penetration by United Nations Command aircraft was increasing in intensity.

In December, in the area north and west of Pyongyang, large numbers of MIG–15 fighters were seen by the United Nations Command pilots whenever the weather was favourable for flying. During the first half of December, 2,350 enemy jet aircraft were observed, of which United Nations Command fighters shot down 29 and damaged at least 28. The day of heaviest activity was 29 December, when United Nations Command pilots sighted 360 MIG's. Night-flying United Nations Command aircraft were frequently fired upon by Chinese-North Korean night fighters, some of which were reported to be jet types. Observed tactics indicated that ground-controlled radar and searchlights were used in these interceptions.

b. Truce Negotiations

On 23 June, the permanent representative of the USSR to the United Nations suggested, in the course of a radio broadcast, that, as a first step towards a settlement of the war in Korea, discussions should be started between the belligerents for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the 38th parallel.

The report to the Security Council of the United Nations Command for the period 16–30 June, stated that, on the last day of that period, the United Nations Command repeatedly broadcast to the Commander-in-Chief of Communist forces in Korea a proposal that accredited representatives of each Command meet on the Danish Hospital Ship *Jutlandia* off the coast of Wonsan, for the purpose of negotiating a cease-fire agreement.

On 1 July the Peking radio broadcast a joint message from Generals Kim Il Sung of the North Korean Army and Peng Te-Huai of the Chinese Communist Army that their representatives would meet with the representatives of the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command in Korea for talks concerning a cessation of hostilities. The message proposed that the meeting should be held on 10 July at Kaesong, near the 38th parallel. After further exchange of messages, liaison officers of both sides met on 8 July at Kaesong and discussed arrangements for the first conference of the delegations of both forces to be held on 10 July.

Two meetings were held on 10 and 11 July respectively, the United Nations Command being represented by Vice-Admiral C. Turner Joy, Major-General L. C. Craigie, Major-General Henry I. Hodes, Rear-Admiral Arleigh A. Burke and Major-General Paik Sun Yup and the Chinese-North Korean delegation by General Nam Il, Major-General Lee Sang Jo, Major-General Chang Pyong-San, Lt.-General Tung Hua and Major-General Fang Hsieh.

The two meetings were devoted to the discussion of the agenda presented by each group. In his opening remarks, Admiral Joy stated that the United Nations Command delegation was prepared to do its part in trying to work out an armistice agreement. It was however, made clear, the United Nations Command stated, that the United Nations Command delegation would not discuss political or economic matters or military matters unrelated to Korea.

At both meetings, Admiral Joy presented a proposal that international newsmen be admitted to the scene of the conference, empha-

sizing that they would not be admitted to the conference room. After waiting for an answer, Admiral Joy stated, before the close of the second meeting, that the Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command intended that twenty newsmen form an integral part of the United Nations Command delegation to all subsequent sessions.

On 12 July the Chinese-North Korean armed guards denied the newsmen access to the conference area. The negotiations were thereafter suspended for two days, at the end of which the Chinese-North Korean leaders agreed to a proposal by the United Nations Command that a neutral zone be established assuring equality of treatment to both delegations, removing restrictions of movements of United Nations Command delegates and couriers and removing armed personnel from the conference site. The talks were resumed on 15 July. Progress in the negotiations was marked on 26 July by joint agreement upon subjects to be included in the formal agenda. The agreed agenda was:

"Item 1. Adoption of the agenda

"Item 2. Fixing a military demarcation line between both sides so as to establish a demilitarized zone as a basic condition for a cessation of hostilities in Korea.

"Item 3. Concrete arrangements for the realization of a cease-fire and armistice, including the composition, authority and functions of a supervising organization for carrying out the terms of a cease-fire and armistice.

"Item 4. Arrangements relating to prisoners of war.

"Item 5. Recommendations to the governments of the countries concerned on both sides."

The substantive discussions began immediately after the adoption of the agenda on 26 July. The Communists maintained their insistence that the 38th parallel should be the line of demarcation of forces during the armistice period. Since the 38th parallel bore only a coincidental relationship on the prevailing position of the ground forces at that time and none at all to the operations of the air and naval forces, the reports stated, the United Nations Command delegation refused to accept that view and made it clear that an armistice must be premised upon the prevailing military situation.

During the next fortnight, the United Nations Command continued to reiterate its refusal to abandon the strong defensive positions it had won by throwing back the invading forces, it was reported. On August 4, approximately one company of Chinese-North Korean infantry, armed with grenades, mortars and machine-guns in addition to small arms, traversed the neutral zone passing not more than 100 yards from the conference building. Subsequent to the protest by the United Nations Command and suspension of negotiations pending receipt of satisfactory explanation, the action was admitted by the enemy Command to be in violation of their pledge and assurance of July 14, but the whole matter was dismissed by them as "minor" and "trivial".

On August 9 General Nam II, through his liaison officer, claimed that the United Nations Command had violated its guarantees by attacking a Chinese North-Korean vehicle plainly marked with white cloth and carrying a white flag. The sole guarantee ever given by the United Nations Command Liaison Office with regard to aircraft refraining from attack on the Communist delegation's vehicles was, the United Nations Command report stated, contingent upon their being properly marked and upon prior notification being given of the time and route of their movement. The latter specification had not been compiled with and United Nations aircraft did machine-gun the truck. A similar complaint, it was stated, was again made on August 14, when the Chinese-North Korean Command was informed that the United Nations Command provided no immunity for vehicles unless the time and route of the movement had been communicated to the United Nations Command.

Another charge levelled against the United Nations ground forces was that a contingent had fired into the town of Panmunjom on August 7 from a position 200 yards away. The United Nations Command reported that a thorough investigation, made at the instance of General Van Fleet, proved this to be a pure fabrication—an impossibility considering the relative location of forces on that particular day.

On 16 August the Chinese-North Korean delegation accepted the suggestion of the United Nations Command delegation that a sub-committee of the delegations undertake to resolve the impasse imposed by the enemy's insistence on their one and only proposal for a line of demarcation between opposing forces—the 38th parallel. The hope that the meetings of the sub-committee, held in an informal atmosphere, would encourage the Chinese-North Korean side to explore the means for equitable solutions, was, however, belied by the subsequent conduct of their delegation at six meetings from 17–22 August, it was stated; at these meetings that delegation refused to examine any proposition other than the 38th parallel for the line of demarcation. It appeared to the United Nations Command delegation that the Chinese-North Korean delegation had instructions not to accept any compromise or alternative proposal.

Another charge of the violation of the neutral area was made by the Chinese-North Korean delegation, it was reported, on 19 August when a Chinese lieutenant was killed at a point southwest of Panmunjom. Careful investigation by all echelons of the Command of the units on the front, the United Nations Command stated, showed conclusively that no personnel under United Nations jurisdiction were involved. The United Nations Command was of the opinion that the group responsible for the incident, reported by witnesses to be in civilian clothing, must have been partisans or irregulars of unknown loyalty.

On 22 August the enemy reported another incident, alleging that Kaesong had been attacked by a plane. Certain pieces of metal and a small crater 24 inches in diameter were pointed out as evidence. The pieces of metal were described by the Chinese-North Korean representatives as remnants of a napalm bomb. Subsequent investigation, the United Nations Command reported, revealed that no United Nations aircraft were anywhere near the Kaesong area at the time of the reported attack and that the pieces of metal could not have been the parts of any of the types of bombs used by the United Nations Command. The charges appeared to the United Nations Command to have been entirely false and the evidence manufactured. The enemy delegation elected to suspend negotiations at delegates' meetings on 22 August.

In its next report, 1–16, September, the United Nations Command said that the Chinese-North Korean Command had intended from the very beginning to use the respite offered by the negotiations for improving their military position for a possible renewal of their aggression with forces rested, reconditioned and better equipped.

On 6 September the United Nations Command proposed that the liaison officers of the two sides meet to discuss the selection of a new site where discussions could be held without actual or artificial interruptions. The enemy delegation refused to accept the suggestion, the report said.

During this period, the United Nations Command admitted that one violation of the neutral zone occurred on 10 September, when a United Nations Command B–26 aircraft, off course through faulty naviation, strafed the neutral zone but did no damage. The plotting by radar of the plane's course, it was stated, coupled with an interrogation of the pilot, led to the conclusion that this plane did violate the neutrality of the zone. The same methods had been employed to prove that other enemy charges of bombing and strafing by United Nations Command aircraft had been false. The regrets of the United Nations Command for this one incident were immediately published and forwarded to the enemy and disciplinary action was initiated against the pilot.

After further exchanges of messages, the United Nations Command proposed on 27 September, that both delegations should meet as early as possible at a place approximately midway between the battle lines in the vicinity of Songyon-Ni, and that, upon resumption of meetings at this place, both delegations be prepared to return to the discussion of agenda item 2.

On 3 October 1951 General Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-Huai replied to the United Nations Command proposal that the conference site be changed to Soghyon-Ni. Their reply insisted that Kaesong in enemy-held territory be kept as the conference site. The United Nations Command rejected Kaesong and proposed a site between the battle lines. On 7 October the Chinese-North Korean leaders proposed Panmunjom as a site and further proposed a rectangular neutral zone to include Kaesong and Munsan. Liaison officers met at Panmunjon on 10, 11, 12 and 14 October and, although substantial progress was made, full agreement was not reached.

On 12 October the United Nations Command admitted that United Nations jet aircraft had made two strafing attacks in the Kaesong area on the afternoon of 12 October. On 14 October, in a letter to Generals Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh-Huai, the United Nations Commander-in-Chief stated that these attacks had been made in violation of standing instructions which specifically directed that all units and pilots avoid flying over or attacking the Kaesong area. The United Nations Command accepted responsibility for the violations and reiterated that it would continue to make every effort to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

On 22 October liaison officers of the two sides signed an agreement which specified terms of resumption of armistice negotiations which were subsequently ratified by the two delegations. The agreement, among other things, provided for an area with a radius of 1,000 yards in the vicinity of Panmunjon as the conference site, and for the immunity of that area from hostile acts. It was further provided that no armed personnel of either side would be permitted in the conference site except certain police detachments with small-arms.

The meetings suspended on 22 August were resumed on 25 October. It was agreed to resume sub-delegation meetings for the purpose of discussing agenda item 2, the demilitarized zone.

In the next fortnight no agreement was reached on the item. The fundamental divergence of views between the two delegations, it was stated, was whether the cease-fire portion of the military armistice should be put into effect forthwith or after agreement on other items of the agenda. The Chinese-North Korean delegation held that, as an "act of good faith", the United Nations Command should agree to a *de facto* cease-fire concurrently with the acceptance of the current line of contact as a basis for a demilitarized zone. The United Nations Command stated that since this position was contrary to the understanding previously reached and confirmed—the hostilities must continue pending agreement on the terms governing an armistice commission—it had refused to agree to the proposal.

The United Nations Command felt that a *de facto* cessation of hostilities prior to reaching an agreement would jeopardize the United Nations military position and would enable the enemy to augment his ground and air forces in close proximity to the battle line.

An agreement on agenda item 2 was reached on 27 November 1951, fixing a military demarcation line between both sides so as to establish a demilitarized zone as the basic condition for the cessation of hostilities in Korea. The agreement stated:

"1. The principle is accepted that the actual line of contact between both sides (as determined under either paragraph two or three, as appropriate) will be made the military demarcation line and that at the time specified in the signed armistice agreement both sides will withdraw two kilometers from this line so as to establish the demilitarized zone for the duration of the military armistice.

"2. If the military armistice agreement is signed within thirty days after the two delegations approve in the plenary session this agreement and the specific location of the military demarcation line and demilitarized zone determined by the sub-delegations on the basis of the above stated principle and in accordance with the present line of contact (as indicated in the attached map and explanatory note), the military demarcation line and demilitarized zone shall not be changed, regardless of whatever changes may occur in the actual line of contact between both sides.

"3. In view of the fact that hostilities will continue until the signing of the armistice agreement, if the military armistice agreement is not signed within thirty days after the two delegations approve in the plenary session this agreement and the specific location of the military demarcation line and the demilitarized zone as determined in paragraph two above, the sub-delegations shall revise, immediately prior to the signing of the military armistice agreement the above military demarcation line and the demilitarized zone in accordance with the changes which have occurred in the actual line of contact between both sides, so that the revised military demarcation line will coincide exactly with the line of contact between both sides immediately prior to the signing of the military armistice agreement and will constitute the military demarcation line for the duration of the military armistice."

The agreed line of contact, the United Nations Command stated, ran in general from the Sa-Chon River on the west, thence north-east to a point about six miles north of Chorwon, thence generally east to a point north of Kumhwa, thence north-east to Kumsong, thence east to a point north of the Punch Bowl region, thence north-east to a point on the coast at Pooeji-Ni.

On 3 December the Chinese-North Korean delegation introduced two proposals:

"(6) In order to ensure the stability of the military armistice so as to facilitate the holding by both sides of a political conference of a higher level, both sides shall undertake not to introduce into Korea any military forces, weapons and ammunition under any pretext.

"(7) In order to supervise the strict implementation of the stipulation of paragraph 6, both sides agree to invite representatives of nations neutral in the Korean war to form a supervisory organ to be responsible for conducting necessary inspection, beyond the Demilitarized Zone, of such ports of entry in the rear as mutually agreed upon by both sides, and to report to the Joint Armistice Commission the result of inspection."

In its report, the United Nations Command stated that proposal (6) would result in the evacuation of United Nations Command forces from Korea by attrition. The United Nations Command held that it had the right to maintain its forces in Korea during the period of military armistice and pending a settlement at a higher level.

Proposal (7), it was stated, showed the clear enemy intent to confine the activities of the military armistice commission to the militarized zone only.

Comparable United Nations Command proposals were as follows:

"4. A. Both sides shall designate an equal number of members to form a Military Armistice Commission which shall be responsible for supervising the execution of and adherence to the whole armistice agreement. The Military Armistice Commission shall be provided with, and assisted by, observer teams which shall be responsible to, shall report to, and shall be subject to the direction and supervision of the Military Armistice Commission only. The observer teams shall be composed of representatives of nations neutral in the Korea War, such nations to be mutually agreed to by both sides.

"B. Observation outside the Demilitarized Zone shall be performed only by neutral observer teams. Observation within the Demilitarized Zone may be performed by neutral teams, by joint teams selected by the Military Armistice Commission, or by the Military Armistice Commission itself.

"C. Neutral observer teams shall be located at such land, sea, and air ports of entry and communication centres as are mutually agreed to by both sides. These observer teams shall be permitted freedom of movement over principal lines of communication throughout all of Korea and each side shall afford these teams full assistance in the execution of the duties assigned them by the Armistice Commission. In addition, such periodic aerial reconnaissance and observation and photographic flights as are mutually agreed to by both sides will be performed by neutral teams.

"5. Neither side shall increase the level of military units, military personnel, war equipment, or war material existing in Korea at the time the armistice becomes effective. The rehabilitation, expansion, and improvement of existing airfields and aviation facilities and construction of new airfields and new aviation facilities shall not be permitted."

Toward the close of the period there were four basic points of disagreement concerning agenda item (3):

1. No increase in present strength levels and equipment and stocks versus no introduction of personnel and equipment under any pretext.
2. Rehabilitation of facilities, particularly airfields.
3. Status of offshore islands.
4. Relationship of neutral observer teams to the military armistice commission.

Item 4 of the agenda consisted of "arrangements pertaining to the prisoners of war". From 4–10 December the United Nations Command delegation daily urged that a separate sub-delegation be designated to discuss this item. The suggestion, it was stated, was made by the United Nations Command delegation for the sole purpose of expediting the negotiations and in view of the humanitarian aspects of prisoners-of-war matters.

Finally, on 11 December the Chinese-North Korean side agreed to initiate discussions. The United Nations Command stated that, at the outset of the discussions, it made, and repeated daily, two fundamental and logical proposals: namely, that information on prisoners of war be exchanged and that representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross be permitted to visit prisoners-of-war camps. Both of the proposals were rejected. The United Nations Command stated that it had long ago agreed to observe the Geneva Conventions relative to prisoners of war and had done so. Names of prisoners of war were also sent to the International Committee of the Red Cross. Representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross regularly visited United Nations Command prisoner-of-war camps. The enemy so far had refused to exchange information on prisoners.

During the period 16–18 December agreement was reached on the following three principles for agenda item 3: "Concrete arrangements for carrying out the terms of the cease-fire and armistice".

1. All armed forces under the control of either side including all units and armed personnel of the ground, naval and air forces shall cease all hostilities within 24 hours after the armistice agreement is signed and becomes effective.

2. All armed forces under the control of either side, shall be withdrawn from the demilitarized zone within seventy-two hours after the armistice agreement is signed and becomes effective. Except for such armed forces of a police nature as may be specifically agreed to by both sides, no armed forces of either side shall thereafter enter the demilitarized zone; nor shall the armed forces of either side commit any acts of armed force against the demilitarized zone. Each side shall manage in accordance with the stipulations of the armistice agreement the administrative affairs of the portion of the demilitarized zone lying on its side of the military demarcation line.

3. All armed forces, ground, naval and air, under the control of either side shall be withdrawn, within five days after the armistice agreement is signed and becomes effective, from the rear and coastal islands and waters of the other side, meaning islands which were formerly controlled by the other side and any others specifically and mutually agreed to. If they are not withdrawn within the stated time limit, and there is no mutually agreed and valid reason for delaying the withdrawal, the other side shall have the right to take all necessary action against such armed personnel for the maintenance of security and order.

The major issues which remained to be solved under agenda item 3 were rehabilitation of airfields, aerial observation and aerial photography and rotation and replenishment.

The United Nations Command stated that it had held, from the beginning of the negotiations, that no military advantage should accrue to either side during the period of an armistice. The rehabilitation of airfields in Korea would, it was considered, afford the enemy a tremendous military advantage which was at present denied to him. Mutual air inspection constituted a safeguard for both sides, yet the Chinese-North Korean side rejected it as being unnecessary.

The Chinese-North Korean delegation also opposed unlimited rotation and replenishment. The United Nations Command held that both sides should have the right to replace their personnel on a man-for-man, a piece-for-piece basis. Otherwise, it was unit-for-unit basis and their equipment on thought, attrition would result in a *de facto* United Nations Command's withdrawal from Korea.

In an earnest endeavour to reach agreement, it was reported, the United Nations Command delegation introduced new proposals making major concessions to the other side, i.e., elimination of aerial observation and provision for the rehabilitation of a reasonable number of airfields for civil operations.

On item 4, (relating to the exchange of prisoners), it insisted on two essential steps prior to reaching an agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war: (1) exchange of prisoners-of-war data to include numbers, nationality, names and locations of prisoners of war held by both sides; and (2) authority for entry into the enemy prisoner-of-war camps of the delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross who were immediately available for prisoner-of-war relief work.

On continued pressure from United Nations Command, it was reported, the Chinese-North Korean Command, on 18 December 1951, furnished a list of prisoners of war available for exchange, including 3,198 United States, 1,216 other United Nations Command and 7,142 Republic of Korea pris-

oners, making a total of 11,556. This total being challenged, the enemy Command agreed to furnish additional information on the whereabouts of approximately 1,000 prisoners, whose names were furnished to them by the United Nations Command and who were not on the enemy lists.

To meet the demands of the United Nations Command that the Internaational Committee of the Red Cross be allowed access to prisoner-of-war camps, the Chinese-North Korean Command agreed, on 24 December, that, as a concession to the United Nations Command, they would have no objection to the formation of joint teams of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Red Cross organizations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Chinese People's Republic going to the prisoner-of-war camps of both sides to assist in supervising the prisoners-of-war exchange after the armistice agreement was signed.

The senior delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross rejected the proposal, as he considered that it would violate the neutral position of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

On 24 December the Chinese-North Korean side suggested that Christmas letters from prisoners of war be exchanged via the subdelegation on agenda item 4. The proposal was immediately accepted by the United Nations Command delegation. Arrangements were expanded by the United Nations Command to establish not only delivery facilities for United Nations Command and Republic of Korea prisoners of war in Chinese-North Korean hands and for Chinese-North Korean prisoners in United Nations Command custody; but action was also taken to establish a temporary postal service to handle incoming mail to United Nations Command and Republic of Korea prisoners of war. That information, complete with details on how mail should be addressed, was given world-wide publicity.

The 30-day period during which the armistice was to be negotiated came to an end on 27 December without any formal action being taken.

During the period of the truce negotiations, the front was only moderately active, with patrolling and local attacks continuing on both sides. The United Nations Command, however, reported that the enemy had taken full advantage of the respite from major combat operations and that his stocks of military supplies in forward areas had been increased.

By the middle of August the United Nations Command reported that the density of hostile formations across the front and their deployment in depth was approaching that of the massive forces which preceded former offensives. Prisoners of war, it was reported, indicated that a new offensive was planned but their information was still not conclusive as to the date. The United Nations Command stated that the enemy retained the capacity to launch an offensive at the time of his choosing.

c. Other Questions

(1) Information activities

Through the combined use of radio broadcasts, loudspeaker transmissions, miniature weekly newspapers and leaflets dropped from the air, the United Nations Command continued throughout the year, it reported, to present to enemy soldiers factual news and accurate information regarding the conflict in Korea and their position in it. These were complemented by frontline broadcasts and airborne loudspeakers. Emphasis was placed on regularly restating the United Nations objectives in Korea of peace, unification and rehabilitation. The desire of the United Nations to prevent expansion of the conflict and to arrange a peaceful settlement was kept constantly before soldier and civilian alike, it was stated.

Early in May, following the enemy's unsuccessful offensive, an intensive campaign was launched to impress upon enemy soldiers in Korea the futility of the exorbitant sacrifice of life which their leaders had called upon them to sustain. United Nations leaflets, widely disseminated behind the lines as well as at the front, emphasized the extremely high casualty rates in the April offensive, the continuing material superiority of the United Nations forces and the guarantee of humane treatment by the United Nations Command of prisoners of war.

Throughout the armistice discussions at Kaesong, all concrete developments were fully reported throughout Korea by means of all available media.

On the occasion of the United Nations Day on 24 October and during the preceding and following weeks, particular emphasis was placed on explaining the United Nations and its objectives.

(2) Accusations of germ warfare

The United Nations Command reported that heavy enemy losses during winter and spring were followed by malicious propaganda alleging that United Nations forces had resorted to bacteriological and chemical warfare. These charges, it was stated, were wholly groundless and manifestly absurd. But it had been definitely established, the United Nations Command stated, that not only the enemy's armies but also the civilian population under their domination had suffered terrible losses due to disease because of the lack of the basic preventive and curative measures.

(3) Prisoners of war

In April the United Nations Command reported that in the past few weeks enemy prisoners of war formerly interned in enclosures of the United Nations Prisoner-of-war Camp No. 1 in the Pusan area had been transferred to Koje-Do. At that time there were over 90,000 prisoners at Koje-Do. The Koje-Do island was a site which had been carefully selected from the standpoint of the health and welfare of the prisoners. The geographical locations of the new enclosures had been transmitted to the enemy through the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva, in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the treatment of prisoners of war. By the end of May, over 117,000 prisoners of war were occupying enclosures of Koje-Do island.

In accordance with article 38 of the Geneva Convention, intellectual, educational and recreational pursuits of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war were actively encouraged, the United Nations Command reported. Instructional centres were erected in each compound, and four hours of classroom instruction were provided each week for all prisoners, on a voluntary basis. All prisoners had the opportunity of seeing at least one motion picture programme each week. Radio broadcasts, including news, music and entertainment programmes produced by prisoners of war were available to a majority of the prisoners. Athletics, vocational training, hobbies and handicrafts were becoming increasingly popular. Daily and weekly news sheets were provided for the use of all literate prisoners and reading groups were encouraged for the benefit of the illiterate. The construction of permanent-type winter housing employed a large number of prisoners, both skilled and unskilled.

The large number of prisoners of war detained by the United Nations Command necessitated, it was reported, the establishment of specific United Nations Command procedures for the disciplinary control of the prisoners. In October, therefore, the United Nations Command prepared and promulgated a penal code governing the conduct of prisoners of war, together with regulations governing the trial by a United Nations Military Commission of prisoners of war for offences committed after capture. A United Nations Command procedure for the imposition of nonjudicial punishment and regulations governing the confinement of prisoners of war were also promulgated in October 1951.

In its report for the period 16–31 December, the United Nations Command stated that a screening and investigation of individuals detained in the United Nations Command prisoners-of-war camps had disclosed the presence of approximately 37,500 civilian residents of the Republic of Korea. The detention of those civilians, it was stated, was attributable to various circumstances attendant upon the confusion inseparable from hostilities, such as the displacement of large masses of the civilian population.

A thorough rescreening of those civilians, it was stated, was now being conducted jointly by the Republic of Korea and the United Nations Command to ensure that none were dangerous to the security of the United Nations Command forces. The civilians, all citizens of the Republic of Korea, had now been segregated from the prisoners of war in separate camps and, following the re-screening, would generally be released to return to their homes. The United Nations Command, it was said, had furnished the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva with complete information concerning the group, including the names of all individuals concerned.

(4) Reports of violations of laws of war

In March the United Nations Command stated that reports continued to be received concerning the violations by the enemy of the laws of war.

The report of the United Nations Command for the period 16–31 August stated that, as of July 1951, approximately 8,000 United States military personnel had been reported killed as war crimes victims. Approximately 15,000 South Koreans, of whom 14,000 were civilians, had been reported killed in other reported incidents. Those figures, it was stated, did not include the deaths reported in Seoul, Taejon and other places occupied by the enemy forces.

FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CLARK M. CLIFFORD ANNOUNCES PLAN TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND RECLAIM OUR POW–MIA'S

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last night, the former Secretary of Defense and alleged confidant of Presidents, Clark M. Clifford, announced that he has a plan to end the war in Vietnam and reclaim our POW–MIA's. Mr. Clifford's remarks have received wide coverage by radio and television, and have been "front paged" by the daily newspapers, yet no one, to my knowledge, had bothered to ask Mr. Clifford why he did not have such a plan when he was being paid to run the Department of Defense. I will tell you why. He did not have one, and in Mr. Clifford's words, he did not understand the war in those days. Well, I have news for you, he was not the only one.

Robert Strange McNamara did not understand it either.

Neither did Averill Harriman. He was too busy designing tables.

Neither did the Kennedys.

Neither did Lyndon B. Johnson.

Neither did HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He now says he did, but L. B. J. would not let him talk.

Neither did EDMUND MUSKIE, who says in 1971 he wishes he had had something to say in 1965.

The list is endless, but suffice to say, no one had a plan until Richard Nixon started withdrawing the troops, now everyone has a plan.

Mr. Speaker, American troops are coming home, at a faster rate than had even been announced. Richard Nixon is keeping his promise. No other President from Truman through Johnson has been able to do likewise.

I have listened to Clark M. Clifford for hours on end. I have never been impressed with him in the past, and even less in the present. I doubt that his intelligence gathering on Vietnam is any better than mine. I would suggest that Mr. Clifford stop playing politics, and let the doers get on with the job.

BIG BROTHER AND YOU

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention an article by an outstanding writer and a vigorous defender of civil liberties: Nat Hentoff. Mr. Hentoff, writing in Juris Doctor, a magazine for young lawyers, has reiterated the threat that information gathering—by credit unions, police departments, and government agencies—poses to individual privacy and liberty.

As Mr. Hentoff points out:

> There are two ways to safeguard what privacy we have left—through the courts and through the legislative process.

The courts cannot be the sole bearers of the responsibility to protect individual rights. Congress as a coordinate branch has an obligation to safeguard the constitutional rights guaranteed by the fourth amendment. We need to make clear our commitment to these rights, and I believe that my Federal Privacy Act will provide such a commitment. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The article follows:

THE LAW BEAT: BIG BROTHER AND YOU

(By Nat Hentoff)

Finally—very belatedly—attention is being paid to the accelerating pervasiveness and efficiency of Big Brother. But is enough attention being paid, and will it last? In the Armageddon between civil libertarians and Big Brother's record-keepers, the media will play a crucial role.

Unless the citizenry at large is impelled by its own *self-interest* to beat back the assault on privacy, Michigan Law Professor Arthur R. Miller's vision of the not-far-distant future in his new urgent book, *The Assault on Privacy*, will prove to have been prescient rather than fanciful: "An identification number given to us at birth might become a leash around our necks and make us the object of constant monitoring through a womb-to-tomb computer dossier."

Obviously, there are two ways to safeguard what privacy we have left—through the courts and through the legislative process. In the matter of secret police dossiers on citizens exercising their First Amendment rights, there are, for example, a growing number of suits being filed around the country by the American Civil Liberties Union, its affiliates and other public interest groups. Media coverage of these suits, and the reasons for bringing them, has so far been characteristically scanty and fragmented, where such coverage has taken place at all.

Yet one would think it important information—and not only to the citizens of Los Angeles—that the Civil Liberties Union of Southern California has charged in its suit against the Los Angeles Police Department that members of the latter "have spent and are spending public funds . . . to make and maintain intelligence files and other files, records and reports pertaining to church, political, educational and social welfare organizations and associations and of person associated with such groups, *with respect to which and with respect to whom neither . . . the Police Department nor any police officer has any information that such group or person has committed, will commit or intends to commit any criminal offense.*" (Emphasis added.)

This kind of secret police activity is, of course, happening in every city in the country. But with exceedingly few exceptions, television and the straight press act as if nothing of the sort is going on. Nor has there been anywhere near the necessary media coverage of all those other dossier-keeping agencies. An apolitical citizen may not become aroused over the stealthy work of secret political police (military and civilian), but he might well become outraged, and *political*, were he to recognize how normative the compiling of the most intimate data has become in this computerized land.

As Ralph Nader notes, by way of illustration, in a paper for the American Civil Liberties Union: "When you try to buy life insurance, a file of . . . intimate information about you is compiled by the 'inspection agency.' The insurance company not only finds out about your health, it also learns about your drinking habits (how often, how much, with others or alone, and even what beverage), your net worth, salary, debts, domestic troubles, reputation, associates, manner of living, and standing in the community. The investigator is also asked to inquire of your neighbors and associates whether there is 'any criticism of character or morals.'

"The 'inspection agency' that obtains this information," Nader continues, "puts it into a dossier and saves it. The agency may later make another investigation for an insurance company, or for an employer, a prospective creditor or a landlord. In fact, the agency will probably make this personal information available to anyone who has $5.00 and calls himself a 'prospective employer.'"

I do not believe that most Americans are as yet so thoroughly anesthetized that they would be apathetic to this kind of pernicious record-keeping and dispersion—if they were kept informed about it and its ramifications by the media. And if they were, there might then be enough political support to get New York Congressman Edward Koch's Federal Privacy Act passed. (Its Senate sponsor is Birch Bayh.) This bill is only a beginning, and it only applies to government agencies, but an awakened populace could lead to its also including private agencies.

As it is now written, the Koch-Bayh measure requires each agency maintaining records on any individual to notify the individual that such a record exists, notify the individual of all transfers of such information, disclose such information from such records only with the consent of the individual or when legally required, maintain a record of all persons inspecting such records, and permit the individual to inspect his records, make copies of them and supplement them.

Clearly there is much information about individuals that should not be compiled at all—by any agency. But the Koch Bayh bill does begin to deal with dossiers that currently exist and would make it easier to control future record-keeping. The bill, however, hasn't a chance unless other congressmen hear from constituents who have suddenly realized that the Fourth Amendment is *theirs* too.

The other route to beat back the assault on privacy is through the courts, and it is here that lawyers ought to be much more informed and active than they are yet. The ACLU and its affiliates should not be expected—nor do they have the resources—to bring all suits that are relevant to this issue. In his epilogue to *The Assault on Privacy*, Miller observes: "I fear that my own profession—the law—is being somewhat laggard in coming to grips with the broader ramifications of the computer. Leading groups within the legal fraternity, such as the American Law Institute, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and the American Bar Association, have yet to energize themselves in any significant manner. If these associations remain inactive and fail to join forces with corresponding organizations in other disciplines, we probably will continue to stumble in the dark."

Nat Hentoff, a columnist for the *Village Voice* and writer for *The New Yorker* is also a member of the Board of Directors of the New York Civil Liberties Union.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my reasons for voting against the rule on the International Coffee Agreement Act which this House considered yesterday. I should also like to compliment the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) for his perspicacity and perseverance in pointing out the flaws in this legislation.

The alleged need for the International Coffee Agreement is set forth by the Ways and Means Committee in its report, at page 2:

> As the world's most important coffee consuming country, the United States has a substantial interest in fostering international cooperation aimed at assuring an efficient supply of coffee at reasonable prices and avoiding the peaks in prices which sometimes have caused the retail price of coffee to rise to well over $1 per pound.

On December 18, 1970, when we last considered this legislation—and I voted for it at that time—we heard the same arguments and received the same assurances from the committee that American consumers would benefit from stabilized prices obtained under the act. At that time, the price of coffee in New York City was 75 cents per pound. This past Saturday, when I went into a supermarket in my home district to check on the "continuing benefits" which consumers are supposedly reaping under this act, I found that a pound of coffee was selling for $1.05.

I am now opposed to this legislation, for I believe that the benefits promised under it are illusory and that it does the reverse of what is intended. Its passage will only insure continuing high prices for the American coffee drinker.

REVENUE SHARING

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks hearings have been held in both House and Senate committees on the subject of revenue sharing. On Tuesday, I was privileged to testify before the Ways and Means Committee on two bills I have introduced that would provide new revenues for our cities and States.

The critical issue at these hearings is not so much "revenue sharing," for the Federal Government already shares its revenues with States and cities. The issue is the very serious financial crisis of these governmental bodies. New York City is perhaps the most troubled metropolis of all with a budgetary gap ranging from $600 million to $1 billion. Furthermore, throughout the State necessary social and educational services are being cut back because of the devastating reductions recently made in the State's budget. How this country restores the health and fiscal solvency of our State and local governments is the objective in devising a new form of Federal revenue sharing. In doing so, it is important that this Federal assistance go where the needs are most critical and where a responsible effort is being made locally to meet the problems.

In the case of New York there is no alternative; Federal help must be forthcoming. Public services are inadequate and taxpayers are bearing a tremendous tax burden. An example of this is the fact that in 1970 New York State collected $2.5 billion of the total $9.19 billion collected by all the States in personal income taxes. And New York City collected an additional $250 million.

In January I introduced H.R. 847, a bill to provide a 40-percent Federal tax credit for State and local income taxes. Under this bill a taxpayer would be given a 40-cent credit against his or her Federal income tax for every dollar paid in State and local income taxes. State governments would then be able to increase their taxes, thereby picking up the credit, without actually increasing the taxpayers' burden.

On May 27, I introduced H.R. 8762, the General Grant Revenue Return Act of 1971, with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY). This bill would send back to the States and localities a portion of the Federal tax revenues. The State distribution formula is based essentially on two factors: need and revenue raising effort through State and local income taxes. The bill would provide the States with approximately 10 billion in its first year. Because of its large educational and welfare expenditures and high level of tax collections, New York State would receive $1.45 billion with an estimated $484 million going to New York City.

Mr. Speaker, while this Congress must be concerned about the Federal Government's own fiscal problems, it must also be concerned about the fiscal solvency of our local governments. It should be recognized that Federal revenues come from the people of this country who are citizens of not only the country, but also their States and municipalities. We have an obligation to be concerned about the taxpayers' problems at the local level. We must act to provide new revenues, and we must be certain that what is done actually does provide new money and does not end up being just a juggling of today's budgetary figures.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL AWARDED TO BRIG. GEN. CHARLES H. SNIDER, ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL FOR VETERINARY SERVICE, USAF

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1971, Kansas State University presented its Distinguished Service Award in the field of veterinary medicine to Brig. Gen. Charles H. Snider.

A native of East St. Louis, Ill., General Snider has had an outstanding career and has received considerable recognition for his important contributions to veterinary medicine. Presently, General Snider is the Assistant Surgeon General for Veterinary Service, Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Air Force Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

It has been my pleasure to know General Snider and his family over the years. I am very proud that he comes from the 24th District.

At this point in the RECORD, I include General Snider's biography which appeared in the Kansas State University program:

DR. CHARLES H. SNIDER

Brigadier General Charles H. Snider is the Assistant Surgeon General for Veterinary Service, Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Air Force Headquarters.

Born in East St. Louis, Illinois, on March 31, 1917, General Snider earned his D.V.M. at Kansas State University in 1940. He later received a master of public health degree at the University of Michigan in 1951. After completing his professional degree at KSU, he was associated with a pharmaceutical firm in his home town.

General Snider was commissioned in the Army Veterinary Corps Reserve in December 1940, and began active duty on September 9, 1941. He was integrated into the regular Army Veterinary Corps in 1946 and then transferred to the Air Force Veterinary Corps on July 1, 1949.

His first duty assignment was as meat-dairy product inspector at the Army Quartermaster Depot, Chicago. In November 1943, he was reassigned to the 1629th Service Unit, St. Louis, in the same capacity. From May 1945, to January 1946, he commanded the 5035th Army Veterinary Service Unit in Chicago.

He became commander of Detachment 5, 5035 Army Service Unit and was also attending veterinarian for the St. Louis Quartermaster Market Center. In May 1948, he became assistant veterinarian, Perishable Subsistence Section, Headquarters, Quartermaster Market Center, Chicago.

In November 1951, he served in French Morocco as commanding veterinarian, Seventeenth Air Force. He was responsible for formulating programs of preventive medicine, public health, and disease control efforts. In June 1954, he was transferred to the Air Force Surgeon General's Office in Washington, D.C., assuming duties as deputy for professional services in the Veterinary Office.

General Snider was reassigned in June 1958, as Air Force special project and liaison officer, Veterinary Division, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Washington, D.C. During this time, he assisted in developing and instructing Army-Air Force training programs for military veterinary medicine, laboratory animal medicine and preventive medicine.

He was the Department of Defense project officer for preparing the section on military veterinary medicine for the congressional committee print, "Veterinary Medical Service and Human Health." In September 1960, he assumed duties as commanding veterinarian, Headquarters, Air Force Logistics Command, Wright-Patterson Air Base, Ohio.

General Snider was appointed as assistant surgeon general for veterinary services in October 1963. He was recently honored with a public service award by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

COMMENDATION FOR COCHRAN VETERANS HOSPITAL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been considerable interest and concern with our veterans hospitals. Without trying to gloss over the problems that exist and the efforts being made to correct them, I share with my colleagues a copy of a letter Mr. Clyde Ferrell, 103 St. Justin, Cahokia, Ill., has written to the director of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in St. Louis and a copy of which Mr. Ferrell sent to me. His comments are indicative of the cooperation and service my office has received from the two Veterans' Administration hospitals in St. Louis:

MAY 16, 1971.

Mr. DAVID ANTON,
Hospital Director,
VA Hospital,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Although I am writing you this letter personally, I am sending copies to the Representatives and Senators both in Illinois and Missouri.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your most capable staff for the most wonderful medical treatment and care that any veteran could possibly expect.

I am a wounded veteran of WW II. I have lived and worked in the Illinois area for 25 years having always made good and above average income, and always in the past paid for hospitalization and medical care that I had received in private hospitals.

In the past two years I have had to give up 3 jobs paying in the excess of $10,000 a year due to the fact that I could not walk and had very little use of my arms and hands.

In the Illinois area where I live there are very few doctors and the ones that do practice will not accept new patients. As my condition grew worse, and upon advice from friends, I came to Cochran Hospital April 16, 1971. Having had no experience with VA Hospitals, I talked with a Mr. Mackey in the Admission office who was very understanding, courteous and helpful in processing me through to get examined and admitted.

I must admit that the first two days after being put in a ward with seven other patients I was pretty well disgusted after listening to them talk and say such things as this doctor is no good, this nurse is no good, the food is bad and everything in general is lousy. I came to the conclusion that these patients were just too damn lazy to work and were in this hospital for a free ride believing that the government owed them a living. I met the young and fantastic doctors that were to take my case and help me. My whole attitude changed. These fine doctors: Dr. Bernard Jaffe, Dr. Richard Shaw, Dr. M. Fried, Dr. John Sheridan, Dr. John Boucher, Dr. Barrett Holder; these doctors with great speed and efficiency started taking X-rays and other tests and found the trouble right

away and told me how they were to correct it and what I was to expect. I have hardening of the arteries and there is no blood circulation to my legs and arms. The more I talked with Dr. Jaffe and his group the more confidence I had in them. After 3 years of worry they gave me hope that I would walk and be able to work again.

On April 26, 1971, Dr. Jafee operated on me. I think it was a very serious operation but he said it was successful. I spent 10 days in the Intensive Care Surgical Unit and I would like to at this time thank those dynamic women nurses that took care of me. There are not enough words and thanks that I can give these wonderful and dedicated nurses.

I do not ever expect in my life time to meet and get to know such a fine group of women nurses at one time and in one group. Regardless of how serious any operation is or could be with your breathing machines, heart machines and these Intensive Care nurses and wonderful doctors, I don't see how anyone can miss. I shall always remember these nurses: Miss Wehrle, Miss Sherry Brown, Mrs. Mary Barnes, Mrs. Judy Waligorski, Miss B. Peralta, Miss Maria Verkamman, Mrs. J. E. Robinson, Mrs. Randall and Mrs. Douglas Roberts.

I should also like to mention 2 great doctors that were of help to me in the Intensive Care Unit, and to me they are the greatest—Dr. John Newton, Dr. Holloway. I appreciate very much what they did for me.

Before and after my surgery, I was visited at my bedside by the Social Service representative, various Veteran Service representatives and Contact Service. They all wanted to know if there was anything that they could do to help me. This was really something that I did not expect, but it makes me feel more than ever that this whole organization has one thing in common—"what can we do for you, the veteran."

I would also like to comment on the food service. Having been in here for 30 days I have been on liquid diets, nothing at all and on regular diet and I can truthfully say that the food is the best that I have ever eaten. As a matter of fact I did not eat this good at work at our cafeteria or at home. The food service is really great. Your dieticians are to be congratulated. According to Dr. Jafee I will undergo 2 more operations before my condition is 100% OK. But regardless of whether I stay in here another day or another month, as each day ends, my respect grows not only for my wonderful doctors and nurses, but the entire administration.

My sincere thanks to you and the entire administration for what you have done for me. I think for the first time in my life I am proud to be a veteran and know that there are people like the ones in this organization that care.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE W. FERRELL.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT TO SHORTEN PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, I introduced H.R. 8606, a bill to limit the length of presidential campaigns to 60 days. This legislation, which I have introduced in previous Congresses, has always received considerable editorial and grassroots support. People are tired of long presidential campaigns. They are bored from the constant overexposure of candidates in the media and distrustful of the exhorbitant expenses which stem from marathon campaigns. Candidates are forced to be strong men, and the electorate is forced to suffer through an endless barrage of spot commercials and campaign speeches.

In its present consideration of campaign reforms, I hope that the Congress will regulate this basic source of other campaign ills—the lengthy presidential campaign. The 60-day campaign will automatically reduce and possibly eliminate other objectionable electoral excesses. The short campaign is the most direct approach to presidential campaign reform, and I hope that the Congress will adopt this proposal as part of the larger reform packages it is now considering.

I am pleased that popular support for this idea is continuing. I include at this point editorials from the Bridgeport Post and the Danbury News-Times on the subject of shorter campaigns:

[From the Danbury News-Times, June 2, 1971]

SHORTEN THE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

One way to cut campaign costs, without getting involved in the merits and demerits of plans to limit certain kinds of expenditures, is to cut the length of campaigns.

We've been treated for months, now, to full examination of the possibilities and probabilities of the Democratic ticket in 1972, as well as discussions on whether President Nixon will have stand-in candidates in various state primaries or permit his own name to be listed on the Republican ticket

It's still a long time to election day—one year, five months and five days, to be specific. It's a little more than nine months until the first presidential preference primary.

Two years ago, Congressman John Monagan proposed legislation to shorten presidential election campaigns. He's trying again this year.

It's an idea whose time has come. We only hope other congressmen recognize this fact—soon.

[From the Bridgeport Post, May 30, 1971]

SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

U.S. Representative John S. Monagan of the 5th District would like to see presidential campaigns shortened. So would we and the vast majority of American people. No doubt the aspirants for the White House would not object to a time limit.

Mr. Monagan believes a short campaign "makes sense physically, financially, and psychologically." So, he has introduced legislation which would make illegal the nomination of presidential candidates more than 60 days prior to election day.

It is a simple, practical solution.

That is the fault with the Monagan idea. Congress does not welcome direct, uncomplicated answers to problems. If any sort of election reform legislation does come from the 92nd Congress most likely it will not deal as forthrightly with the situation as does the Monagan proposal.

In announcing his plan Mr. Monagan recalled that in 1860 Abraham Lincoln won the presidency though he did not campaign. A century later John F. Kennedy traveled 40,000 miles to deliver 360 speeches. That year his campaign and the losing effort of Richard M. Nixon cost some $20 million. No one should think Mr. Monagan believes the candidates in 1972 should sit back and see what happens on that fateful Tuesday in November. Rather, his reference to the events of 1860 and 1960 are intended to illustrate how politicians have gone from one extreme to the other.

Mr. Monagan is on target when he claims that marathon campaigns bore the electorate while exhausting the candidates. In other words, a little shrinkage would help the salesmen and the customers too.

TO WARNER LAWSON: A CHORAL TRIBUTE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked the passing of Warner Lawson, the distinguished dean of the School of Fine Arts at Howard University and originally of Hartford, Conn. His contributions to the fine arts in the Washington area were highlighted by his being the first black man ever to conduct the National Symphony Orchestra as well as being the first black member of its board of directors.

I vividly remember a Verdi requiem which Lawson's Howard chorus sang under Howard Mitchell's direction and I shall never forget the dramatic power of this group.

I am proud of his Connecticut origins and grateful for his lifelong devotion to enriching the lives of his students and of the people of this area.

Monday, a choral tribute was paid to Dean Lawson by the students he trained for over 25 years. In further tribute I call to the attention of my colleagues this fine article by the inimitable Paul Hume in the Washington Post of June 8:

A CHORAL TRIBUTE

(By Paul Hume)

Men and women who sang under Warner Lawson's direction in great choirs that proudly carried Howard University's name came together yesterday morning to sing in tribute to their leader, who died last Thursday.

From all over the country, 130 of them gathered in a choral reunion, vividly demonstrating the accomplishment of the years when Dean Lawson built the Howard University Choir into one of the country's noted choral ensembles.

Their voices filled Rankin Chapel as they sang, "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept." Some of them had sung in the first choir Lawson conducted after coming to Howard in 1942. One singer canceled several European commitments to sing for the man who had had a part in making those commitments possible.

Beethoven and contemporary American music mixed freely with Negro spirituals just as it did throughout Lawson's years at Howard. Randall Thompson's "Alleluia" had the radiant beauty of tone it held the many times the dean of the School of Fine Arts led it.

Now it was being directed with a fine supple freedom by his long-time assistant and associate Evelyn White. And the singers were responding as if the man who had taught them to sing together, alone or with orchestras in the halls of this country and South America were still standing in front of them.

Warner Lawson was the first black man ever to conduct the National Symphony, as he was the first black man to be elected to its board of directors, a post he held at the time of his death.

Anyone who ever heard the Howard Choir open up with "O Fortuna!" at the beginning of Carl Orff's "Carmina Burana," or the "Blanziflor et Helena" at its close, will never forget the torrential sound, prefectly balanced and projected, with which the chorus matched the orchestra. So fine was his training in rehearsal that Lawson needed nothing

more than to wave his right arm toward his singers for their song to burst forth that way.

He and Howard Mitchell often worked together to prepare some of the most memorable concerts in National Symphony history. Their joint efforts produced, in Villa-Lobos' Choros No. 10 with its Brazilian text, "Rasga o coracao," a climax of overwhelming power, to which the choir added the kind of rhythmic pulsing excitement that swept through the chapel yesterday in "Ain't that good news!"

Dean Lawson always insisted that his singers show that their mastery of Bach and Beethoven was as artistically complete as their unrivaled singing in spirituals, which they seemed to own in a unique way.

Yesterday listeners heard as flawless an account of the "Hallelujah" from Beethoven's "Mount of Olives," as might be imagined, followed by a "Let Us Break Bread Together" that reached deep into the heart.

In a lull from the choral sound, there came a reminder of the splendor of individual voices that Lawson encouraged. He had a marvelous gift for blending solo voices into his chorus without ever suppressing the individual character of the voice.

This came to mind as one of the sopranos stepped forward to sing the most exquisite moment from "Carmina Burana," that large work that must be called one of "Lawson's Greatest Hits." In a tone of hushed beauty she sang, "In trutina mentis dubia," to flood the memory with echoes of some of the grand nights when the dean brought new glory to his choir, its university and himself.

Warner Lawson for more than a quarter of a century performed the highest function possible to either the musician or the educator: he created a living, vibrant, musical instrument. He created it out of human beings, to whom he gave a model of musical integrity, an example of artistic performance and a vision of creative perfection.

Because of the special bond that exists between a conductor and those whom he trains and leads in thrilling performances, Lawson won to him the hearts as well as the malleable voices of those hundreds of singers he trained in his years at Howard.

His alert, imaginative mind made him a distinguished dean of the School of Fine Arts when the school was created in 1960. It was his heart, following the dictates of his acutely perceptive musical training and instincts, that made his choral work magnificent. The good that he did lives after him.

GRAZING LIVESTOCK ON PUBLIC LANDS

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a formula for determining the cost of grazing livestock on the public lands.

For years, there has been continuing controversy, disagreement, and uncertainty not only as to the value of forage on the public lands, but also as to the methods used to determine that value. Various methods were tried and discarded by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. New methods were introduced only to be abandoned within a few years. The net result was general dissatisfaction by the Government agencies, uncertainty in long-range planning by the livestock operators and confusion and criticism by the interested public.

The proposed legislation accepts the findings and computations of a 1966 grazing fee study so far as that study went in determining the difference in the cost of operating on private and public land. However, the present legislation makes a percentage allowance for the average public land investment cost of the operator. This allowance is in recognition of the substantial investment made by livestock operators on public lands. Such costs have long been recognized by operators, purchasers, and financial institutions and have been accepted as a cost of operating on the public lands.

While the formula establishes a base fee which remains constant, it also provides for a flexible annual fee that is tied to the average price per pound of livestock, the carrying capacity of the range, and other variables. This permits the annual grazing fee to rise above or fall below the base fee to reflect changing conditions.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 7211, a bill which sets out guidelines and objectives for basic public land policy. I recognize that portions of the present bill are not completely in harmony with H.R. 7211 as that bill relates to advisory boards and further, that the present proposal does not expressly provide as a possible penalty for overgrazing, termination of a grazing permit. These differences are relatively minor and can be easily worked out in the legislative process with H.R. 7211 receiving attention prior to the present proposal.

The present bill is in harmony with the general recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission and will assist in bringing order and stability to grazing operations on the public lands.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING—THE SURGEON GENERAL'S REPORT

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, 1970, Surgeon General Dr. Jesse L. Steinfeld approved a document entitled "Medical Aspects to Childhood Lead Poisoning." This details the medical guidelines to assist cities and localities in the detection, treatment, and prevention of lead poisoning.

I am not going to include the entire document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I would like to call attention to parts of this statement by the chief medical officer of the United States concerning a dread disease which ravages the small children of our inner cities.

The initial recommendation of the Surgeon General's statement is that—

> The United States Public Health Service recommends that screening programs for the prevention and treatment of lead poisoning (plumbism) in children include all those who are 1 to 6 years of age and living in old, poorly maintained houses. Children exposed to other special local conditions involving lead hazards also should be screened.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91–695, authorizes grants to States and units of local government for such screening programs. The importance of these programs is stated by the Surgeon General:

> The prime goal of screening programs is the prevention of lead poisoning. The prevention of plumbism can be achieved through the early detection of children with undue absorption of lead . . .

The Surgeon General also stresses the need for treatment, once undue blood levels have been identified, stating that screening should be "followed immediately by remedial action before the state of overt poisoning is reached." Grants for treatment programs are also authorized by the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91–695.

Another component of a meaningful assault on a disease which takes the lives of 200 children annually, permanently institutionalizes 800 more, and causes moderate to severe brain damage to another 3,200, is eradication of the lead-based paint from the environment. As to this, the Surgeon General states:

> (S)creening programs should not be limited to the detection and treatment of children with lead poisoning. To be effective, such programs must also include adequate plans for medical follow-up of those children screened and found to have high levels of lead absorption, as well as those diagnosed as having lead poisoning. For all of these children, the program must provide for adequate and speedy removal of lead hazards from their homes.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act authorizes grants for eradication programs.

The Surgeon General, in his report entitled "Medical Aspects of Childhood Lead Poisoning," sets up a list of priorities, realizing that many communities—actually, all communities—do not have the financial resources to conduct a full-scale, adequate assault on childhood lead poisoning. He states:

> In some cities, undue exposure to and absorption of lead among children may be so prevalent that an overwhelming number of those screened are found to have blood lead values of 40 micrograms or more per 100 milliliters of whole blood. Under such circumstances, local resources may not permit immediate evaluation of all such children, and a schedule of priorities will have to be adapted.

The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act authorizes $30 million for fiscal year 1972, of which all but $5 million is authorized for screening, treatment, and eradication programs. Hopefully, these funds, once appropriated, will help communities to be able to avoid having to set priorities which exclude some of the children who should be treated.

TRIBUTE TO AN OUTSTANDING OFFICER

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, Dade County, Fla., celebrated Armed Forces Day with an outstanding parade and reception for the men and women serving in the various branches of the military. We are most fortunate in Florida in having an outstanding Air Force Reserve unit, the 915th Military Airlift Group stationed in Dade County. This organization has consistently distin-

guished itself in winning many honors in operational excellence, outstanding logistical functions and maintaining an enviable combat readiness posture. It is appropriate that we pause to honor and commend the outstanding work being done by the men and women of this unit to guarantee the security of the United State of America and to further the ideals of the American way of life.

I particularly wish to cite the accomplishments of one very distinguished senior officer that I have had the pleasure of knowing for many years, Lt. Col. Tracy M. Baker, Jr., Chief of Supply of the 915th Military Airlift Group, Homestead Air Force Base, Fla. Colonel Baker has served in a distinguished manner in the Armed Forces of the United States for many years and has demonstrated superior leadership which has served as an inspiring example to the young people in that area. Colonel Baker started his career in the military as an enlisted member of the U.S. Army Infantry. Early in World War II he completed aviation cadet training as a rated pilot, has flown 200 combat missions, both in World War II and the Korean conflict, and is the holder of many combat medals and services awards. Most recently, for the past six and a half years he has served at Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., and his work with the Air Force and the local community has created the finest public relations in any area of our Nation. During these years the organization where he has served has received numerous awards including the Air Force Outstanding Unit Citation, the 21 AF Operational Excellence Award, several outstanding logistical awards and, on numerous occasions, it has been brought to my attention by various distinguished officials what a fine outstanding officer Colonel Baker is and it has been noted that Colonel Baker's unique abilities have contributed directly to the superior performance of the 915th Military Airlift Group. During this period as cost reduction manager for the 915th Military Airlift Group, Colonel Baker's management action saved thousands of dollars and he was awarded a certificate of achievement from Headquarters based on these actions. The Mayor of Dade County and the Awards Committee of the Armed Forces League of Greater Miami has honored him with a Distinguished Services Award. I am also pleased to note that he was recently recommended by his commanding officer for the Air Force Commendation Medal.

On this occasion I have singled him out for special attention in recognition of his passing the 30-year mark of total military service, the honors bestowed upon him by the Mayor of Dade County and the Armed Forces League and respectfully recommend to the Members of Congress that his distinguished services and devotion to duty for his country be recognized at this time.

HENRY L. DOHERTY MARINE SCIENCE CENTER

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I had the pleasure and privilege of attending the dedication ceremony of the Henry L. Doherty Marine Science Center at the University of Miami. This great building, so much the fruition of the dreams and the great work of Dean F. G. Walton Smith of the University of Miami School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, will immeasurably contribute to the work which will be done in the future by the University of Miami Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.

This edifice will also long honor the notable name of Hon. Henry L. Doherty, its principal benefactor.

The ceremony at the time of the dedication of this meaningful center was a stimulating and inspiring one. Because of the great interest of my colleagues and so many of my fellow citizens in marine and atmospheric science, I include a transcript of the dedication ceremony in the RECORD:

DEDICATION CEREMONY: THE HENRY L. DOHERTY MARINE SCIENCE CENTER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI ROSENTIEL SCHOOL OF MARINE AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE

Dr. F. G. Walton Smith, Dean, Rosentiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science:

Ladies and Gentlemen. I am most happy to welcome you to the dedication of this building. In particular, I want to welcome those of my friends and colleagues who made this development possible by their personal efforts or by helping to finance it, and also those who will share in the use of this building, because this is not merely a University of Miami building. It is a building for the oceanographic community. It's a building for the Commercial Fisheries Laboratory, for the Weather Bureau, the ESSA Laboratories, and for ocean industry, all of whom are represented by the plaques that you see in front of this stage. So, welcome to the Center.

Right Reverend James L. Duncan, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Southeast Florida:

Almighty God. Creator of the Universe. By whose continued creation the earth and the seas are sustained and replenished, we yield thee hearty thanks for mankind's discovery of thy laws and of the history of thy-created process. Especially, we thank thee for those whose study and knowledge have contributed to the marine sciences, the results of which are being gathered in this place, that such knowledge may be shared and increased. Bless, we pray thee, all the benefactors whose gifts made possible this center, especially thy servant Henry L. Doherty, in whose memory this building is named. Grant that all who use this facility may use it that thereby knowledge and sound learning may abound so all mankind may praise and bless thy holy name. Grant, we beseech thee, that its use may promote such reverence and holy feeling that we may use the gifts of thy bounty as trustees and stewards so that the fruits of the waters may sustain man in unity and peace according to thy holy will. Amen.

Dean Smith: I would now like to introduce our guests on the platform. You have already met the Bishop. Next to him is the man who, during his term of office in this University, has seen a great advance in the scholastic quality of the University, and in particular, a great advance in the world fame of this School. Dr. Stanford.

I don't know whether I really should introduce Commandant Jacques-Yves Cousteau, an old friend of mine and a man of considerable fame. I have here a list of some of his major efforts, and I've been asked to read them, but I really think this is redundant. However, I will do it. He is, as you know, the Director of the Institut Océanographique at Monaco. He started off as a sailor. He entered the Brest Naval Academy in 1930, and he was sent to the seaport of Toulon as a gunnery officer. Then, in 1943, as everybody knows, with engineer Emile Gagnan, he invented the automatic independent compressed-air Aqualung. Later, the Commandant converted a 360–ton former minesweeper, the H.M.S. *Calypso*, into an oceanographic vessel. In 1957, the *Calypso* achieved the deepest anchoring (25,000 feet) in the Romanche Trench in the Equatorial Atlantic. Also, in 1957, he was elected Director of the Oceanographic Museum at Monaco. In 1966, he became General Secretary of the International Commission for Scientific Exploration in the Mediterranean Sea, and in 1968, he was nominated as Foreign Associated Member of the National Academy of Science of USA. I know he has published at least seven books and quite a number of films. His film *The Silent World* received the Oscar in 1956 as the best documentary feature. *The Golden Fish* film was awarded the Oscar for the best short film in 1960, and in 1965, his film *World Without Sun* also received an Oscar. He is a "triple Oscar." In February 1967, he undertook an important television and scientific cruise around the world from the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean to the Pacific, and it was during this cruise that he realized the TV series called *The Under-Sea World of Jacques-Yves Cousteau*. It is a great pleasure to welcome Commandant Cousteau here.

In the next seat is Mr. A. C. Newlin, who is one of the most important people here today because he's Vice President of the Henry L. and Grace Doherty Charitable Foundation which has provided the greater part of the funds for this enterprise of ours. He received his LL.B. degree from Columbia University in 1928. He was admitted to the New York Bar that year, and since then, has been practicing law in New York City. He's a Director of the Pacific Tin Consolidated Corporation and President and Director of the Marshall and Nellie Alworth Memorial Fund in Duluth, Minnesota; Vice President and Director of the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation; a Trustee of the Solomon Guggenheim Foundation in New York City; and Chairman of the Board and Trustee of Centre College at Danville, Kentucky. He's also a Director of the Metropolitan Opera Association in New York City. He is also either Vice President or Director of a number of charitable foundations.

Dr. William David McElroy is the Director of the National Science Foundation. He also is important because the National Science Foundation contributes very heavily to the operation of this School. It has provided us with ships and with the funds to operate ships and with the funds to carry out research, and I know that he's trying to stabilize his funds. He has a Doctor of Philosophy from Princeton University in 1943. This sort of puts me in my place because I was a Post-Doctoral Fellow there in 1933. He has an Honorary Doctor of Science degree from the University of Buffalo, and in 1944, he was with the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Later on, he became Director of the McCollum-Pratt Institute at Johns Hopkins University, and from 1956 on, he was Chairman of the Department of Biology at Johns Hopkins. In July of 1969, he was appointed Director of the National Science Foundation. His areas of professional specialization are bioluminescence, the light emitted from animals; bacterial mutations; biochemical genetics; mechanism of enzyme action; and bacterial and mold metabolism. I have a list of the professional societies that he belongs to, but since there are twelve of them, I'll just say he belongs to twelve professional societies. He's also been a member of the National Academy of Sciences since 1963, and in 1957,

he was a Harvey Lecturer. So, I think we can safely say that he is a distinguished scientist.

Mr. Otho Bruce represents the community that is centered around this Marine Science Center. He's a Senior Vice President for Industrial Development of the First National Bank of Miami, and although he's only been here in Miami seven years, he's become a very active member of the entire business, and especially marine community. He is a member of the Marine Technology Society; the National Oceanography Association; the Advisory Board for the University of Miami Sea Grant Program; the Miami-Dade Junior College Marine Science Advisory Board; the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce Economic Development and Seaport Committees; the National Association of Manufacturers Ocean Resources Committee; and the Navy League. And, he is Chairman of the City of Miami Advisory Board on Marine Science and Oceanography. We regard Otho Bruce as our most important link with the community.

Many important things start in the legislature, and we're fortunate in having the person who, I think, must be the dean of our legislators here in Miami. He has been a great friend of this institute ever since we started it. I would like to introduce my friend, Claude Pepper. Whenever we need help with a Congressional Committee, Claude is always there to help.

Mr. Otho B. Bruce, Senior Vice President, Industrial Development, The First National Bank of Miami:

Thank you, Walton, Bishop Duncan, Dr. Stanford, distinguished guests. Ladies and Gentlemen.

Before 1940, the only tropical oceanographic institute in the USA was an isolated laboratory on Dry Tortugas, belonging to the Carnegie Institution. This was closed in 1939, but almost immediately afterwards Dr. F. G. Walton Smith was persuaded to come to the University of Miami to establish a marine institute. It is not necessary to repeat the well-known story of the way in which this institute has grown, from a single room to international stature, but I should mention that today it has two ocean-going research vessels, is building a third and is about to modify a fourth. These, and the buildings we see around us, with their modern scientific equipment, are a tribute to the scientists who had the courage and foresight to join Dr. Smith in his struggles. They had good reasons to do so—for Miami has unique advantages for ocean science and industry. A look at the map will show that Miami is closer to Ecuador and Peru, as well as to the greater part of the Atlantic, than are Woods Hole and San Diego; in fact it is closer to more parts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans than any other city in the United States. Miami also has a year-round good climate, which permits virtually uninterrupted research.

These natural advantages have brought to Virginia Key the Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration laboratories, now under construction. This hard core of science and engineering has benefited the entire marine-oriented community of Miami, and is rapidly making it a leading world center for marine research, education and industry. I am proud to be asked to speak for this community, since I am here to represent the leaders of those organizations that are gathered around this important Marine Science Center. Among them are Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Director of the NOAA Laboratories; Dr. Carl Sindermann, Director of T.A.B.L.; Dr. Peter Masiko of Miami-Dade Junior College; Mr. Sigmund Miller of the Miami Chapter of the Marine Technology Society, representing the marine industries; Capt. Charles Stephan of Florida Atlantic University, representing the academic section; Mr. Burton Clark of the Miami Seaquarium; and others too numerus to mention.

The purpose of this new Center is to focus all of these activities into a united effort to develop and protect our oceans, and to ensure that Dade County will achieve its destiny as a world leader in these matters. It will serve as a data center where laymen can benefit from the work of a high-calibre group of ocean scientists in the Virginia Key Oceanographic Complex.

This brings us to the role that the City of Miami and Dade County have played in this magnificent effort. Dade County provided the land on which the University of Miami, Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration have located, and both the city and county have agreed to set aside land on Virginia Key for further ocean science development. The Dade County Commission, in fact, has already passed resolutions agreeing to lease or donate land to groups of private universities, and is now considering a request for a further lease of land to the University of Miami which will enable it to provide the county with an additional multimillion dollar educational and research facility, which will also be used by ten major universities across the country, at no cost to the local tax roll. Similarly, the City of Miami has provided the land to enable Miami-Dade Junior College to establish its Marine Technical Training facilities here. I congratulate Mayor Clark, Mayor Kennedy, and City Manager Reese for these wise and foresighted actions of the county and city.

Looking to the future, I see a further addition to this great complex, as the International Oceanographic Foundation forges ahead. This is the public service group which bridges the gap between science and engineering on the one hand, and the general public on the other. Not content with producing and distributing its widely read magazine, Sea Frontiers, it is now planning a unique permanent marine science expo, to be called Ocean Space, which will be erected on Virginia Key when arrangements with the City of Miami are completed. This will be a dynamic $6 million exposition of what the oceans mean to all of us, and even how to preserve the oceans from the danger of pollution.

Today, we are in the Center of this rapidly growing ocean science community. We should be proud to be at the inauguration of this great, new think-tank. I congratulate all who have made it possible by their personal efforts and by their financial contributions, which have ensured such impressive returns.

Dr. William D. McElroy, Director, National Science Foundation:

New science centers like this one are both an achievement and a commitment. In a moment I will speak about our commitment to oceanography. But first let me add to the praise for those who have worked so hard and so well to create this fine science building. I know the void it fills in the exceptional education and research programs developed at the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science. Few oceanographic institutions in this country combine the size of student body and range of coverage in marine science found here. I know, therefore, that the Doherty Marine Science Center has much practical utility. Joining this practical utility with quality people is a certified formula for a distinguished program.

Through programs like these we can significantly improve our understanding of the world's oceans—their margins, their properties and their processes. The National Science Foundation is proud to join with the Doherty Foundation, with the University of Miami, with Dean Smith, and with many others to make this Center possible. Our ability to get things done is significantly amplified by cooperation which brings together the interests of the government, university, and private sectors. This is the type of partnership we will need as we move into the seventies. I congratulate everyone involved, and I envy those who will experience the delights of discovery which will take place within the Center.

As we pay tribute to those who had the vision and drive to build the Doherty Marine Science Center, we should not lose sight of the fact that it is part of a larger scientific complex, the national oceanographic enterprise. The Doherty Marine Science Center is essentially completed—the national oceanographic enterprise is not—and probably never will be.

As part of the national oceanographic enterprise, the National Science Foundation feels responsible for assuring that a capability for scientific research in oceanography exists and thrives in this country. The Foundation's goal is to provide support for those seeking knowledge about the ocean and the marine environment. In line with this aim, the President's budget for the NSF in the next fiscal year has an increased emphasis on oceanography—particularly in the fields of ocean ecology, dynamics, and chemistry. The National Science Foundation, the lead agency for the International Decade of Ocean Exploration, has requested $20 million from Congress for fiscal year 1972, an increase of $5 million over the previous year. This relatively new program focuses on major problems, such as environmental quality, environmental forecasting, and seabed assessment. It is intended to increase our understanding of the oceans, as well as to encourage nations to make wise and cooperative use of the oceans. In addition, we expect an increase for ship operations, construction, specialized facilities, equipment, and support services.

Funding is also proposed for an initiative whereby the Foundation and the scientific community can coordinate more closely the acquisition and the use of oceanographic facilities. This will be done in terms of priority needs of the entire academic oceanographic community and of national goals in oceanography. Through this cooperative effort, called the National Oceanographic Laboratory System, (NOLS), we expect the academic oceanographic facilities of the nation will be operated to increase the impact of the oceanographic community upon major scientific problems of the seas.

I mention these new program initiatives for two reasons. The first is to indicate that the importance of our aspirations for oceanography is recognized and renewed at the national level. Second I suggest that our renewed commitment to the study of the oceans cannot be approached solely in traditional ways.

We must rethink and reassess our customary ways of organizing and managing our affairs. In the earlier period of expanding oceanographic support, each institution tried to expand and to develop for itself a full range of ships, skills and shore facilities. This produced a number of capable ship operator institutions. However, if we are to meet the challenge of world leadership in oceanographic research; if we are to be able to do "big science" when that makes sense; and if we are to maintain the viability of the oceanographic community, new mechanisms and management concepts like NOLS are as much a part of the picture as increased funding.

Not too long ago, the idea that the day-to-day activities of man would have significant effects on the world's oceans would have been rejected by the public. Now we know otherwise. We simply cannot afford to be without the knowledge providing guidance to those making decisions relative either to man's uses of maritime resources or man's effect on these resources.

Just as the world's oceans are constantly changing, so too is the oceanographic com-

munity. It is this dynamic aspect—symbolized by the usefulness of this new facility—that is so encouraging for the future of marine science.

Mr. A. C. Newlin, Vice President, The Henry L. and Grace Doherty Charitable Foundation, Inc.:

Ladies and Gentlemen. There have been suggestions that great values are in the "Silent World." Which is not the same as saying "silence is golden." But perhaps both promote the idea of being orally brief, which I shall be.

Rome was not built in a day.

And while there is no Roman architecture in evidence here, this building was not built in a day.

It was February 13, 1967 that we had our first meeting with Dr. Stanford and Dr. Smith. I do not recall now how they got wind of the fact there was "Gold in them thar hills," but they did, and they swept in in the best style of academic vultures, thirsting for the kill.

And kill they did, with their persuasive arguments.

Then apparently they settled back to deal with the problem in the careful deliberate way that it merited, as well as to raise, principally from sources more public, the balance of the funds then considered required.

Confident of their sincerity and obvious desire to do the best job possible, we had no complaint, but you can guess what happened. With the passage of time, building costs did not go down. The argument was irrefutable—more money admittedly was needed—and so more money was forthcoming.

Now I notice from the literature about this project that the end is not yet. But we have great confidence that the winning ways of Dr. Stanford and Dr. Smith will cause many others to want to contribute something toward completing to its finest detail this handsome worthwhile building.

We at the Doherty Foundation take pride in the fact that its contribution was the initial grant that made construction of the Marine Science Center possible. And we are gratified that the Center bears the name of the late Henry L. Doherty, the founder of Cities Service Company in 1910, and its chief executive officer until his death in 1939.

He was essentially an earth scientist, although principally interested in gas and oil. We are sure he would approve our making this building possible by using financial resources he helped to create, and that he would be pleased his name is identified with it.

Mr. Doherty established a lasting reputation through his strong leadership of the movement for oil conservation. In the face of opposition from almost all of the industry of that period. Mr. Doherty strongly advocated unit operation of pools to eliminate the waste of both oil and gas, which was then prevalent.

During his later years, Mr. Doherty was strongly identified with Florida by his acquisition of much real estate in both Miami and Palm Beach, and he spent long working vacations here. We are sure he would be happy to know his name is being associated with that great Florida institution, the University of Miami.

Being of the legal profession myself, and not a scientist, I always have been interested in one of Mr. Doherty's frequently expressed philosophies, that a good way to improve the world was to kill a lawyer a day. He probably would have added, "and support scientists all the time."

We are confident the Marine Science Center will add to the effectiveness of this institution and will help to attract to it qualified individuals, without whom the finest educational facilities are merely sterile monuments.

We wish Dr. Smith and his associates the best of luck in utilizing this beautiful building.

Commandant Jacques-Yves Cousteau, Director, Institute Océanographique, Monaco:

Ladies and Gentlemen. Recently, I was invited for the launching of Apollo 14 at Cape Kennedy. It went off nicely. Very impressive. And we left the site and our car was clogged into a giant traffic jam, and one hour and 45 minutes after, Apollo 14 had turned all around the globe and we had made five miles.

During this five long miles, I remember very clearly having been impressed and thinking about the relationship between space and the sea as I had never done before. These 500,000 cars that were jamming the highway were proving that at least a million Americans had gone to the trouble of coming there, camping six or seven miles away from the launching site in order to see the greatest adventure of mankind with their own eyes. And, at the same time, there were protests asking for this money to be given for poverty or asking that this money be given for closer research like medical research or ocean research. In fact, I was very impressed by the fact that the question was misunderstood—that the hope of mankind was precisely that a few of us were able to leave our world in order to better understand it and to have a better outlook of our problems.

I remember having, in two instances, chatted with Armstrong. As you know, the men that are sent to the moon are highly trained superior individuals, but they are not selected according to their ability to translate their feelings. And, we are still lacking an interpreter, a poet, a philosopher to have gone out to the moon and told us about it. But Armstrong, in his own language and in simple words, told me very beautifully that the thing he remembered most was the beauty of the earth as seen from the moon. This has been said over and over again, but it's a most important thing. It was well worth 20 million dollars, because this impression, that men have seen the earth as the only water-gifted planet in our area and water gifted means life gifted, will probably have the greatest impact on marine sciences, because it will oblige us to think of how important it is for us to protect that small water supply—the oceans.

In a world of superspecialization, a look on a planet from outerspace was a return to the eternal values of humanities. It was opening new perspective and hope for control—control of the toys that we have generated through thinking. Two main consequences, I think, from this outer space exploration were the feeling of loneliness and the feeling as a consequence of solidarity. Loneliness, because mankind is alone (we know that now) in the solar system. And feeling alone, we feel closer together and probably this—we never were to work closer together in peace. It will also establish solidarity in science.

While I was clogged on the highway, I was making plans. I had had conferences during two days with the specialists of NASA about the use of the SKYLAB (their next important experiment) for the monitoring of the oceans, the earth's resources, and of the ocean pollution as well. And, it seemed to me to be probably the most exciting possibility for the marine sciences—the use of manned satellites to observe, control, and better understand our planet—our small fragile planet. But, if oceanography is going to be spaceborne, it also is going to be airborne. The intermediary link between the satellites and the surface is obviously better use of airplanes, helicopters and, probably soon, dirigible balloons.

I think that, apart from this approach to the ocean sciences from space and from air, the second most exciting thing of this year is the breakthrough that was recently made in Marseilles for the penetration of the oceans by man. Saturation diving was organized in two experiments: one in 1,320 feet of depth; the other one in 1,700 feet of depth. And the goal to be achieved next year is to have man capable of staying a week and working a week down to 2,000 feet in the ocean. The necessary support base—a mobile base—a submarine *Argyronete*—is under construction and to be finished next year. The third most exciting aspect, I think, is that this year an understanding is generalizing the public that the sea is part of man's environment and not a colony to be ruthlessly exploited.

Meanwhile, my little ship *Calypso* and my two or three airborne teams carry on, circling the globe, hurrying to put into film cans as much as we can of the dying ocean. There are already things in my films that will never be seen again. And, our great grandchildren may refer to such films to know what coral reefs were.

In this area near Florida, we have recently made two projects. One, the blue holes, which are in the Bahamas, are very interesting geological features, and I brought to the University of Miami a big stalactite from British Honduras to be studied and dated here by Dr. Ginsburg. Since then, I have been to the Bahamas in Andros, and I made the most fascinating dive of my entire career. With six of my friends we went down into a little crack in 10 feet of water on the reef out of Andros. We went down into a slot that was just so narrow that we were hitting our tanks against the walls all the time. It was snaking down vertically to the depth of 165 feet. There, we had to swim 700 feet horizontally at the depth of 165 feet in a narrow tunnel, and we finally ended up into a vast cave where there was a forest of beautiful stalactites and stalagmites, showing that this entire underground system had been above sea level 11,000 or 12,000 years ago. The site was the most impressive thing I have ever seen, and so much so, as we were unable to bring electric lights there, we had flares burning underwater, and it gave a really fantastic sight.

The other project is very special. It is very close to Miami. We are studying a case—the case of the so-called useless animal. This so-called useless animal is the sea cow, the manatee. And, it is a philosophical problem, because if an animal is useless, why keep him? Why protect him? This terrible thought. The defendants, the manatees, need a good lawyer to fight for them. That is what we are trying to do. Their case seemed hopeless. In fact it isn't. Some people have tried to justify the existence of the manatees in a very silly manner. They thought that if they ate grass they could be able to clear the irrigation channels. That was not a very good justification. And, the manatees are protected, but inefficiently. We are discovering that they are not useless at all. We are discovering that they are an interesting link, that they are closely related to the elephants, and that, possibly, if we were wiser, we could use them if we really want to for the most efficient way to manufacture protein.

The case of the useless animal, if I may, reminds me of the case of the useless scientist. That's something that bothers me a lot. And the useless scientist is considered as the fundamentalist—the man who does not make applied research—who does not bring in resources directly from his research. After the war, the glory of the United States has been to encourage greatly the basic sciences as it has been nowhere in the rest of the world. Unfortunately—and I'm speaking as a citizen of the world—this plan that had been followed by other nations is now considered as obsolete. We are entering the era of goalism. We want to justify and switch our emphasis to the practical. This goalism is practically the end of the dreamer. "Don't search," they say. "Find."

We look to oceanography now for food, for minerals, and into its nature for antisubmarine warfare logic. In fact, what it is developing is a direction—a centralization of the direction and the orientation of research all around the world, all the nations. That's a new trend; that's a fashion. It changes, but it changes slower than the female fashion.

The United Nations has made very interesting in-depth studies proving that what has made the success of the United States science after the war was precisely its pluralism and its freedom. Nevertheless, since four or five years, the trend is exactly the opposite, increasing the cost and the prey of bureaucracy upon the fundings, obliging the scientist to lie in order to justify their fundamental research. In a trillion dollar economy, about 165 billion dollars are directly or indirectly dedicated to marine activities. Less than half of 1 percent of that sum is given to marine sciences, which is only 3 percent of the national research and development funds in this country. This means that out of that less than one-tenth is for basic research.

There is in the public and in the students a great confusion. The extremes, I think, could be considered as Buckminster Fuller on one side, who thinks pretty naively that technology and intuition will bring the golden age to mankind. The other opposite being Lewis Mumford, the author of "Pentagon of Power," thinking that science and technology is bringing western civilization to a breakdown. None of this has any reason to be considered. In fact, since 1967 (I am speaking of American figures, but I could give you the French figures as well—it's the same thing), in real dollars, the funds have gone down 20 percent and basic science has been the most hit in this cutback. In 1969, a Mansfield amendment has eliminated basic science from defense funding which made it even more dramatic for basic science. So, those scientists who really want to carry on their fundamental research have either to go to hypocracy and justify false goals with time and money lost all along the line, or to charity where private philanthropy is filling the gap as much as it can. Foundations have poured out, in 1970, more than 17 billion dollars in this country, but very little has gone to marine science. That's why I'm pleased to see here some of that money.

The public has been misled by the expression "basic science." It has been blinded by, I will use the word, romance. Yes, romance, because the fruits of applied science have been so exciting—nuclear research, space, laser, etc., that they have assumed the romantic aura of the dedicated scientist groping alone and in darkness with impractical reserves. We have been infatuated with the better-product syndrome and, in fact, we have been given lesser ones in reality. The young generation today cries out for a purpose for life, not merely a waltz.

It is only possible to orient research if we know what to search for. It is feasible in some fields; it is not feasible in the ocean yet because ocean science is not yet in that state where you know what to look for. The inventory is not yet made. We do not know yet precisely what to measure. Freedom of research at that stage is vital. All over the world, it is high time to reclaim marine science, for without the firm base of open-ended undirected research, the pursuit of applied marine science rests on fractured substance.

Each time I come here the Lab has grown bigger, better equipped, and new projects are cooking. Today a new building is dedicated. For me, it's an impressive "reference book in being." May it be used by scientists liberated from today's pressure of goalism.

Dr. Henry King Stanford, President, University of Miami:

May I be permitted, here at the outset of my brief comment, a parenthetical observation. Mr. Newlin, we may have reaped like academic vultures, when we hovered over you there in Wall Street, but I believe academic eagles would be a nearly more apt description inasmuch as our prey, sir, was alive not dead.

If one holds the concept that geography influences greatly the course of human events, then perhaps it was inevitable that, here at the tip of the Florida peninsula, a distinguished center devoted to oceanographic research would emerge. But, geography has had a great assist, and that assist has been given by Dean F. G. Walton Smith.

I like to tell the story that when I came to Miami in the summer of 1962, I got two letters from friends in Virginia and Wisconsin. The one in Wisconsin said, "Congratulations, you are stepping into the future." The one from Virginia said, "There you can build your own pyramids." Both of those phrases were filled with expectation for the development of South Florida. Well, here on this island, Dr. Smith has built his own pyramids from which he is stepping into the future, not the way the pharaohs expected to do, but in this life. And, all of us in the academic community which is the University of Miami applaud his magnificent feats against great obstacles over the years in developing the Rosentiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science to its present level of worldwide fame.

I appreciate the reference to the fact that this building belongs to the community. Certainly the University of Miami in all of its divisions likes to believe that it is a great community asset and that wherever possible, it can serve the community. I should say that, if this building belongs to the community, the community might be ever sensitive to the obligation to help us pay the bills for operating it.

But I must confess that, as President of the University, I look upon this School first from the standpoint of the role it plays within the University, and all of us are proud to be colleagues of this distinguished faculty which has been assembled from far and wide. But, there is another interest of mine. Perhaps I should introduce the expression of that interest by the old bromide defining the university as a collection of disparate schools connected by a common plumbing system, or a group of intellectual preoccupations connected by a common concern for parking. What I'm trying to get at is—what relationship is there between this School out on the Key and the Main Campus in Coral Gables and the Medical Center? There is a strong relationship that is growing stronger, I'm proud to say. I've always thought of the ocean as an interdisciplinary soup. There you find an attraction for men of medical research, engineers, and even lawyers, to mention some of our colleagues from the Medical Center and the Main Campus who are joining hands with their academic colleagues here in studying the ocean in all of its diverse manifestations.

So, we are proud of the distinction this School brings to the University. We are proud of the research and teaching which are accomplished here. We are proud of the interdisciplinary cooperation which is provided by this School. On behalf of our trustees and all the faculties of the University, I express to Mr. Newlin and the Henry L. and Grace Doherty Charitable Foundation, to Dr. McElroy and the National Science Foundation, and to all who have contributed, our deepest appreciation for the great impetus you give us in moving this School and the University forward. I assure you, all of our supporters, that we will conduct the School and the University in such a way as to merit your continued confidence and support. Thank you.

THREAT TO ISRAEL

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply disturbed by the apparent complacency with which our Government has accepted the signing of a 15-year mutual assistance treaty between Egypt and the Soviet Union.

This is a threat to the survival of Israel which cannot be thwarted by a simple lifting of the arms embargo which we seem to have imposed on our best ally in the Middle East. This is the kind of threat which caused us to create the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to defend Western Europe from the Soviet military threat.

Now a similar threat is pressing upon the cause of freedom in the Middle East, upon the only democratic state in that vital area of the world. It is a wholly inadequate response to talk about, maybe, a few more Phantom jets to offset a 15-year pledge to back Egypt in her opposition to the very existence of the State of Israel.

What Israel needs and what the peace of the Middle East needs is a firm guarantee by the United States that it will not permit the destruction of the only democratic state in that area of the world.

I have, therefore, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 331, to express the sense of the Congress that the United States should conclude a NATO-type mutual defense treaty with Israel.

This is the formal guarantee which Israel needs. This is the guarantee which can forestall aggressive action by Egypt and her Soviet partners.

This is the guarantee we must have to assure peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I have expressed this view in previous Congresses and introduced similar resolutions. I regret that the course of events in the Middle East only emphasizes the need.

I hope the Congress and the administration will recognize that we cannot delay forever, from Congress to Congress, in giving Israel a formal security guarantee and giving her enemies a formal warning that the United States will not permit the destruction of this valiant, free nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. MORGAN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. TERRY, today, for 2 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEGICH) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FUQUA, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. ASPIN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, on June 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

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

Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON of New York.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.
Mr. MCCLORY in four instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, in two instances.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. MYERS.
Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan.
Mr. GOLDWATER.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.
Mr. GUDE.

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

Mr. DRINAN.
Mr. CARNEY.
Mr. BEGICH in five instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in eight instances.
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in five instances.
Mr. ASPIN in two instances.
Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts in five instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. WALDIE in five instances.
Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.
Mr. DANIELSON.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON.
Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. RYAN in five instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. DOW.
Mr. ECKHARDT.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 8, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6359. An act to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to authorize increased appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5065. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8629. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8630. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2591. A bill to amend section 8 of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 974), as amended, to standardize procedures for the testing of utility meters; to add a penalty provision in order to enable certification under section 5(a) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, and to authorize cooperative action with State and Federal regulatory bodies on matters of joint interest; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the district of Columbia", approved May 29, 1928; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–261). Referred to the Committee on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8589. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, to revise the composition of the Commission on Licensure To Practice the Healing Art, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92–262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8794. A bill to provide for the payment of the cost of medical, surgical, hospital, or related health care services provided certain retired, disabled officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police Force, the Executive Protective Service, and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 469. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6483, a bill to amend section 5232 of title 10, United States Code, to provide authority for appointment to the grade of general of Marine Corps officers designated under that section for appropriate higher commands or for performance of duties of great importance and responsibility (Rept. No. 92–264). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 470. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8687, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1972 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–265). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 471. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8866, a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–266). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8548. A bill to curtail the mailing of certain articles which present a hazard to postal employees or mail processing machines by imposing restrictions on certain advertising and promotional matter in the mails, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8549. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to broaden that authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain admiralty claims administratively, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Commmittee on the Judiciary. S. 1538. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended (Rept. No. 92–269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain employees to establish qualified pension plans for themselves in the same manner as if they were self-employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABOUREZK:

H.R. 9001. A bill relating to the construction, enlargement, remodeling, and improvement of a townsite on the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. BARING, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. LLOYD):

H.R. 9002. A bill relating to the administration of grazing districts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.R. 9003. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus supplies and equipment to certain sheltered workshop programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9004. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 9005. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Re-

tirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9006. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee and Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9007. A bill to provide an incentive for the production of motion pictures in the United States by excluding from gross income, for Federal income tax purposes, a part of the gross income derived from the distribution or exploitation of motion pictures produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9008. A bill to establish an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9009. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9010. A bill to provide for regulation of public exposure to sonic booms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9011. A bill to further provide for the farmer-owned cooperative system of making credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, for rural residences, and to associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, to provide for an adequate and flexible flow of money into rural areas, and to modernize and consolidate existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 9012. A bill to amend the Self-Employment Contributions Act of 1954 to provide that an election to be exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, made by a minister, a member of a religious order, or a Christian Science practitioner, may be revoked at any time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9013. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Secret Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9014. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide an increase in annuities thereunder whenever there is a general benefit increase under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Chamber.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9015. A bill to assist in the efficient production of the needed volume of good housing at lower cost through the elimination of restrictions on the use of advanced technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for employers who hire unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAFFERY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9017. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 9018. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Santa Fe, Gila, Cibola, and Carson National Forests in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9019. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Jicarilla Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 22-A, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9020. A bill to amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to provide that certain plants which process egg products shall be exempt from such act for a certain period of time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9021. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 9022. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 9023. A bill to transfer the Coast Guard to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9024. A bill making an appropriation to continue or resume funding of certain nutrition projects under title IV of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9025. A bill to prohibit display of the flags of the Vietcong and the Government of North Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9026. A bill to provide for orderly trade in antifriction ball and roller bearings and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9027. A bill to prohibit the use of certain devices and contests in rodeos and other public performances involving animals, and to prohibit the shipment or movement in interstate or foreign commerce of animals and devices involved therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 9028. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BELL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. Moss, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 9029. A bill to prohibit the imposition by the States of discriminatory burdens upon interstate commerce in wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BOB WILSON and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 9030. A bill to prohibit the imposition by the States of discriminatory burdens upon interstate commerce in wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 9031. A bill to amend section 13(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend to employees engaged in the delivery of certain types of advertising material the minimum wage, overtime, and child labor exemption currently provided by that section for employees engaged in the delivery of newspapers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 9032. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Havasupai Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 91, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9033. A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to assume control of overseas war memorials erected by private persons and non-Federal agencies and to demolish such war memorials in certain instances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. ASHLEY):

H.R. 9034. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Ohio Canal and Cuyahoga Valley National Historical Park and Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution designating the third week in July of each year as "Man in Space Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of September 20 through September 26, 1971, as "American Square Dance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 472. Resolution urging that import controls be placed on men's wearing apparel, textile goods, and shoes manufactured in foreign countries employing cheap labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

210. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to fees for medical services rendered by teaching physicians under the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. GUDE introduced a bill (H.R. 9035) for the relief of Andrea J. Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.