

U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 18

AUGUST 22, 1967, TO AUGUST 31, 1967

(PAGES 23451 TO 24928)

with one wheelbarrow, a piece of hose, and broke. So, before you work yourself out of the last job, line up a bigger one to pull yourself out.

Always lining up a bigger job, Henry Kaiser developed a massive industrial empire. The son of immigrants, Henry Kaiser proved the limitless opportunities of this country.

We of the State of Washington are proud that our State had a role in his life, and we thank him for his structures there that will contribute to our well-being for years to come.

My deepest sympathies go to Mrs. Kaiser and all of the Kaiser family.

INTERNATIONAL DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS WEEK

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, our Nation next week will celebrate International Drum and Bugle Corps Week in honor of the more than 1 million persons who participate in the drum and bugle corps annually. I salute this meritorious and character-building activity for the youth of today.

I am confident that this generation of young people, which holds the destiny of our country in its hands, will make significant efforts toward making the Nation and the world a better place in which to live. The drum and bugle corps plays a significant role in instilling in its members and the American public the ideals and traditions that have put America at the forefront of the world community.

I am sure that we are all aware of the service that the drum and bugle corps performs all across the country in its cities, towns, and villages. It is particularly fitting that we pay tribute to these distinguished bodies next week. Drum and bugle corps throughout the land will be marching in Labor Day parades and performing at local concerts and community-sponsored events. I look forward to hearing these enthusiastic young Americans engaging in constructive and patriotic public service. We all owe the drum and bugle corps our warmest-felt thanks for devoting their time to the glory and honor of our Nation.

Mr. President, I urge all Americans to turn out and support their local corps during the week we are dedicating to it. It is inspiring for me to see today's youth participating in this rewarding activity, and next week the drum and bugle corps will undoubtedly renew America's faith in its youth and in the virtues of its past.

AN ANALYSIS OF RIOTS AND OTHER CRITICAL URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the furor which has been raised over the riots in our cities—some of this furor justified, some of it misdirected, some of it plainly irrational—it is refreshing to read a sane and sensible analysis of this and other critical urban problems. In the New York Times of August 20, the text of an interview with the Vice President of the United States by Robert B. Semple was published. In it, Vice President HUMPHREY probes the administrative, fiscal, program, and psychic dimensions of the Nation's urban dilemma.

I commend this timely, thoughtful, and purposive interview to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUMPHREY ON HIS "MARSHALL PLAN"

(NOTE.—An interview with Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY by Robert B. Semple Jr. of The New York Times Washington bureau. It took place in Mr. Humphrey's Washington office last week prior to President Johnson's announcement . . . offer no new urban ideas this year.)

Q. Mr. Vice President, in a speech Aug. 2 in Detroit, following the riots there, you suggested a "Marshall Plan" for slum areas. So far, however, the President has proposed no new programs to deal with the cities. The question has been asked, therefore, whether you were not in fact asking for something greater than the Administration was willing to pay for. Is there any difference of opinion in the Administration on what should be done about the cities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I don't think there's any difference of opinion. One of the pitfalls of public speaking is that when you use an analogy based upon something that happened in the past—such as the Marshall Plan—you are subject to misinterpretation.

Q. What did you mean by "Marshall Plan" when you used that phrase?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I, of course, was referring to the plan of action that had been used successfully to carry out the recovery of Europe after World War II. I was suggesting the present-day need of applying a similar concept to the problems of our cities.

Q. Do we have that same concept?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I made that point very clearly in my speech. I pointed out that the President's Model Cities Program, for example, embodies much of the same concept. It offers Federal money, but that money will only be available if the local government proves that it has a sound plan to rehabilitate slum areas. It calls for a massive infusion of both public and private capital. It calls for local initiative, local decisions on where the Federal money should be spent. And it calls for coordination. I think the real secret of success in the Marshall Plan lay in the fact that the Europeans themselves set up in Paris a coordinating mechanism so that when the funds came in they were not just splashed around the continent. They were carefully directed with a sense of priority to those areas where they would have the greatest impact and mobilize the greatest number of existing resources.

Moreover—and perhaps most important—the Model Cities Program calls for a massive long-term, public-supported commitment to the solution of a particular problem.

Q. How much did we spend on the post-war Marshall Plan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. About \$14-billion over a five-year period.

Q. Is this more or less than we are spending on urban problems now?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Less. The President originally requested \$2.3-billion for the first six years of the Model Cities Program alone. Congress reduced that request to \$900-million for two years, of which the President has asked full funding of \$662-million for this year. Over-all, the Administration has requested for fiscal 1968 some \$25.6-billion for programs to aid people below the poverty line. This is double the expenditure in 1963. As for cities, we have requested \$10.3-billion for use in urban development and general improvement of urban living conditions. [Editor's Note: This consists mainly of aid-to-education funds, urban renewal, welfare payments, highway expenditures, and the anti-poverty program.]

Q. In other words, your Detroit suggestion of a "Marshall Plan" represented in effect a

plea for a commitment to programs that Congress has already decided we can afford—programs already authorized?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In a large part, except for this one caveat. I wanted very much to alert the American people to the necessity of understanding that the problem we have in the cities is not one that is subject to piecemeal approaches or to Federal effort alone. You have to mobilize your national resources, public and private. You must make a long-term commitment, as we did in Europe. And you must have local planning, local participation.

In other words, when I link the Marshall Plan with our Model Cities Program I am talking not only in terms of money but also in terms of concept—particularly the concept of the "total rehabilitation" of an area. The Model Cities Program, like the Marshall Plan, is not piecemeal; it is comprehensive.

Q. But what happens when we compare our urban commitment with our commitment to national defense? Senator Fulbright has said that since 1946 we have spent \$904-billion, or 57 per cent of the nation's budget, on military power but only \$96-billion, or 6 per cent, on social programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure of those figures, but in any case I think it's not a very helpful comparison, with all due respect to Senator Fulbright. That would be like saying if you had illness in the family, that you were spending too much of your budget taking care of the ill, and too little caring for the well. The fact is that there has been "sickness" in this world in these post-World War II years which we have not had the luxury of ignoring.

Moreover, to use these figures as a way of saying that we've done too little in our social programs is to misrepresent the case. I think we ought to do more on the domestic front. I thought so all during the 1950's when I served in Congress.

The recent record has been better. We have almost tripled the aid to our cities in the last six years, and in the last two years alone added \$3-billion. So when I hear people say that we haven't done enough, all I can say is: Well, we've done more than anybody else has done previously. This doesn't mean we've done all we should. All I wish is that we'd had a little more help earlier in the game when some of us stood there as a rather beleaguered little group in Congress.

Q. You've mentioned the words alienation and motivation. Is it true—as some have suggested—that one of the main causes of these disturbances is this sense of alienation among the bottom fifth of the population, the have-nots, who have been left behind by the surging prosperity of the rest of the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I don't believe we really know what causes the riots. There are those who believe the riots are caused by poverty. I mean they put it that simply. I'm sure poverty plays a heavy role.

But the fact is that a number of the participants in the riots were people who had good jobs. It may very well be that the fact that things are getting better has produced some of its own turbulence. Rising expectations are never realized fast enough. When some light is let into the dark chambers of poverty and hopelessness, this in itself may generate forces of expectancy and anticipation—which means that we may very well be going through a turbulent period for some time.

No. I don't think that conditions in which the bottom fifth of the nation live alone cause riots. Because if that were the case, there should have been more riots ten years ago, and fewer now.

Q. I gather that you don't think there's one easy solution—such as the various programs of income maintenance suggested in some quarters, the guaranteed annual income, the family allowances, the negative income tax?

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the ways in which you can relieve the pain of poverty is by simply writing a check, by handing out money. That will eliminate poverty, but does it really get at the problems of despair, uselessness, apathy, alienation, indifference, hostility? We're not dealing with men who simply want money handed to them. We're dealing with people who are nonparticipating, isolated members of society—who need to feel they have a place in the scheme of things. I don't think we should reject the negative income tax proposal, or similar proposals, out of hand. But money alone is not going to bring people back into our society.

Q. If direct money payments are not the whole answer, what are the components of what you have described as the total approach? And, what can we do now?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To begin with we must use those weapons that are readily available now. Local governments can do a much better job of providing services to the ghetto areas—enforcing building codes, providing proper street lighting and police protection, collecting the garbage, for instance.

State governments, meanwhile, have been very inactive in meeting most of these ghetto and urban problems, even though the city is a creature of the state, and often has no more power than the state constitution or state law gives it.

Second, private resources—scientific, managerial, academic and financial—must be mobilized and brought to bear on the slum problem—to create jobs; to provide training; to attempt to profitably meet public needs; to enter, for example, the \$50-billion market for low-cost housing.

Let me repeat the task today is not merely to pass the program before Congress—as desirable as that is—but it is to mobilize the entire American community. Our nation needs to get a sense first of all, of moral outrage—outrage over what has happened and the conditions within these ghetto areas.

Q. Can we successfully come to grips with the problems of the cities and fight the war in Vietnam as well?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I've addressed myself to this and I believe we can. Let me be very candid with you. I would be the happiest man in the world, and the President would be even happier, if we were in a world of peace. But we cannot back away from the role that history has given us. Even if the struggle in Southeast Asia were brought to a quick and final conclusion, tomorrow we would be faced with a world in which there was tension and mass suffering.

We don't have easy choices any longer. I can only say this: We will have to keep our economy growing in order to develop the resources to do the job here as well as abroad—and keep reviewing all the time our allocation of resources and priorities in both places. And we will have to have the vision and the courage to stick it out through some difficult times ahead.

WORDS OF CAUTION FOR THOSE WHO WOULD RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some of our fellow citizens who have been urging that the United States recognize Red China and favor her admittance to the United Nations must be wearing very red faces these days. In fact, many in Great Britain must be favoring the same facial color as they read about the manner in which the once proud and haughty British Empire is being booted about like a former African colony by the Communists in Red China.

Articles published recently in the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune under foreign datelines are typical of the

news stories emanating from China in these troubled times. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHINA

New York Times, August 23, 1967, Peking dateline (Agence France-Presse):

"Red Guards invaded the British diplomatic compound here last night, hurled gasoline cans into the buildings and set them afire, destroying the chancery and damaging the home of Britain's chargé d'affaires.

"The chargé d'affaires, Donald C. Hopson, and a number of other Britons were beaten by the Red Guards, who were angered by Mr. Hopson's rejection of a Chinese ultimatum. It had demanded that Britain lift an order closing three leftist newspapers in Hong Kong.

"Most of the British diplomats and their families had taken refuge in the compound during the last few days as the dispute over Hong Kong intensified."

"At dawn today, members of the British diplomatic community left the compound to seek haven with friends or in other foreign embassies.

"All were pale and disheveled. Some were covered with blood. Mr. Hopson, Britain's highest ranking diplomat in China, wore a bandage on his head and a bloodstained coat.

"The fleeing Britons agreed that the policemen and soldiers who surrounded the British compound had tried to protect them from the Red Guards. Some of the policemen were wounded trying to stem the fury of the crowd, the British said."

"Earlier in the day, members of the Chinese staff employed by the mission read the ultimatum to Mr. Hopson on the lawn of the British compound.

"Mr. Hopson rejected the ultimatum and a demand by the Chinese staff members that he hold his head bent low—an admission of guilt as well as a sign of humiliation—during the reading of the protest."

At 10:45 p.m., the precise time when the Chinese ultimatum expired the crowd erupted into overt violence, according to diplomats living near the British compound.

Arthus Veysey, Chicago Tribune, August 23, 1967 (London dateline):

"Britain immediately forbade all Chinese officials here from leaving the country.

"Britain, in effect, is holding the Chinese, who number between 50 and 60, as hostages for the safety of the 25 British diplomats and their wives and children in Peking.

"The British clampdown includes members of the Chinese embassy, the Chinese news agency, the Bank of China, and all official trade missions."

New York Times, August 23, 1967, edition: "The crucial questions about the Hong Kong crisis must be these: Are Peking's Communist leaders any longer capable of rational behavior? Is China still a functioning country?"

"There is no rational reason why Peking should force a showdown with Britain over the closing of three obscure Hong Kong Communist newspapers and the arrest on sedition charges of five of their executives."

"Yet, Communist riots have erupted regularly in Hong Kong since May 11 and have increased in ferocity recently with constant verbal and occasional physical support from China. The sacking of the British mission in Peking and the attempted humiliation of its personnel yesterday after London's rejection of an ultimatum on Hong Kong brings the situation to the acute stage.

"What is Mao's game? Or is Mao really in

charge, calling the shots that not only have provoked crisis with Britain but strained relations with Moscow almost to the breaking point? When the demonstrations began, Western experts believed Peking's goal was to wrest from the British as many as possible of the concessions it had earlier extorted from the Portuguese Government of Macao. Now the question must be asked whether the Chinese objective is not the destruction of the Crown Colony.

"An aging Mao might see in this drastic act a means of reuniting Chinese and alleviating the internal convulsion caused by the cultural revolution. It might even be that the anarchic situation inside China—the fact that it is not 'a functioning country'—could bring on a move by extremists against Hong Kong that Mao could not prevent.

"The trouble is that the West simply cannot fathom the action of China's Communist leaders at this critical juncture, much less know that rational calculations play any part in their behavior. Predicting Peking's course is as hazardous in Hong Kong as it is in Vietnam."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for those who still believe—although their numbers are rapidly decreasing—that the Chinese Communists are simply "agrarian reformers," as we were once told by high authority, I would recommend a steady diet of reading the news reports describing how China's so-called Western friends are being treated in Peking and other mainland cities of China. Having done that, they can then return to their collateral lines of trying to convince Americans that aggressive communism has changed its form in Russia and that the global plans of the men in the Kremlin should be respected as sincere expressions of good will while we ignore the military support the Russian Communists are providing our enemy in Vietnam and to Egypt and other aggressive Arab States in the Mideast.

FIRST STEPS TOWARD ARAB-ISRAEL RECONCILIATION

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, while the crisis in the Middle East is in no way over, there are signs that the Arabs and Israelis are beginning to take the first small steps toward some form of reconciliation.

It would be naive to predict that the recent war in the Middle East and the humiliating defeat of the Arabs will, by some miracle, bring about a new era of harmony and "togetherness," but both sides do appear to be arriving at the conclusion that there are mutual advantages to some form of cooperation.

The barrage of propaganda and name calling will no doubt continue. But if peace is ever to come to the Middle East, both sides must seek new ways to settle their differences, acknowledge the territorial integrity of Israel, and work together to solve problems which are common both to the Israelis and the Arabs.

An editorial published in this morning's New York Times reports on some of the first small signs that the Israelis and the Arabs are beginning to move toward some areas of reconciliation.

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

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