

The bill now goes to the Senate where the funds can be reinstated. Rep. Hervey G. Machen, a Maryland Democrat whose district includes the Potomac shore, and a group of supporters are rallying all who will hear to write to their Senators and House of Representatives members to support the restoration of the funds into the bill.

Neither of Virginia's two Senators nor, as far as we can recall, Virginia's House members have been put on record on this issue, so important to Northern Virginia and to the preservation of the Old Dominion's historic heritage. We urge all those in sympathy with the program for retaining the Potomac's beauty to make their minds known to their legislators in Congress.

Basic Vietnam Policy Was Set by Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are trying to disavow their party's role in establishing the policy followed by President Johnson in Vietnam.

Those of us who have been here since 1954 remember the sequence of events quite clearly. For those who were not here or who have forgotten, the following column from the May 8, 1967, edition of the Washington Evening Star gives in detail the formulation—by the Republicans of the Eisenhower administration—of the very policy some of them are now trying to disavow.

The article follows:

EISENHOWER DID SET THE BASIC VIETNAM POLICY

(By Richard Wilson)

Among many other matters gotten out of proportion by the Republican Policy Committee white paper on the Vietnam war is the attitude of the Eisenhower administration toward the conflict in Indochina.

The staff of the Republican Policy Committee of the U.S. Senate would have us believe that the Eisenhower attitude was so detached that President Johnson cannot claim his policy is a natural extension of the Eisenhower policy. This simply is not so.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in fact and demonstrated by the record, defined repeatedly precisely the basis upon which Johnson undertook the massive Vietnam intervention.

Research into this matter is very revealing. It reveals that the policy of the U.S. government has been consistent through three administrations, Eisenhower's, Kennedy's and Johnson's, over a period of 15 years.

The critical and controlling statements on policy were made by Eisenhower, expanded by Dulles and elaborated somewhat beyond their real limits by Nixon. Eisenhower asserted the United States vital interest in arresting further Communist expansion in Asia following so closely upon the termination of the Korean War. His words were neither weaseling nor vague.

With the Viet Minh insurgents carrying on a general attack against Dien Bien Phu, the Republican leader in the Senate William F. Knowland of California, volunteered to lead

a fight to send U.S. troops to Indochina if Eisenhower decided it was necessary.

Nixon told an editor's convention on April 16, 1954, that if the French failed in Indochina the Free World could not afford further retreat in Asia and "must face up to the situation and dispatch forces."

Dulles on Sept. 3, 1953, said Communist China was equipping and supplying the forces in Indochina and warned that a second Chinese aggression in Asia "could not occur without grave consequences which might not be confined to Indochina." On March 29, 1954, he said the U.S. could not passively accept imposition on Southeast Asia of "the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese ally," and though preventing it would involve serious risks they "would be far less than would face us a few years from now if we dare not be resolute today."

Eisenhower, it is true, did say that no one could be more bitterly opposed to "ever getting the United States involved in a hot war in that region than I am," but declared what he was doing, which was supporting the French at the rate of \$400 million a year, was intended to avoid getting into a hot war. That was on Feb. 10, 1954. On March 10, 1954, under the pressure of Senator Stennis' stated fears that a war might be caused by the killing of U.S. Air Force technicians Eisenhower had sent to Indochina, the President declared: "I will say this: There is going to be no war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it. Now, let us have that clear."

Then on April 26, 1954, Eisenhower told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce: "No matter how the struggle may have started, it has long since become one of the testing places between a free form of government and dictatorship. Its outcome is going to have the greatest significance for us, and possibly for a long time to come."

So let there be no more dissembling about what the true attitude of the Eisenhower administration was toward the war in Vietnam. All this was 13 to 15 years ago. No one can say whether under similar circumstances Eisenhower would have undertaken the massive intervention Johnson decided was necessary.

But what can be said with certainty is that the concept of what is involved in Southeast Asia and its long range significance and importance was the same in the Eisenhower administration as it is in the Johnson administration.

Bobby Kennedy is right. There is sufficient blame in this whole matter to go around for everybody, including himself, when he was advising President John F. Kennedy. The Indochina policy has been a prolonged and sustained bipartisan policy undertaken in the conviction that it is in the national interest of this country and is vital to the Free World to arrest the expansion of communism in Asia.

The 176th Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that all Americans join in observing this 176th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, that

noble document modeled after our own Constitution. The national commitment to free and democratic institutions, as proclaimed in the Constitution of May 3, lives still in the hearts of the Polish people in the mother country and in other lands throughout the world.

In the words of the Constitution:

All Power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is tragic that the gallant Poles have been so cruelly thwarted in their persistent efforts to move forward as a free nation, first by partition by the empires of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and later by the totalitarian forces of nazism and communism. The United States championed Poland's right to freedom at the end of the First World War and gladly witnessed the rebirth of the new Poland which tragically was engulfed by the forces of nazism in 1939. At the end of the last war we did our very best to see a free and independent Poland, but unfortunately we were not successful. Today we hope and pray that the indomitable will and brave spirit of the people of Poland will sustain them until their longed-for liberation into a free and independent country can be achieved.

On this the 176th anniversary of the Constitution, I am happy to send sincere greetings to the people of Poland and also to express the genuine appreciation and immense debt which the United States owe our citizens of Polish ancestry. The dedication of the Polish people to the principles of their Constitution is the best assurance that one day their land will again stand in full freedom and independence.

B + c *file*
The Fiat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 8, 1967, edition of the Washington Post discusses intelligently and reasonably some of the issues involved in proposed U.S. participation in the Italian-Soviet Fiat plant deal. The question of U.S. participation should be considered on the basis of our total short- and long-term national interests and not on the basis of shortsighted visceral attitudes. This editorial is very timely and germane to the broader question of East-West relations. I insert this editorial in the Record:

THE FIAT DEAL

Whether the Government should finance export of machine tools for the Soviet Fiat plant is, in economic terms, not just a matter of a one-shot \$50 million deal. The issue is whether the United States will put on-limits or off-limits a major world market, one that is growing and one that is particularly interested in the advanced technology which

May 10, 1967

A 2318

is the American forte. The precise size and shape of that market cannot be foreseen. What can be foreseen is the outrage and frustration that would arise from a tardy realization that a good opportunity had been missed.

The path to that opportunity lies in legislation to carry on the Export-Import Bank, the Government agency that would guarantee credit to sell the machine tools to Fiat; Fiat will sell them to Russia in a \$1 billion auto-plant package. The House Banking and Currency Committee has just beat back a move to block the Fiat deal; similar moves are expected on the House floor, if not sooner in the Senate Banking Committee. Administration spokesmen testified forthrightly for the deal in the House hearings but the crucial voice, the business community's, has yet to be heard.

Behind most opposition is the visceral view that the United States should not trade with the Soviet Union while it supports the enemy in Vietnam. Those most deeply bound by this view were not reassured even when the Nation's military and intelligence chiefs testified that there are no strategic objections. It is deep in the bones of many citizens, and it perhaps can only be eroded by time, not argued away.

The fact is that, in trying to escape from the unrelieved East-West antagonism of the past, the United States cannot expect to spurt quickly into unrelieved serenity and peace. Public and Congressional opinion may lag behind changing world realities but there remains a good measure of legitimate doubt that the new era has arrived. In the interim—however long and uncertain that may be—fears of error and habits of distrust will tug at chances for East-West cooperation and at hopes of better days. The Fiat deal is the latest worthy object, following the consular treaty and the civil air agreement, of this fateful tug between cold war and fragile peace.

Herman Robinson, of Elizabethton, Tenn., Speaks on the Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving speeches I have ever read is the one made by my good friend, Herman Robinson, to the second general session, annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, at the Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., on April 28, 1967.

Mr. Robinson is chairman of the Tennessee Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robinson is a former State senator, and he is also the best example that could ever be given to the handicapped, for his courage, patience, and faith have hurdled him over obstacles that few of us are asked to face. He is truly an inspiration for us all.

I am proud to call him my friend, and I insert his speech at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF HERMAN ROBINSON, ELIZABETHTON, TENN., CHAIRMAN, TENNESSEE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED, BEFORE THE SECOND GENERAL SESSION, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED.

We could close this program right now—and maybe we should. What can I say that can add anything to what these people, these handicapped people, have just demonstrated to you?

I tell you that if we didn't have a good picture of what our work is all about, we have it now.

The only question remaining is: "What are we going to do about it?"

We hear a lot about problems.

We do not hear enough about opportunities.

I believe we have as many opportunities in portunities to our problems. . . .

And what we have seen with our own eyes yesterday and this morning shows us clearly what can happen when we apply our opportunities to our problems. . . .

My home town is nestled in the Appalachians.

The other day a lady walked into our 10-cent store to buy a birthday present for her 10-year-old son.

The clerk pulled down one of those put-together toys—you know the kind. They come with an assortment of nuts, bolts, screws, wheels, circles, squares, gee-haws and hee-haws—a little bit of everything.

"But," asked the mother, "Isn't this a little complicated for a young boy?"

"Oh no, not complicated," the clerk told her, "but educational! It helps a boy adjust to the world in which he lives. You see, no matter how he puts it together, it's wrong!"

A pretty good commentary, wouldn't you say?

It does seem that no matter how we put it together, it's wrong.

Vietnam, the population explosion, the soaring crime rate, the climbing divorce rate, riots and demonstrations in the streets, revolts on the college campus, disrespect for the flag, beatniks and Vietniks.

Yes, these we have with us—But they are not everything.

In some areas of endeavor, in some parts of our society, the picture is more cheerful. We are beginning to put the puzzle together right.

Our program this morning is surely proof of that. So don't sell us short. We are not about to give up the fight.

It was my privilege a couple of years ago to visit Russia on a people-to-people mission. While I was there I think I learned some things. One, the Russian people are a lot like our people, two, the Russians don't have hire-the-handicapped-problems. Under their system, the M.D. tells the commissar what a man is capable of doing. The commissar tells the factory head of the farm manager to put him to work—and that takes care of that. Everybody does something—he does what he is told to do. Those who don't or can't aren't likely to eat. It's that cold-blooded—and the state determines what, when, where, why and how.

Now, in our democratic society, we can't order any individual—handicapped or not—to take this or that job.

Thank God, there is a right of choice here—and the individual—although handicapped is not yet the pawn of the state. May he never be!

But the free and voluntary nature of our way does impose its penalties. We have to do by understanding and compassion and wisdom what the Communists do by decree and edict.

That's our problem in this matter of hiring the handicapped. That's why it is hard to put the pieces of the jig-saw together. And that's why I am here on this occasion—I want to talk to you about it.

We need to look our problems and fears in the eye—and conquer them. And we need to be able to see the opportunities that always accompany our problems.

Some of us, unfortunately, never see beyond the problems. There are quite a few "fear words" among us today. War is one—and with reason. Race is one; poverty is one; demonstration is one; strike is one; cancer is one; and handicapped is one—a big one.

Some of us start dodging and ducking when the word "handicapped" is mentioned.

Yet we know that there is more trouble in this area than any other, in so far as problems of employment are concerned.

I don't have to tell you that unemployment percentages are down, overall.

But they remain relatively high among the handicapped, as you know.

Handicap? Poverty? Trouble? Don't all these tend to go together?

Employ the handicapped, and you begin curing some other sicknesses, too.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am not speaking theoretically. I am not telling you something I have read. I am not just repeating what somebody believes.

I am telling you what I have experienced.

I was handicapped from birth. I still am. The doctors told my mother and father I would never walk or talk—and I didn't until I was seven years old.

They said I would never learn anything—but I did learn, not much maybe, but something.

And here I am today doing the best I can with what I have—not doing very well, perhaps, but doing, nevertheless.

What I have done, others can do better—if given the chance. And they must be given the chance.

If kind and concerned individuals hadn't given me a chance, I would have been a nothing. Certainly I would not be addressing you here today.

My affliction was spastic paralysis. My hands shook. I walked like a man who had too much to drink. People got out of my way when I came down the street.

But I got the crazy idea I could play football—and everybody laughed. It was a big joke, in and out of school.

Then came the big turning point in my life. The high school coach took me in hand. He made me the waterboy, and I was happy.

But I doubt that he was happy. Because on several occasions I spilled so much water that opposing teams accused him of "wetting down" the field.

And our players would say "Coach, don't let Herman have the ball. He'll shake all the air out of it."

Oh yes, it was a big joke—and the fellows couldn't get enough of it.

But, let me tell you, the next year or two, they got enough! For I went out and mixed with them—and eventually made the team. And started giving out as many licks as I was getting!

When I would make a bad mistake, Coach would say, "Herman, you just stay in there and keep plugging." He was an inspiration through the years.

They called him "Mule," and I think that was because he was too darn stubborn to give up on people like me.

I am so humbly glad that "Mule" never did laugh at me back in those days when I was a blundering kid, and he was a young coach turning out champions.

Would you like to see "Mule"? He's here. Stand up, "Mule", and let them see you.

the acquisition of necessary equipment and instructional materials) of programs which are designed to upgrade the quality of the entire program of schools consisting of a large proportion of children from non-English-speaking low-income families or special programs designed to meet the educational needs of children in areas having high concentrations of children from non-English-speaking low-income families, including—

"(1) intensive early childhood programs involving bilingual education techniques designed to provide children during the pre-school, kindergarten, and early elementary years with educational experiences which will enhance their learning potential;

"(2) special programs or projects designed to supplement and enrich the programs of elementary and secondary schools, including bilingual education programs and bicultural education programs which acquaint students from both English-speaking and non-English-speaking homes with the history and culture associated with each language;

"(3) comprehensive programs of supportive services to students, including guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, summer programs, psychological and social work services, health and nutrition programs, and efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

"(4) adult education programs related to the purposes of this title, particularly for parents of children participating in bilingual programs.

"Approval of project applications

"Sec. 703. (a) A grant may be made under this title only for a project under clause (a) of section 702 or a project involving programs under both of clauses (b) and (c) of section 702, upon application submitted to the Commissioner jointly by a local educational agency and an institution of higher education, at such time or times, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such application shall—

"(1) provide that the local educational agency and the institution of higher education jointly submitting the application will be responsible for carrying out the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(2) set forth procedures and policies which assure that the training provided by the institution of higher education for teachers and teacher-aides will be coordinated with the bilingual education programs of the local educational agency in which such persons are serving or will serve;

"(3) provide for such methods of administration as will best carry out the purposes of this title;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that the Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of assistance under this title, be made available by the applicant for the education of children served by programs assisted under this title, and in no case supplant such funds;

"(5) show the estimated total current educational expenditure per pupil participating in the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(6) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title;

"(7) provide for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds expended for the purposes set forth in section 702 have been effective, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto

as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(8) provide assurance that, to the extent consistent with law, provision has been made for the participation in the project of non-English-speaking children who are not enrolled in public school on a full-time basis.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

"(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

"(2) the project set forth in the application is of such size, scope, quality and design as to provide reasonable assurance of making a substantial impact in meeting the special educational needs of persons who come from non-English-speaking low-income families; and

"(3) approval of the project is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner, including criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title and criteria designed to take into account the impact upon the educational programs in communities in which the number of non-English-speaking persons from low-income families constitutes a substantial proportion of the population.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Payments

"Sec. 704. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to each applicant which has an application for a project approved under this title such amounts as the applicant may expend under the terms of the grant, which may include an amount for development of the proposal of not to exceed one per centum of the grant in the first year of a project assisted under this title.

"(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 705. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

Sec. 3. (a) That part of section 801 (as so redesignated by section 2 of this Act) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which precedes clause (a) is amended by striking out "and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "V, and VII".

(b) Clause (j) of such 801 is amended by striking out "title II and title III," and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, and VII".

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

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission

to extend his remarks at this point in RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens should be able to look upon the sunset of their lives with the assurance that they will not be darkened by the ugly shadow of poverty.

We in the Congress must take the necessary legislative steps to improve our social security system so that our senior citizens will have the assurance they so rightfully deserve that their retirement years will be lived in dignity and self-respect.

I have received a resolution from the Rhode Island chapter of the National Council of Senior Citizens requesting such action which I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Whereas, President Johnson has urged the Congress of the United States to increase Social Security benefits by an average of 20 percent with the biggest proportionate share going to the 2½ million retirees who now get only the minimum of \$44 a month (\$66 for a couple); and

Whereas, even the proposed increases would fall short of assuring Social Security beneficiaries genuine financial independence, as contemplated by the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, many other nations, far less affluent than the United States, have far more adequate social welfare systems; and

Whereas, no remotely comparable insurance protection is available to Americans at any price;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Congress of the United States take prompt, positive action to attack the deficiencies that exist in the Social Security system, so that older Americans, widows and children, and the disabled can live out their retirement years in dignity and self-respect rather than in poverty and despair; and

Be it further resolved, since the program's biggest single defect is the lack of adequate cash benefits, that the Congress act to increase these benefits as proposed by the President; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Pastore, Senator Pell, Congressman St Germain, Congressman Tiernan, and Chairman Wilbur Mills, requesting them to support the President's proposals, and to place this resolution in the records of Congress; and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be given the fullest publicity through the communications media,

May 10, 1967

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, the national holiday of the Rumanian people is celebrated. On this day in 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern—Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania and the Rumanian dynasty was founded. Eleven years later, in 1877, the principality of Rumania severed her links with the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed her independence and on May 10, just 15 years after the founding of the Rumanian dynasty, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a most significant day for the Rumanian people and for the world because mankind has been greatly enriched by the many contributions made to it by this great nation. A nation, which we are sad to say, not stands beneath the dark shadow of communism.

Twenty-two years have passed since the independence of this spirited nation has been disrupted by the forces of communism but this passage of two decades has not destroyed the will of the Rumanian people to assert their sense of national pride and national independence. It still remains to pierce the shadow of communism with the bright light of hope and historic strength.

This spirit of nationalism is particularly significant when we view how it has managed to break the monolithic Soviet bloc into many factions of communism, some of which are opposed to each other. And the spirited light of nationalism shines brightest in Rumania. Someday I expect this spirit to overcome the darkness of communism and once again clearly place before the world the splendor of an independent Rumania.

EXPORT-IMPORT FIAT CASE

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, too often immediate considerations cloud ultimate objectives and cause us to veer off course in our endeavor to gain a lasting world peace.

Such is the case concerning the authorization of the Export-Import Bank to grant a \$40 million credit to Italy's Fiat Co. in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the United States for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

Because of Russia's assistance to North Vietnam, an immediate consideration, too many people have failed to realize that the loan in question would provide for an increasing amount of the Soviet's industrial capacity to be geared to producing consumer goods, an ultimate objective.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert into the Record an editorial concerning this matter that appeared in the May 9 edition of the Providence Journal.

This article brings to light all the considerations of the case at hand and is as follows:

TOOLING UP

The House banking committee has acted in the nation's best interest by helping to establish what could be an important element in President Johnson's plan for improved East-West trade.

The committee narrowly rejected an amendment that would have barred the Export-Import Bank from granting a 40-million dollar credit to Italy's Fiat company in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the U.S. for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

The amendment had a political ring because, generally speaking, it would prohibit the bank from making loans or guaranteeing any loans for the use of any nation whose government is providing goods or services for an antagonist of the United States.

The Soviet Union happens to be helping North Vietnam in the Vietnam War, and the machine tool credit involved in the Fiat-Soviet auto plant would fall under this prohibition.

The House committee fortunately was guided by long-range and more valid considerations concerning U.S. security. It is to America's advantage and in the cause of world peace if an increasing amount of the Soviet's industrial capacity is geared to producing consumer goods. There also is important American self-interest in selling machine tools in what probably will be a rapidly growing market.

It is to be hoped that the entire House will see these advantages as clearly as did the majority of the banking committee and help to move along this important bit of liberal trade legislation.

WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the glories of an affluent society is its ability to combat poverty wherever and whenever it may exist.

Being cognizant of our ability to remove the ugly shadow of poverty from the face of our land, the Congress committed itself to this task by waging a war on poverty. Our commitment is a firm one. And it should be.

Therefore, it was with great delight that I listened to President Johnson's stirring words yesterday about the war on poverty.

It is clear that we are not backing off from our commitment to fight poverty—

He stated—

Nor will we—so long as I have anything to say about it.

We are staying for the long pull.

Continued the President.

These words embrace the tenacity that must be the very backbone of our antipoverty program. The President knows that victory in the war on poverty will not be easy to come by. He is aware of the strong political forces that threaten to destroy the war on poverty in favor of short-range political gain. But the President is determined that the war on poverty shall be won and he is willing to stick it out. And, I submit, so is this House and the rest of the Nation.

It would indeed be a tragedy for America, Mr. Speaker, if this body should fail

to face up to the long pull and should fail in its commitment to our underprivileged citizens. And this is what would occur if the so-called Republican opportunity crusade were to be enacted. This "crusade" would abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity, the only voice the poor have ever had in the Halls of Government. It would scatter the anti-poverty programs throughout the old bureaucracy to agencies whose heads have publicly warned that they are strained to the administrative breaking point by the programs they already have.

Much to my dismay, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the Office of Economic Opportunity and the President's war on poverty. Too many people have failed to realize that the war on poverty is not a matter of welfare or the dole. On the contrary, its aims are to abolish the dole by making productive members of society out of those welfare recipients who are not able to help themselves.

And there is another misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, to which the President alluded yesterday. That is the erroneous idea that the economic opportunity legislation is an exclusively Negro program.

Poverty wears different masks in different places—

The President wisely remarked—

We may sometimes think of it as a Negro affliction, but seven out of ten poor people are white.

I would like to emphasize for the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the war on poverty is a comprehensive program and a national program. It has the strong support of the President and of the Nation. It, therefore, deserves the strong support of this body.

PANAMA CANAL: BETRAYAL OF OUR TAXPAYERS' VAST INVESTMENT PROPOSED

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since December 18, 1964, the governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama have been engaged in diplomatic negotiations for a new treaty to replace the treaty of 1903 under which Panama granted in perpetuity to the United States exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

In a joint statement by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on September 24, 1965, they announced that agreement had been reached on the following points:

First. That the 1903 treaty will be abrogated.

Second. That the new treaty will effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory—United States owned.

Third. That the new treaty will terminate after a specified number of years.

Fourth. That a primary objective of the new treaty will be to integrate the