

recessed, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 20 (legislative day of October 22), 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Cecil M. Childre, **XXXX** Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster **XXXX** Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. James Francis Collins, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 90: 12: *So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in whose divine keeping and control are our days, we thank Thee for this day which has come as a fresh gift from Thy hands.

May there be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

We are again approaching Thy throne of grace, with our many needs, through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open unto those who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We are not asking Thee to deal with our beloved country in any preferential manner and that it may become an industrial paradise or an economic Garden of Eden, with plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and plenty to play with, when vast

multitudes are finding the struggle of life so difficult.

Give us a large part in building a better world and a finer civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 19, 1963:

H.R. 1989. An act to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; and

H.R. 5244. An act to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. PEARSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Government Research be permitted to sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

BAD EFFECT OF DEPRESSED AREA LEGISLATION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised that Radio Manufacturing Engineers, Inc., which has one plant in my district in Washington, Ill., and one in Eureka, Ill., represented by my good friend LES ARENS is pulling up stakes and moving to eastern Tennessee.

Both of these plants are subsidiaries of Electro Voice Co. of Buchanan, Mich., making cartridges on tone arms for phonographs, employing some 150 to 200 persons and have attempted to get defense contracts. Having failed and lost their three last attempts to bid on defense contracts because competitors from so-called depressed areas are given a preference, these plants are being closed and moved to an area in eastern Tennessee so they can get a similar preference and bid more competitively. What is more, under the ARA program, they will get their new plants built for them, in Tennessee, by local entities with Federal funds.

This is a clear-cut case of pirating of industry and points up the folly of so-called depressed areas legislation. I opposed it when it was considered in the House and this is just one good reason for my continuing opposition to the program and I suspect there are many other fine districts around the country being adversely affected by this program.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS DURING 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. 167)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 17th annual report covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during 1962.

This record tells the story of deep United Nations engagement in the great issues of the 1960's. It demonstrates that despite the financial irresponsibility of some of its members, the organization has, through executive action and parliamentary diplomacy, played an indispensable role in dealing with an impressive number of the world's problems.

The United Nations political relevance—and its developing capacity for effective action—is indicated by a brief look at several major aspects of world affairs and at what the United Nations did about them in 1962.

GREAT POWER CONFRONTATION

When the Soviet Union sought to alter the balance of nuclear power by installing missile bases in Cuba, the United Nations—as well as the Organization of American States—proved an important instrument in resolving the most dangerous crisis of the nuclear era. The Security Council served as a forum in which the U.S. Government made clear to the world that its actions, taken in concert with its neighbors of the hemisphere, were the reasonable response of rational men to a sudden and unacceptable threat in their midst. The Secretary General, only recently elected to his post after a period as Acting Secretary General, provided a useful point of contact in the early stages of negotiations with the Soviet Union. The United Nations also could have provided an onsite inspection service at short notice had the Cuban Government not refused to cooperate with the world organization, and made necessary a continuation of other means of surveillance in the interest of hemispheric security. Finally, the United Nations provided an appropriate place for negotiating the remaining issues after Soviet missiles had been withdrawn.

It was in 1962 that a major United Nations peacekeeping force in the Congo established a level of internal security which permitted a very substantial reduction in the size of that force. The Central Government of the Congo, assisted by the United Nations, has preserved—in the words of the charter—its "territorial integrity and political independence"—and thereby forestalled a threat to international peace—in the face of three attempts at secession: a Communist-sponsored effort in the north, a local eruption in the interior, and a secession backed by outside interests in the south. Assisted by technical aid from most of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the Government of the Congo has meanwhile increased its capacity to manage an economy of rich potential in the face of severe difficulties, including a crippling lack of trained manpower and experienced administrators.

In two other fields the United Nations has continued to be a vital instrument to effect a disengagement in important sectors of the great power confrontation.

The organization has served as a forum for encouraging an agreement for the cessation of nuclear weapon testing and for promoting progress toward general disarmament. It has served, as well, as a mechanism for negotiating legal principles and technical cooperation in outer space. We must be no less concerned with these persistent efforts to shape the future within the framework of the United Nations Charter than we are with United Nations operations designed to respond to the alarm bells of the present.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During 1962 an impending conflict was averted in West New Guinea—the first territory administered by an international organization—by the patient work of a United Nations mediator. In the Middle East the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees were on the job of removing and reducing tensions, and controlling those that could not yet be removed. In Kashmir, United Nations contingents patrolled under provisions of truce and cease-fire agreements. In Korea, a United Nations Commission stood ready to help in the unification of the country in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly. Since the end of 1962, the United Nations has begun another work of peacemaking, through an agreement for the disengagement in Yemen of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING

At the 17th General Assembly the United Nations received and then accepted the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that peacekeeping expenses of the United Nations in the Congo and the Middle East, earlier approved by the Assembly, are expenses of the organization within the meaning of article 17 of the charter. The failure of member states to pay their related assessments would thus subject them to the loss-of-vote provisions of article 19. The Court's opinion and its acceptance set the stage for what, based on later actions by the General Assembly, promises to produce a sturdier sense of financial responsibility on the part of most of the members.

COLONIAL QUESTIONS

Despite predictions of "another Congo," the United Nations trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi moved peacefully from dependence under Belgian administration to independence as the Republic of Rwanda and the kingdom of Burundi and then to membership in the United Nations. The organization continued to tackle the problems of non-violent transition as awakening peoples moved steadily toward independence from older colonial patterns. The remnants of the world's colonial past still present some hard cases—the last precisely because they are the hardest—which will test the capacity of the world community, and of the United Nations, to devise the procedures and institutions of peaceful change.

It should come to us no surprise that the struggle for national self-deter-

mination should be so closely linked with other fundamental questions of human rights. It has been so in our own country. As the decolonization process nears an end—with miraculously little bloodshed—men and nations can shift their attention from national freedom to the larger issue of individual freedom.

THE DRIVE FOR MODERNIZATION

Through its specialized agencies and regional commissions—its technical assistance and preinvestment work—its civil role in the Congo—its new projects such as the world food program, the world weather watch, and regional planning institutes—its standard-setting and rulemaking roles in such fields as maritime safety and international radio frequency allocations—its useful reports and its many conferences—the United Nations moved ahead as the principal international executive agency of the decade of development. We continue to believe it possible, through vigorous international cooperation, to achieve an average annual rate of economic growth of 5 percent in the newly developing nations by the end of this decade.

In short, the United Nations in 1962 was confronted—in practical and operational ways—with a broad agenda of the great issues of our time. Like most institutions devised by man, the United Nations exhibited both accomplishments and shortcomings. But despite noncooperation from some members and wavering support from others, the organization moved significantly toward the goal of a peace system worldwide in scope. The United States will continue to lend vigorous support to the building of that system.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, November 20, 1963.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention and concurrence of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Monday next to take up for consideration in the House a continuing resolution providing for the coming month of December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALEY. 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 respond to their names:

[Roll No. 208]

| | | |
|--------|---------------|--------------|
| Abbt | Bow | Buckley |
| Abele | Brozman | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Bonner | Broyhill, Va. | Casey |

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Celler | Kelly | Passman |
| Cunningham | Knox | Pilcher |
| Dague | Laird | Pillon |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lloyd | Powell |
| Dawson | Long, La. | Rains |
| Derwinski | McDade | Randall |
| Dingell | Madden | Roberts, Ala. |
| Duncan | Mailliard | Rogers, Tex. |
| Gill | Martin, Calif. | St. Onge |
| Harding | Martin, Mass. | Shelley |
| Harsha | Meador | Springer |
| Harvey, Ind. | Miller, N.Y. | Stubblefield |
| Henderson | Milliken | Trimble |
| Jones, Ala. | Minshall | Tuten |
| Keefe | O'Brien, Ill. | Younger |

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES, PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. RALPH R. ROBERTS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sorrowful mission to announce to the Members of the House the death on November 18 of Mrs. Eloise C. Roberts, and to express to her bereaved husband, Ralph Roberts, the Clerk of the House, the profound sympathy of all the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roberts was a fine and noble woman. She exemplified the finest qualities of womanhood. Although ill for a number of years, her smile, her cheer were ever present, brightening the very air around her and comforting and cheering those within the circle of her presence.

The funeral services will be held at St. Thomas Church at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. Burial afterward will be in Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in this simple tribute to the memory of a noble woman and of expression of sympathy to Ralph Roberts, I speak for all the Members of the House in expressing these sentiments.

TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 558 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move the

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and pending that I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 provides for the consideration of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. Speaker, the basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 777 is to authorize additional funds to finance the continued operation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as to make a number of amendments to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 in order to facilitate its administration with respect to security clearance of contractors and subcontractors, to make clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has no jurisdiction over the possession or use of firearms by individuals, and to impose certain limitations on the obligation and use of funds by the Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 558.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 makes in order the consideration of the bill S. 777 to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 there is authorized to be appropriated \$30 million, as amended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As the bill passed the Senate \$20 million was authorized, obviously about 50 percent of the original sum has been added which seems considerable.

It is also a rather interesting thing to see the House increase an appropriation made by the Senate. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, an amendment will be offered to this, and that when the amendment comes up it may be voted down. That is, we will have an oppor-

tunity to return to the original Senate bill or even cut that if we think it is necessary.

On the security investigations, section 2 adds a new subsection to the act which provides that in the case of contractors or subcontractors, their officers and employees, a report of investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the FBI, may be accepted by the Director when he determines that the completed investigation meets the standards established in the act.

The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than "confidential" to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees on the basis of reports on less than full-field investigations.

Then there is also the requirement of congressional approval for reduction in the U.S. armed services. This is section 3. The House Foreign Affairs Committee retained the language in the present law which requires congressional approval for any action which would obligate the United States to disarm, reduce or limit our Armed Forces or armaments. The Senate bill would have deleted this language and substituted language which would simply require approval to be "in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States."

In section 5 there is:

(a) Not more than 20 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.

(b) None of the funds authorized shall be used to support any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

It seems that these two last points are well taken and deserving of favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this rule, which provides 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. 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 bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

The motion was agreed to.

IN 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 bill S. 777, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, S. 777 authorizes the additional funds which are necessary for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to continue its operations, and amends the Arms Control and Disarma-

ment Act of 1961 in certain respects in order to facilitate the Agency's operations, to remove a possible uncertainty as to its meaning, and to impose certain limitations on the use of the Agency's funds.

The bill is short and most of its provisions are self-explanatory. It provides for no changes in policy, and its provisions reflect no change in our approach to the problems of arms control and disarmament from the approach embodied in the basic legislation which was enacted in September 1961.

Before discussing the detailed provisions of the bill, let me say just a word about the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. There apparently are people in the United States who regard the Agency as directing a conspiracy against the security of the United States. I have seen statements which appeared to indicate that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was devoting its money and its manpower to undermining our Defense Department and weakening our military forces.

Let me encourage everyone to keep this fact in mind: The primary job of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to provide the backup for the representatives of the United States in their conduct of arms control and disarmament negotiations. There is no way in which the Disarmament Agency or the President can obligate the United States to disarm or reduce its Armed Forces without congressional approval. This is clearly stated in section 33 of the act, and the bill before the House today contains an amendment to eliminate the language approved by the Senate which made some changes in the very clear and explicit language which has been in effect since 1961.

Let me state categorically that the President does not have authority to transfer jurisdiction over our Armed Forces from the Department of Defense to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to transfer American military forces to the United Nations. Let me also state categorically that there is no authority in the act for the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to call out the Armed Forces of the United States.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$30 million to finance the Agency over a period of 2 years. This authorization would make possible an appropriation of \$15 million for fiscal year 1964, which is the sum requested by the Agency. The committee has increased the authorization for 2 years by \$10 million, from \$20 million—the figure approved by the Senate—to \$30 million. The committee has taken this action after detailed study and careful consideration.

The Agency proposes to use \$11 million of the \$15 million which it has requested to finance research and \$4 million to meet its administrative expenses. Both these sums represent substantial increases over the amounts spent for these purposes during fiscal 1963, but it is necessary to recognize that the Agency is new and is only now ready to carry on its normal scale of operations.

I am sure that every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee had reservations with respect to the request for \$11 million for research when we first began consideration of the bill. All of us recognized the fact that much of the information which would be used in arms control and disarmament negotiations would involve the capabilities of various types of weapons systems, and we knew that the best source of information on such matters was our own Department of Defense.

We were aware also that control of the use of nuclear devices was a major issue which the Agency has to deal with, and it seemed to be obvious that our Atomic Energy Agency was doing very extensive research in this field. We realized also that the military capability of the Soviet bloc would be of major importance in dealing with arms control and disarmament, and we felt sure that the Central Intelligence Agency is, and must inevitably continue to be, the principal source of information in this area.

Nevertheless, after careful consideration of the types of research which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is doing and with the research projects which it has planned for the immediate future, the committee is convinced that an authorization of \$11 million for this purpose can be justified.

We held several days of hearings on this matter during which we heard from senior officials of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Central Intelligence Agency. We questioned these officials about their own research programs which were related to arms control and disarmament, and we also asked them what they knew about the research program of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and of the procedures for coordinating research in this field.

The result of our questioning satisfied us that there has been no significant duplication of research activities in the arms control and disarmament field, and that the procedures for coordination are well organized and working effectively.

Section 35 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act makes detailed provision for coordination of the work of the Arms Control Agency with other Government departments, and the President has, by Executive order, assigned to the Director of the Agency responsibility for coordination. This Executive order requires that the Director of the Arms Control Agency maintain a continuing inventory of research projects and other activities relating to disarmament matters in order to prevent duplication of effort. As I have already indicated, the testimony of representatives of the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has satisfied the committee that the job of coordination was being done in a satisfactory manner.

Although the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency makes extensive use of the research of the Defense Department and other agencies of the Government, there are many problems which are not of direct concern to anyone else

and which it has to investigate for itself. The largest research project in its present program is designated "Project Cloud Gap" and requires the use of Air Force planes and other equipment in order to carry out field tests of disarmament procedures. This particular project will require an expenditure of \$2.4 million of Agency funds, and the Air Force will put up approximately the same amount.

It is necessary to recognize that the problems of inspection of forces, weapons and weapons production under an arms control agreement are essentially different from those with which our armed services have to deal. Under an arms control agreement, our authorities would be expected to have the right to make inspections in order to detect violations of the agreement. We have a lot of experience in finding out about the forces and weapons of the enemy when the enemy is trying to keep us from looking. We have to develop new techniques for checking up on forces and weapons in a country which gives us the right of inspection but may be trying to mislead us.

The committee found, as it became more familiar with the nature of the problems confronting the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the job that the Agency has to do, that an expenditure of \$11 million for research was necessary. Let me repeat that the committee found no evidence that there has been significant duplication of research activities in the past, and we found that procedures exist which should prevent duplication in the future.

Section 2 of the bill amends the provisions of existing law with regard to security clearance for the personnel of contractors or subcontractors. These amendments do not in any way relax our security requirements or involve letting down our guard.

The first amendment provides that when contractor personnel have been cleared as a result of an up-to-date full field security investigation by the Defense Department or another agency of the Government which is satisfactory to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency can accept this investigation rather than require a separate field investigation of the same person.

This amendment will not make it any easier for contractor personnel to gain access to classified information; instead, it, in effect, provides that a person does not have to be vaccinated twice for the same disease.

Section 2 also provides that contractor personnel may be given access to information classified no higher than confidential on the basis of a current national agency check rather than on a full field investigation. I want to repeat that this involves information classified no higher than confidential. Any higher classification will continue to require a full field investigation.

The reason for this exception is that in many cases, such as bidders conferences, a quick clearance for low classification material is essential in order to initiate discussions to see whether potential contractors are interested or qualified to perform a proposed contract

research program. There are, of course, many cases in which low classification material is all that a contractor needs in order to do the job which is required. Let me point out also that the authority provided by these amendments is already available to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense.

You will note at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the bill, the language approved by the Senate has been stricken out. The elimination of this language means that the provision contained in section 33 of existing law—"That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States"—is continued in effect without change.

The Senate had amended section 33 to limit the required congressional approval of the reduction in U.S. forces or armaments to "the constitutional processes of the United States" and deleted the reference to "further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States." It is the belief of the committee that by retaining, without change, the language in existing law, any action obligating the United States to disarm, reduce or limit its Armed Forces or armaments, must have congressional approval, either in the form of a treaty ratified by the Senate or, in the case of an obligation other than a treaty, by a majority vote of the House and Senate.

Section 4 of the bill imposes two limitations on the expenditure of funds by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The first provides that not more than 20 percent of any appropriation made pursuant to the act may be obligated or reserved during the last month of the fiscal year.

The Agency during fiscal 1963 did obligate most of its funds during the last few months of the year. In justification, the Agency pointed out that the bill containing its appropriations for fiscal year 1963 was not enacted until October 18, 1962, and that its funds were not apportioned until November 16 of that year.

In any event, no one likes to see funds obligated during the last few days of a fiscal year in order to prevent them from being returned to the Treasury, and the committee believes that this is a good provision.

Section 4 also contains the provision that:

None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Arms Control Agency has among its primary functions under section 2(c) "the dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament." This amendment is intended to make clear that the dissemination of information concerning disarmament does not include campaign-

ing among organizations or individuals interested in arms control and disarmament to obtain support for legislation recommended by the Agency.

Section 5 of the bill contains language to prevent the Agency from making research contracts with private or public institutions or persons outside the United States. The committee found that in one instance the Agency had entered into a research contract with a British firm. We do not think this is sound policy, and the amendment in the bill will prevent a recurrence of such action.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who studies the law as it exists and the record of the Agency during its 2 years of operation can see for himself that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is performing an essential service in an effective manner. Its original authorization of \$10 million, which was made in September 1961, has been used up. There is every reason to believe that the United States will be engaged in almost continuous disarmament negotiations during the years to come just as we have been in the past. In order for us to be able to evaluate correctly the proposals of our adversaries and for us to make sure that our counterproposals do not endanger our own security, we need the technical services of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

I urge the approval of this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman says this does not waive any security measures. Up until the passage of the bill, however, the clearance of an individual or a contractor was left up to the Civil Service Commission or to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department already have and make use of this authority. The clearance of Agency personnel is not affected. This merely authorizes the acceptance of clearances made by other agencies such as the Department of Defense and the AEC for contractor personnel.

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

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

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania just said there was no way the President can disarm without approval of the Congress. Could I ask the gentleman under what arrangements the President acted recently when we agreed in the United Nations that we would not suspend nuclear weapons in outer space on our space vehicles?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think we agreed. We stated our policy and the U.N. passed a resolution expressing approval of our policy. The U.N. resolution does not constitute an agreement or a commitment.

Mr. STINSON. There was an agreement made at the United Nations providing that no nuclear weapons would be suspended in outer space.

Mr. MORGAN. All the U.N. General Assembly can do is make recommendations to governments. It cannot commit them to act.

Mr. STINSON. Was the Congress consulted on that; does the gentleman know?

Mr. MORGAN. The Congress was not consulted. The President does not have to get the approval of Congress to make a statement of policy.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, many of us, including myself, had great hopes for the future of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency when we voted for the authorization and appropriations for its operation.

After observing the operation of this Agency for 1 year, I am deeply disappointed. Instead of working on plans to represent the interests of America and the free world in disarmament plans, this Agency has apparently been studying reasons for the free world to surrender to the Kremlin to avoid the strife and turmoil that is inherent in freedom.

The annual report of this Agency, submitted by President Kennedy to the Congress, refers to the studies made for the Agency. May I quote verbatim from one of these studies:

Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200-million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian empire in 1918.

There is purely the philosophy of those who would surrender freedom to Communist tyranny to gain a temporary peace and tranquillity. To me it is unthinkable that we should condone and even encourage the continued police state control by the Kremlin of the millions of captive people of Europe and Asia. Every tyrant through the ages has promised peace if others would surrender to them. Today the Kremlin goal is for the rest of the world to surrender to its rule and then we would have peace, peace with slavery. Mao Tse-tung has the same ambitions, only that we should surrender to him.

Certainly freedom is expensive; freedom through the ages has been reserved for the brave and the daring. Freedom has dangers and uncertainties. If we fear to be free, if we would betray those who died for freedom, if we believe it is better to be Red than dead, if all we desire in the world is the safety of slavery, then I would agree that this could be achieved temporarily by everyone surrendering their freedom to the dictates of the Kremlin.

I am certain, however, that the American people and other freedom-loving peoples have higher dreams and ambitions—even if they must defend them against the forces of tyranny.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has spent the American taxpayer-

ers' money for such trips as I pointed out before; that is, the justification and praise of the "Soviet police system."

I voted for this authorization when it came up before, but I certainly did not intend that the American taxpayers' money should be so spent to defend Communist slavery. Now they want to raise the authorization threefold from \$10 to \$30 million.

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, in September 1961, the House, by a vote of 290 to 54, passed the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. The purpose of the act was to establish the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to explore, develop, and recommend possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security.

I supported that act and the creation of this new agency for peace. The goal for which it was established was reflected in the 1960 Republican Party platform as follows:

We are ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests.

We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements and an equal concern to protect all peoples from nuclear danger, leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards.

We cannot have adequate safeguards unless we participate knowledgeably in international negotiations dealing with such agreements.

The Arms Control Agency was charged by Congress with the responsibility in this field. It cannot carry out that responsibility unless it has the funds to do the research necessary for informed participation in arms control and disarmament negotiations. This is essential to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs carefully reviewed the Agency's research program and concluded that it was justified. It also concluded that there were no duplications in Agency research.

Mr. Chairman, at that time I concurred in that conclusion and supported the recommended authorization of \$15 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years. It seems to me that \$30 million for 2 years, approximately three-fourths of which would be spent for research, is a rather modest amount.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings it was brought out that the Agency realistically believes that general and complete disarmament is not presently attainable in today's world. The United States has not entered into any agreements obligating the United States to disarm. I want that to be exceedingly clear to the Members of this body. Indeed, under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act no such action could be taken without prior congressional approval. The Members will find in Public Law 87-297 these words:

That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United

States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, both the Eisenhower administration and the present administration have found it useful to state that the objective we are working for is a limited arms control measure. Some limited measures have been concluded. We now have a direct communication link between the United States and the Soviet Union. That link can reduce the risk of war in times of crises. Some people think it could increase the danger of war. I do not happen to think so, although I must say I doubt the word of Communist Russia in every instance because they have broken their word in every instance but one or two in 10, these many years.

Mr. Chairman, we have a ban on testing nuclear weapons underwater, in outer space, and in the atmosphere. That ban may begin to clear the air, both literally and figuratively.

Top officials from other Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, pointed out at the hearings that the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible for the "hot line" agreement and the limited test ban treaty.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a United Nations resolution calling on all nations not to place weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth. Such a resolution calls upon other nations to adhere to the same national policy we have already announced.

So, there have been accomplishments by this Agency that we created only 2 short years ago. Not monumental accomplishments, but significant steps.

For these I think we can all be grateful—grateful because they do represent progress toward a saner and safer world consistent with the dictates of our national security.

What the committee bill asks us to do is to provide continuing means to pursue this quest for peace in a manner that will safeguard our national interest. That is why I support this authorization and hope it will be supported by my colleagues.

For these I think we can be grateful because they do represent progress toward a saner and safer world. What the committee will ask us to do is to provide continuing funds to pursue this quest for peace in a manner that will safeguard our national interests.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the newsletter of the State Department about this Arms Control Agency. I quote the following:

Just prior to the creation of the Agency, activities in the arms control and disarmament field had been carried on by the U.S. Disarmament Administration, an element of the Department of State, whose last administrator was Edmund Gullion, now U.S. Ambassador to the Congo. But as the arms race accelerated it became more and more urgent that a separate agency be established which could give to our disarmament negotiators continuity of direction, could administer the political and scientific research needed for developing sound national security policy on

arms control and disarmament, and insure the constant and full-time application of U.S. resources toward reducing the danger of war.

One of the important areas in which research has been carried on is the effect it would have on unemployment and on matters that are so close to our hearts these days.

What would be the effect of a general disarmament? We must know. We still have time to plan ahead of time.

I think it is very important, Mr. Chairman, that all of the Members of this body know what they are really talking about. Some are talking about the action taken previously to the creation of this Agency. Dates are things that do matter in the judgment of this legislation and I trust most earnestly every one of you will give careful consideration to the actual facts; that we will not be doing our thinking on what look like facts but we will dig into them; that we will also recognize very, very seriously that nothing is to be done unless by treaty or by the aggressive action of the membership of this House and the other body. I think there are more safeguards in here than many people appreciate.

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

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio mentioned the requirement in this legislation covering congressional approval for any reduction in our Armed Forces raises an issue which has been of concern to me in connection with this act and other statutes as well. This is an especially appropriate bill to invite consideration of this issue which has to do with the constitutional prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides that no action shall be taken under this law that would obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

In other words, the law states that an international disarmament agreement must be accomplished by treaty and I would think that as such it means the advice and consent of the Senate would have to be obtained as against an executive agreement which was approved by the President without such advice and consent. The alternative to a treaty under the existing law would be congressional legislation passed by both House and Senate approving any disarmament agreement.

What concerns me, however, is whether a Chief Executive would recognize that provision of the law.

For example, section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act provides for Senate advice and consent to agreements by the President calling for a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to the act, and in the peaceful application of the results thereof.

When President Eisenhower signed the National Aeronautics and Space Act in July 1958, he stated that he regarded this section 205 merely as recognizing that international treaties may be made in this field, but not as precluding less formal arrangements for cooperation.

Recently I addressed an inquiry to the Space Administration on this point and was told that the legal determination is the responsibility of the Department of State whether a specific international agreement made under the authority of section 205 should be in the form of a treaty and be submitted to the Senate, for advice and consent, or whether it shall be treated as an executive agreement not requiring Senate action.

In the case of the Space Administration and international agreements that have been concluded to date covering NASA cooperative projects with other countries, a determination has been made by the Department of State that submission to the Senate was not required.

So, Mr. Chairman, I very much doubt if section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act will have much influence on our Department of State. Certainly the language of the Senate bill which refers to constitutional processes of the United States and the reference in the existing law which provides for further affirmative legislation by the Congress would seem to diminish chances of the agreement being referred to the legislative branch.

I certainly prefer the existing language which is restored by this bill but frankly I believe the prerogatives of the Chief Executive were intended to cover foreign negotiations. I believe that a President should not use the Executive agreement but rather should obtain the approval of the Senate and in certain cases the approval of both the House and the Senate.

Of course, the Congress has the power of the purse and that is why when President Kennedy suggested a joint venture with the Soviet Union for a lunar landing, I introduced an amendment to the space appropriation bill banning the use of those funds for such a cooperative proposal without congressional approval. Congress can limit the use of funds and I think we should use that power freely.

I think, Mr. Chairman, of all votes I have been called on to make since I entered Congress 11 years ago, this is the most difficult one for me. As one who believes that the legislative branch is the real safeguard of democracy, I fear such authority in the hands of one man—be he Democrat or Republican. That is borne out by my opposition to President Eisenhower when he opposed the so-called Bricker amendment.

Quite aside from that, however, at the moment I have serious misgivings lest our President be misled into an agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union follows a policy of deception and until there is more evidence of Russian trustworthiness, I find it difficult to support this program.

The Communists frankly say they will outdo us one way or the other. Since

Russia has never kept any of her solemn commitments, she cannot be trusted.

I wish there were some real safeguards and that the Senate would have to approve an international disarmament arrangement. As it is a United Nations resolution could bind us. The outline which the Disarmament Agency has developed for complete disarmament has me worried. I don't favor turning over our arms to a United Nations peace force. The world is not ready for that yet. It may never be.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. We are all troubled about that. Ever since 1933 we have had all too many agreements and not enough treaties. I trust we may find ourselves enforcing this.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there have been occasions when I have attempted to buy firearms abroad. Even in enlightened countries on our side of the Iron Curtain I have nearly always found the sale of firearms carefully supervised and restricted—so much so in some instances that I did not think it worth the effort to clear the necessary redtape to obtain the weapon I wanted. In many nations of the world there is almost no such thing as private ownership of firearms. It could happen here. This I know is farfetched. Americans are not constituted to take lightly restrictions of their constitutional rights. But, it can happen. How? I think of a number of ways. Congress could enact restrictive gun laws. There might be administration decrees, based on some grant of power to the Chief Executive. Or, the Supreme Court might, by interpretation, rule out private ownership of weapons. A fourth way would be gradual chipping away by State legislatures of the right to own weapons.

The first is least likely. The Congress, being closer to the people and their thinking, is much more responsive to their wishes. The Congress will hardly in our time deprive the people of a right as highly prized as this. But, Congress constantly is bestowing new grants of power on the Chief Executive. And, Chief Executives, no matter who they may be, are constantly seeking or appropriating unto themselves new grants of Executive power. We already have seen farfetched administrative rulings. The Chief Executives, surrounded as they are by advisers—palace guard is another word—whose backgrounds are not necessarily practical, may go even further in the future in this direction than they have in the past.

In the Supreme Court, we see a complete disregard for precedent, a wholesale rewriting of the law, and even of the Constitution. Look carefully at the rulings of that body for the past 10 years. Are they less surprising than a ruling which would limit private ownership of firearms? Do you think a court which ruled out prayer in the schools would hesitate to place a new and restrictive interpretation on the second amendment to the Constitution and to say ownership of weapons is in fact something to be enjoyed only by active and participating members of the militia?

We have before us a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On the face of it, that bill has little reference to the private ownership of firearms. Yet, a great many people, as well as leading sports magazines and sportsmen's organizations, have become increasingly concerned about the possibility that the Disarmament Agency will concern itself directly with private ownership of firearms.

The language, temper and range of the act are idealistic and broad. There have been indications that the Agency, failing to achieve concrete results on the international scene, or in its zeal to show U.S. support for general disarmament, could turn to domestic regulation of firearms in order to show reason for its continued existence. Assurances of officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have not dispelled this fear. After all they can speak only for themselves—not for their successors.

Therefore, magazines like *Guns & Ammo*, *Outdoor Life*, *Sports Afield*, and the *National Rifleman*, and that great organization of sportsmen, the *National Rifle Association*, with the support of a host of sportsmen throughout the Nation, want it made absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act does not include the elimination of private ownership of firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program.

As a result, language was offered in the Senate by Senator HICKENLOOPER and in the House by me. Senator HICKENLOOPER's legislation was adopted by the Senate. Identical language by me has received the support of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is included in the bill before you and is found on page 3, lines 9 through 16. The language is as follows:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training.

I have not been happy with the actions taken by the Agency. Although its basic design appeared sound and its purpose commendable, the organization has injected itself into too wide an area of operation. I see very little being done by this Agency which could not be done properly by the State Department and other existing Government agencies. To me, it has simply provided more frosting on the cake and costly frosting at that. It is another layer of officialdom on top of officialdom. Like all newly created Government agencies, it quickly began to expand and pyramid. The bill before you would increase its scope and increase its authorization. To me, it would be preferable to let the Agency die.

As a matter of fact, the entire question of disarmament as now discussed by Government agencies carries dangerous overtones—dangerous to the safety of this Nation and its people. I have before me a little pamphlet entitled "Freedom From War" issued by the State Department. This is Department of State

Publication 7277, released in September 1961. From page 3, I quote in part:

DISARMAMENT GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

The disbanding of all national Armed Forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order.

To me, the limited degree of success we now enjoy in our dealings with Russia is due directly and primarily to the fact that the military strength of this Nation is at its highest level since the peak of World War II. To weaken ourselves in the foreseeable future would be a direct invitation for a return to the days of constant harassment of the United States and its allies by the Communists. I need not tell you that there is a great deal of public apprehension over the prospect of surrendering our defenses and our security into the keeping of the United Nations as it is set forth in this booklet.

If the Agency is to be continued, it is very important that the safeguard which I propose be written into this bill.

This is an age of growing restrictions. The trend is toward centralization and control. I do not want to see Congress open the door for curtailment of the right to the possession and use of firearms by law-abiding private citizens. Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting and dying in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintance with firearms they gained as boys in a free society. We would be making a fatal mistake if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms to be curtailed. My provision will help guard against this. I am optimistic that it will be enacted into law. This language is vital enough to merit the support of all freedom-loving Americans.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. As an American woman I want to thank you

very much for bringing this to our attention. I think it is exceedingly important that we take this into consideration and see to it that our right to bear arms here at home is not curtailed.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. She has made many important contributions to the debate of the House.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to point out that page 6 of the report in the last paragraph points out:

Section 3 also amends the law by adding a provision making clear that:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. Admittedly, it is broad language which is intended to insure that no Government agency will seek to deprive the private law-abiding citizen of the right to own and use firearms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we can start with the premise here today that every Member of the House is for peace and especially those Members of the House who have served in combat in one of our numerous wars. I cannot think of a single Member, particularly one who has served in combat, who would ever want to see another war. But, of course, there is something worse than war, and that is slavery—slavery of the mind, the soul, and the body; the loss of freedom.

I for one am not ready now nor in the foreseeable future to disarm the United States, to weaken the United States so that we become the prey and slaves of any other power in the world.

This is an unusual bill. In the first place, it comes to the House from the other body, which is often known as the "upping" body. This comes to the House with a \$10 million appropriation or, rather, it came before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with a \$10 million annual appropriation for a 2-year period. Believe it or not, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has become the "upping" committee of the Congress in this instance. It recommends \$15 million annually for 2 years. It goes the Senate a total of \$10 million better, and for what reason I do not know. As a member of the committee I am unable to understand why.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my chairman, although he did not yield to me. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman did not mention that 17 Members of Congress introduced bills, and their names

are in the report, authorizing the full \$15 million.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I read the names and I do not know that having done so it contributes anything in support of the argument that the taxpayers should be compelled to lavish an additional \$10 million on this program. This is the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. What is arms control? It seems to me that arms control, to have any meaning, is control of enemy arms, and it is peculiarly the duty and the responsibility of the Pentagon, of our military, to control enemy arms.

I say again that not in the foreseeable future are you going to see disarmament. Yet 2 years ago, late in 1961, there was created this super-duper disarmament agency. Prior to that time we were accomplishing just about as much in the way of disarmament with an expenditure of \$700,000 to \$1 million a year. We were spending around \$1 million a year to discuss disarmament. However, late in 1961 came the creation of this super-duper agency, and in the first year, as I recall, the appropriation for its sustenance was \$1.6 million or \$1.8 million. Then it took flight. I believe the figure for last year was some \$6 million. I do not remember the exact figure. Someone can supply the specific information.

Mr. MORGAN. The sum of \$6.5 million is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Chairman. Yes, \$6.5 million for the last fiscal year and now it is proposed to jump this to \$15 million. In all conscience, how can you squander the taxpayers' money this way? And what is the money being spent for? Between \$3 million and \$4 million a year is spent on administration. This organization now has some 210 employees. At the proper time I will submit for printing in the Record—and I hope you will look at it—the payroll of this superduper organization. Some 28 employees—and remember there are some 210 employees altogether—there are some 28 of them drawing from \$14,500 up to \$22,500. This is empire building at its worst. This is really a fat payroll for a few chiefs and mighty few Indians.

Mr. Chairman, I submit at this point as part of my remarks, the payroll of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Of course, this does not include a single dollar of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are spent by the agency for consultants and on so-called research contracts:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—PERSONNEL LISTING AS OF AUGUST 31, 1963

UNCLASSIFIED POSITIONS

William C. Foster, Director, \$22,500.
Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director, \$21,500.
Archibald Alexander, Assistant Director, \$20,000.
George Bunn, General Counsel, \$20,000.
Nedville E. Nordness, Public Affairs Adviser, \$20,000.

GS-18

William H. Berman, Deputy General Counsel, \$20,000.

Robert E. Matteson, Disarmament Adviser, \$20,000.

George W. Rathjens, Deputy Assistant Director, \$20,000.

George R. Pugh, Deputy Assistant Director, \$20,000.

Robert L. Finley, Deputy Assistant Director, \$20,000.

GS-17

Clement E. Conger, Special Assistant, \$18,000.

GS-16

Wreatham Gathright, foreign affairs officer, \$16,500.

Charles N. Van Doren, Assistant General Counsel, \$16,000.

GS-15

Alan F. Neldie, attorney adviser, \$14,565.
William S. Gehron, information officer, \$15,045.

Emery J. Adams, security specialist, \$16,005.

Walter C. Ertel, budget officer, \$15,045.
Phillip C. Holt, assistant disarmament adviser, \$17,445.

Charles R. Gellner, foreign affairs officer, \$16,005.

Vincent Baker, foreign affairs officer, \$15,045.

Harland Moulton, foreign affairs officer, \$15,045.

Donald Benjamin, foreign affairs officer, \$15,045.

Nathan Rich, foreign affairs officer, \$15,525.
Evan T. Sage, foreign affairs officer, \$16,005.

Larry Holmes, foreign affairs officer, \$14,565.

Charles Coleman, physical science officer, \$15,525.

Robert H. Ellis, physical science officer, \$14,565.

Edward M. Risley, foreign affairs officer, \$16,005.

GS-14

Hampton Davis, administrative officer, \$13,270.

Albert Christopher, attorney adviser, \$13,270.

H. Keith Reinecker, security specialist, \$13,270.

M. L. Brockdorf, personnel officer, \$13,270.
M. O. Zimmerman, contract specialist, \$14,120.

Thomas S. Lough, project officer, \$13,270.
Jeremy Blanchet, foreign affairs officer, \$13,270.

Henry D. Wyner, economist, \$13,695.
Ruth L. Sivard, economist, \$13,270.

Leonard S. Rodberg, physical science officer, \$13,270.

John R. Hall, foreign affairs officer, \$14,970.

GS-13

Mason Willrich, attorney adviser, \$11,150.

Douglas Griffiths, contract specialist, \$11,880.

Robert Lambert, foreign affairs officer, \$11,880.

John W. Syphax, foreign affairs officer, \$11,880.

Henry R. Myers, physical science officer, \$11,515.

Kurt Kreith, physical science officer, \$11,150.

GS-12

Mary G. Russell, secretary, \$9,475.

Beatrice Puckett, staff assistant, \$10,105.
Lenor Burmaster, foreign affairs officer, \$10,105.

James S. Bodnar, foreign affairs officer, \$9,790.

Ralph W. Nary, foreign affairs officer, \$9,475.
Jean E. Mayer, foreign affairs officer, \$9,475.

Richard D. Stoll, physical science officer, \$10,420.

Robert Brandwein, international economist, \$9,475.

GS-11

David K. Harbinson, attorney adviser, \$8,045.

Leona Timko, secretary, \$8,045.

Eunice A. Walker, information specialist, \$8,310.

Bernice M. Mills, management technician, \$8,575.

GS-10

Adeline Chatterton, secretary, \$7,535.
Alice O. Whittier, secretary, \$7,780.

Olive J. Doherty, secretary, \$8,315.

GS-9

Mary M. Fitzpatrick, secretary, \$8,025.
June C. Eller, staff aid, \$6,900.

Anne Gulasi, secretary, \$7,125.
Mary J. Shaffer, mail and file supervisor, \$8,025.

Adalyn Davis, foreign affairs officer, \$8,025.
Ruth O. Ihara, foreign affairs officer, \$6,675.

Elizabeth A. Slany, documents officer, \$7,125.

Margaret Johnson, secretary, \$7,125.
Sadie S. Kennedy, secretary, \$7,575.

Julia E. Barry, secretary, \$6,675.
Julia B. Krenzel, secretary, \$8,025.

John H. Graves, documents officer, \$6,675.

GS-8

Katherine Glazer, secretary, \$6,500.
Margaret A. Lersch, secretary, \$6,295.

Esther P. McFarland, secretary, \$6,910.
Kaye M. Burchell, secretary, \$7,935.

GS-7

Patricia M. Williams, secretary, \$5,910.
Patricia Kascak, secretary, \$6,095.

Marian E. Welmer, secretary, \$6,095.
Pauline S. Trapp, secretary, \$6,280.

Regina M. Ridder, secretary, \$5,725.
Barbara Enuton, secretary, \$5,725.

Medora Holm, staff aid, \$6,835.
Helen Szpakowski, secretary, \$6,650.

Sammie Venable, secretary, \$6,465.
Margaret Barrett, secretary, \$6,835.

Shirley Price, secretary, \$6,280.
Susan Edwin, foreign affairs officer, \$5,540.

Lorraine McCottry, secretary, \$6,095.
Rose M. Hilton, secretary, \$6,280.

Margorie Geigerich, secretary, \$6,465.
Elizabeth McDougall, secretary, \$5,725.

Jean Cunningham, secretary, \$5,910.
Barbara J. Givens, secretary, \$6,835.

Dorothy Woosley, secretary, \$5,910.
Gertrude Rohrer, secretary, \$6,465.

Christine Johnson, secretary, \$6,835.
Barbara C. Tewey, secretary, \$5,910.

Thomas P. Flaherty, clerk, \$5,540.
Jack C. Sando, foreign affairs officer, \$5,540.

GS-6

Victoria Gibbons, secretary, \$5,205.
Mary F. Allen, clerk, \$5,375.

Linda C. Yuzzolin, secretary, \$6,055.
Grace B. Knerr, secretary, \$5,205.

Patricia Hennessey, secretary, \$5,035.
Regina H. Simms, secretary, \$6,565.

Henrietta Fliss, secretary, \$5,205.

GS-5

Gene M. Krause, secretary, \$4,565.
Evalyn W. Dexter, secretary, \$4,565.

Paul L. Ishimoto, mail and file clerk, \$5,525.
Oliver J. Vosseler, mail and file clerk, \$5,045.

Francis Johnson, mail and file clerk, \$4,885.
JoAnn M. Rowe, secretary, \$4,725.

Peggy J. McFarland, documents clerk, \$5,045.

Margaret C. Weedon, secretary, \$5,365.
Joan Shepherd, secretary, \$4,885.

Cecelia Skeen, secretary, \$4,565.
Bonnie Barrett, secretary, \$4,565.

Mary R. Grear, secretary, \$4,725.
Lorraine Kostelnick, secretary, \$5,205.

Marguerite Glenn, secretary, \$5,205.
Robert W. Gordon, foreign affairs assistant, \$4,565.

GS-4

Susie M. Townsend, clerk-stenographer, \$4,110.

Trudy I. Leik, clerk-stenographer, \$4,110.
Stephen Pollard, physical science assistant, \$4,110.

Roxanne George, documents clerk, \$4,110.
Edna M. Jones, clerk-stenographer, \$4,110.

James E. Greene, mail and file clerk, \$4,250.

Bonnie J. Moreau, clerk-stenographer, \$4,250.

Odessa Mitchell, clerk-typist, \$4,950.
Patricia Pigza, clerk-stenographer, \$4,250.

Lillian Harley, clerk-typist, \$5,090.
Nancy Hollingsworth, clerk-typist, \$4,530.

Carole Gensh, clerk-stenographer, \$4,110.

GS-3

Elleen M. Hall, clerk-typist, \$4,030.
Gretchen C. Cooksey, clerk-stenographer, \$3,820.

Nancy Bolinger, clerk-typist, \$3,820.
Elizabeth O'Brien, clerk-typist, \$3,820.

Anita L. Lieber, clerk-typist, \$3,925.
David Culbert, clerk-typist, \$3,925.

Patricia Hall, clerk-typist, \$3,925.
Phyllis Getz, clerk-typist, \$3,925.

John Crane, clerk-typist, \$3,820.
Patricia DiFura, clerk-typist, \$3,820.

Josephine Pluchino, clerk-typist, \$4,030.

GS-2

Melvin G. Hall, messenger-clerk, \$3,980.

GS-1

Nathaniel Pollard, messenger, \$3,455.

PUBLIC LAW 313 POSITIONS

Bennett L. Basore, physical science officer, \$20,000.

Alton J. Wadman, physical science officer, \$18,500.

Thomas L. Saaty, physical science officer, \$18,500.

Lessing Kahn, project manager, \$18,500.
Robert Kopp, electronic engineer, \$17,500.

Harold Davis, military systems analyst, \$17,000.

Robert S. Rochlin, physical science officer, \$16,000.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, RESERVE AND STAFF PERSONNEL DETAILED FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE—REIMBURSABLE

Jacob D. Beam, Assistant Director, GM.

C. H. Timberlake, disarmament adviser, CM.

Richard B. Freund, Foreign Service officer, FSO-1.

Idar Rimestad, Foreign Service officer, FSO-2.

Samuel De Palma, Foreign Service officer, FSO-2.

Alexander Kiefer, Foreign Service officer, FSO-2.

Stuart H. McIntyre, Foreign Service officer, FSO-4.

William Haynes, Foreign Service officer, FSO-4.

Anthony O'Boyle, Foreign Service officer, FSO-5.

William C. Kinsey, Foreign Service officer, FSO-5.

Thomas R. Pickering, Foreign Service officer, FSO-6.

Curt F. Gross, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

Russell O. Prickett, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

Alan M. Parrent, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

Richard S. Thompson, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

Marie deGunzberg, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

Robert A. Martin, Foreign Service officer, FSO-7.

William Maddox, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-1.

Jerome H. Spingarn, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-2.

Marion W. Boggs, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-2.

Lawrence D. Weller, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-3.

Philip J. Halla, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-3.

Alexander Akalovsky, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-3.

Thomas C. Irvin, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-4.

Anne W. Marks, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-5.

James C. Kellogg, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-6.

Robert F. Greene, Foreign Service Reserve officer, FSR-7.

Howard W. Catkins, Foreign Service Career Reserve officer, FSCR-3.

Betty A. Peyton, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-5.

Edward C. Mistach, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-6.

Elizabeth G. Drott, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-6.

Francis J. Mullins, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-7.

Rush Voegele, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-8.

Thomas Fennell, Foreign Service Staff, FSS-9.

MILITARY PERSONNEL DETAILED FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—REIMBURSABLE

Edward N. Parker, vice admiral, Assistant Director.

David S. Daley, colonel, U.S. Army.

Pleas E. Greenlee, captain, U.S. Navy.

Paul J. Long, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Charles W. McCoy, colonel, U.S. Marine Corps.

Kent Parrott, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Stuart Porter, colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Ira B. Richards, colonel, U.S. Army.

J. Ernest Samusson, colonel, U.S. Army.

R. B. Creecy, captain, U.S. Navy.

Joseph R. Struby, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Arthur H. Sweeney, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.

Charles H. Tisdale, commander, U.S. Navy.

Raymond E. Woodstock, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force.

Edward C. Kline, commander, U.S. Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the rest of the money is being spent on what we are pleased, these days, to call research. Let me read to you from one of the pieces of literature that was developed through a contract let by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The taxpayers of this Nation, in the name of disarmament, are being victimized into paying for this kind of propaganda:

Whether we admit it to ourselves or not we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over their 200 million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states.

In other words, the so-called Disarmament Agency is spending the taxpayers' money to hire people to tell us what a wonderful state of affairs it is that the Russian Communists have a police system that is able to keep 200 million people in slavery. I ask you, do you think this is the way that you, representing the taxpayers, ought to be spending their money—for this kind of propaganda?

The Disarmament Agency also tells Americans what they should be prepared for. You will find it in House Document No. 57. It is the three-stage disarmament plan. And after we are disarmed who takes over? Who polices us? Why the polyglot United Nations, of course. This illustration, to be found in House Document No. 57, tells better than words what this Disarmament Agency will get us into if it has its way.

Then you can read in the speeches and statements made by Mr. Foster in one of these disarmament pamphlets how in

stage 2—they do not wait for stage 3—how the United States and its citizens will be brought under the International Court of Justice. No longer will Americans be under the jurisdiction of the courts of this country. They will be brought under the International Court of Justice and again under the United Nations. If you want that, continue to build up this organization. I want no part of it.

I say to you here and now that as a minimum this ought to be cut down to the \$10 million that the Senate authorized. It ought to be cut deeper than that. It ought to be cut back to \$5 or \$6 million and then brought back down to \$1 million. I am perfectly willing to maintain a small agency capable of discussing disarmament, if somebody wants to discuss it and really means it. But beyond that, this is a snarl and a delusion. It is the creation of another empire, another bureaucracy, at a cost of millions of dollars.

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

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I will yield to my friend.

Mr. HALEY. I notice in the document to which the gentleman just referred by Mr. Foster and put out by this Agency, that they never refer to nations. They refer to states, which would lead me to believe that this is a movement toward having a United States of the World, rather than the nations of the world. They never refer to the United States as a nation, but merely as one of the states in this scheme.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Everything you read in these documents put out by this Agency means world federalism; one-world government. It means the destruction of our Constitution and sovereignty.

Another element of this insidious plan would be the end of our concept of civilian control of the military. How many other members of the United Nations, and there are more than 100 of them, hold to this concept? Military dictatorships and military takeovers around the world are a dime a dozen these days. Yet those voting for this bill are voting to promote a disarmament plan that would lodge what would be left of our military forces in an organization, the United Nations, in which scores of nations have become subservient to their military forces.

If we believe in freedom for ourselves and the citizens we represent, how gullible can we be in voting for this bill and the disarmament program that is being promoted?

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777, as amended in the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

As one of the original cosponsors of the legislation which established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I have watched its operations with interest over the past 2 years. Its success has been gratifying.

Since its creation, the Agency's research and negotiating efforts have contributed significantly to two agreements which, it is believed, have furthered the cause of arms control and lessened the dangers of nuclear war.

The first of these is the so-called hot line. The need for some form of ready communications between our President and his advisers and the men in the Kremlin became readily apparent during the Cuban crisis of 1 year ago.

In that time of highest tension and impending danger of all-out war, it was recognized that the means were lacking to relay messages quickly and safely between Washington and Moscow. This complicated the dangers of an accidental nuclear exchange.

From that need the "hot line" was developed. Although some have misrepresented the system as a telephone system with our President on one end and Premier Khrushchev on the other, talking face to face, we know that is not so.

The hot line is a teletype system, installed in the Pentagon, which allows fast communications, but rules out the misunderstandings which might result from direct voice transmission.

Although other agencies were involved in the effort to develop this system, it was the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which formulated the system and carried out the agreement.

A second accomplishment was the limited test ban treaty.

This agreement, banning nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, has been hailed around the world by those aware of the dangers to ourselves and our children of radioactive fallout.

It would be folly to see this treaty as an end to the cold war. But, as our President has said, it can be a step in the right direction.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was responsible for the careful advance planning of the U.S. position on the limited test ban agreement.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York, briefly.

Mr. BECKER. Just for the sake of obtaining information, I would like to get some additional information on this point. I do not want to criticize. I just want to get some information.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield for a question.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman talks about one of the accomplishments of this Disarmament Agency in respect to the nuclear test ban treaty. I think the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I did.

Mr. BECKER. The question I want to ask that comes to my mind, and I could be wrong, is this: It is my understanding that Mr. Foster and other members of the Disarmament Agency were in Geneva and were attempting to negotiate a test ban treaty with certain controls and inspections and had been there for years.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will yield further, then, suddenly, Mr. Khrushchev notifies us that he would sign a

test ban treaty and we sent Mr. Harriman to Moscow. It is my understanding that he negotiated the test ban treaty with no controls and no inspections.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is not true.

Mr. BECKER. This is my understanding, based upon what I have read. I do not know where the Disarmament Agency got into the negotiations on the nuclear test ban treaty. I just want to get it straight.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The ACDA laid the groundwork for the negotiations.

Harriman negotiated the treaty, that is true. The gentleman is in error when he says there are no controls and no inspections in the treaty.

Mr. BECKER. There is no inspection in it. That is what the Disarmament Agency was arguing about all the time it was meeting in Geneva.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to refer to testimony in our hearings, page 164, by Mr. Foster with regard to the question that the gentleman poses:

When the apparent change in state of mind was exhibited by Mr. Khrushchev in his July 2 speech which indicated the possibility of a negotiation of this present treaty, we immediately again called a meeting of the Committee of Principals. It was decided that Mr. Harriman would be sent to Moscow as the representative of the President in view of his many contacts with Mr. Khrushchev, but the drawing up of the instructions, that part of the activity was at our initiation and done by us, of course with cooperation again of the Committee of Principals and finally with the President, and when the mission was selected, my deputy, Mr. Fisher, was Mr. Harriman's deputy. The scientists who went were our scientists. The interpreter was our interpreter, the secretaries were our secretaries, so that we made up some 40 or 50 percent of the delegation and in the drafting committee, Mr. Fisher was the actual member of the drafting committee that worked with the representative of the Soviet Union in the final drafting of the treaty.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman has made my point. We signed an entirely different treaty than was negotiated by the Disarmament Agency at Geneva. I think the gentleman has made the point for me.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I tried to make the point we would not be in any position to negotiate a treaty were it not for the preliminary work going on at Geneva prior to the change of mind of Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. BECKER. I agree about the change in mind of Mr. Khrushchev on inspections that we fought for years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The fact is if it were not for the Disarmament Agency we would be in no position to negotiate any treaty without jeopardizing our position.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from New Jersey in what he has just said. The Agency produced the first draft agreement which was taken by Governor Harriman and his staff to Moscow. It supplied staff and backup information for the negotiators.

But more than that, the Agency was active in the development of the verification system which, in the last analysis, made the test ban treaty possible.

For this treaty is not based on trust—we know better than to trust the Russians—but on technical devices that make possible the detection of any Soviet cheating.

In this way the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency not only contributes to the cause of peace we all avow, but also strengthens the security of our Nation.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has conducted its activities on a very limited budget. During its first 2 years, it operated on an appropriation of \$20 million, less than the cost of two B-58 bombers.

The bill before us today increases the appropriation to \$30 million. There is good reason for this rise in expenditure. Necessarily, the Agency's research program is growing. The first 2 years of its operation were devoted to the development of the basic principles upon which to base a sound and effective research program.

Now, however, more detailed research and analysis is required to provide the technical data necessary for sound U.S. negotiations in the arms control area.

The Agency must research, develop, test, and evaluate verification systems. These systems are complicated and expensive. This is particularly true when the ACDA gets into the later stages involving hardware research and field tests. For example, the largest research project programed for fiscal 1964 will involve \$2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures.

Mr. Chairman, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been the target of much criticism during its first 2 years of operation. After studying these criticisms, the committee came to the conclusion that they were largely based on erroneous information or rank prejudice.

One lesson we have learned since the end of World War II is that peace does not come with the cessation of hostilities. Peace can only result from the conscious exertions of men of good will around the world.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency provides our Nation with an effective instrument in the crusade for global peace. It provides us with a symbol by which to show the world that our Nation sincerely is seeking an end to world tensions.

Can we then appropriate \$50 billion for the armaments of war, and find \$30 million too much to pay for an instrument of peace?

The answer is clear. We cannot refuse this appropriation. Rather, we must remain true to the legitimate aspirations for peace which dwell in the hearts of all true Americans.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, as we consider this bill today many of us have

troubled hearts and minds. We are troubled not at the objectives of this legislation but we are troubled at the direction in which it sometimes seems to be leading us.

If Members will refresh their recollections by a rereading of the purposes of the act as it is now written, they will find, I am sure, that it does not envisage a situation in which our country denudes itself of protective armament. Not for an instant would I say a word in support of this legislation if I felt it endangered our national security.

Members should recall that during the debate on a predecessor measure 2 years ago the point was made that we were giving form and substance to an agency already in existence, with the ultimate aim of giving greater congressional control over this agency and at the same time assuring that we were not endangering ourselves as a nation.

Statements have been made—improper, unfortunate, unwarranted, and unjustified statements of the kind the gentleman from Iowa just a few moments ago quoted to us. In my opinion, these are by no means justified by the legislation which is before us.

This Agency was set up, Mr. Chairman. Members will recall, with the purpose of creating an organization which would study, which would prepare, which would be knowledgeable upon matters of international agreements, perhaps eventually leading to disarmament of reasonable and safe degree, and always with safeguards as to our national security.

It was the concept that this Agency should be prepared to advise both the Executive and the Congress upon questions relating to arms control.

I said a moment ago that the legislation which we enacted in September 1961 gave form and control to existing activity. It did just that. There was in the State Department prior to that time an organization which was studying the whole question of agreements leading to arms control.

Our legislative action formalized that organization. Let me remind Members of another thing. When this legislation was before us previously, it was first designated as the Disarmament Agency. As a result of action taken in this body, the words "Arms Control" were added to the title. In fact, we indicated we felt "Arms Control" was a better and a more descriptive name for the organization.

The proposal before us this year was first for a continuing authorization. Neither the other body nor this body found it wise to give that continuing authorization. To demonstrate the fact that we in the Congress felt the need of actively watching the performance of this agency, we put a 2-year limitation on it and that is the bill that is before us today.

We are asked by the terms of the committee bill to authorize the appropriation for a 2-year period of \$30 million. This is \$10 million higher than was authorized by the other body. In my opinion, \$30 million is too much. It ought to be reduced. And at the proper time I will urge the reduction of this to a figure

not greater than the \$20 million for the 2 years already authorized by the other body.

Keep in mind the fact that for the first 2 years of the existence of this organization, there was an authorization of \$10 million which was sufficient to carry it for 2 years and, in fact, there is some of that \$10 million unexpended right now, which has been appropriated in a bill which passed this House earlier this year and is now languishing in the other body. But for 2 years \$10 million has been sufficient to carry out the activities of this organization. I see no reason, my colleagues, why if \$10 million can carry it for the past 2 years, and not from a standing start but as an organization already in being, then why should not \$10 million for each of the following 2 years be enough? I think we would be by no means justified in granting the additional amount of money which the Committee on Foreign Affairs saw fit to put in this bill.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, here is a bill which we may vote for with certain misgivings, having in mind it is our function and our purpose most carefully to watch the activities of this agency. But let us not drown the agency with too much money. Let us keep it on a reasonable financial basis and then discharge our congressional responsibility by watching carefully the course it takes in the future. Two years hence we may then again decide what our course of action ought to be.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think there is not any question that the crying need of the world today is disarmament. As a matter of fact, I voted for the original authorization because I felt maybe this new administration had some new ideas in this field. However, by observing the Agency for some time, and I serve on the appropriation subcommittee handling these funds, I am not convinced that we are making any more progress in this area even though we are spending more money.

I thought it might be appropriate to read something from the UPI wire and get this thing in perspective. I am afraid we do not realize the kind of enemy we are up against. I do not think there is any way that we could possibly trust any agreement with the Soviet Communist bloc at any time at any place. We should be very careful and recognize their objective is our destruction and loss of freedom.

This is the item that came over the UPI wires:

Moscow.—A top Russian missile general has urged Defense Secretary McNamara and other U.S. officials "to give up their atomic blackmail and threats against the Socialist world" or face the consequences, Moscow Radio said today.

It quoted Col. Gen. Vladimir Tolubko, first assistant commander of Soviet strategic rocket forces as saying:

"American soil would become the theater of military operations from the very first minute of any war imposed on us."

Tolubko was quoted as taking issue with McNamara's remarks about America's supposed nuclear supremacy. The Russian said:

"I would once again like to recall a remark by (Soviet) Defense Minister Marshal Malinovsky that we will retaliate for the number of missiles threatening us with a simultaneous salvo of several times the number of missiles, and by such powerful nuclear explosions that they will really wipe off the face of the earth all the installations and industrial and administrative centers of the United States of America, and completely wipe out the countries that have allowed their soil to be used for American war bases."

Tolubko said McNamara's "boasts" were meant for propaganda and to "soothe" the American public and those in the West who "are learning ever more frequently about the failures of American missile and nuclear rocket tests."

"Meantime, the Western press, which cannot be suspected of sympathy for the Soviet Union, is printing more and more news about the supremacy of Soviet nuclear missiles," he said. "Just 11 days ago the British Institute of Strategic Research again stressed officially that Soviet intercontinental missiles have more powerful engines and bigger warheads than American missiles of the same type. The Institute also admits the U.S.S.R.'s supremacy in medium-range missiles."

Tolubko claimed that Russian strategic missiles have no range restrictions and can carry thermonuclear warheads of colossal strength. He also claimed no limit to the destructive power of these missiles.

The Russian general was quoted as saying that Russian nuclear charges and super-powerful rockets "are enough to destroy any country with a few H-bombs."

Tolubko quoted unnamed "American specialists" as estimating that in case of war 263 5-megaton bombs could wipe out 71 large American cities and kill 53 million people.

"We must say these estimates are based on fact," he said.

The Russian said Communist strategic missiles can cross 6,000 miles in 30 to 35 minutes and cannot be intercepted because they are independently controlled and are not linked with any ground radio devices. Tolubko concluded by saying:

"For the sake of all humanity and of maintaining peace on this planet of ours, Mr. McNamara and his colleagues would have done better long ago to give up their atomic blackmail and threats against the Socialist world, a policy promising nothing good for the aggressor."

The Russian Defense Ministry newspaper Red Star accused McNamara of "boasting too much."

"Would it not be better for him to hold his tongue?" Red Star asked. "No one is frightened by the thunder of such speeches."

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, one thing that might be interesting is to review the events leading up to the passage of the original bill as it went through the House in 1961. The Senate committee on August 14, 15, and 16 of 1961 held hearings on the bill. On August 24, 25, and 28 and on September 7, 1961, hearings were also held in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Senate passed the bill on September 8, 1961. On September 19, 1961, the House passed the bill, and it then went to conference on the 23d day of September 1961. But on September 20 the United Nations As-

sembly welcomed the joint statement on agreed principles for disarmament negotiations reached by Presidential Adviser John J. McCloy and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin.

On September 25, 1961, the President delivered a message to the General Assembly of the United Nations stating the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. On the following day he signed into law Public Law 87-297.

At the committee hearing on August 24 the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], the ranking minority member of our committee, asked a question of John McCloy, and I would like to quote it.

Do you find that there are many differing views as to disarmament?

Mr. John McCloy said:

Yes. There are many different views as to disarmament.

Then the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] asked:

Are you going to propose to draw all those ideas together and work them out?

Mr. McCloy said:

That is right.

Yet within 32 days after this statement we find the President submitting to the United Nations the proposal on complete and general disarmament in a peaceful world. So there could not have been any consultation by the agency with Members of Congress or with people with divergent views.

It is even more interesting to read a little bit about the proposed treaty which would in three stages disarm the United States and other countries and place the United Nations in such a position that it would have more arms, more men, and more ability to control the destiny of the world. I say this because in the book prepared by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, "Outlines of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" they state very emphatically that the purpose of the treaty is to enlarge the United Nations peacekeeping organ to such an extent that no other nation, or state, as they refer to it, in the world will have the power to resist. So, as was said earlier as to the possibility of this becoming a one world government or one world organization, certainly the blueprint is here.

The original language in the Senate bill that is before us, S. 777, was changed in committee, and I would like at this time to pay personal tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], who did yeoman work in 1961 to write into the bill language that would in fact save the integrity of the House. Under the provisions that were sent over to us in S. 777, the bill before us today, the House of Representatives basically would have been cut out almost completely from any possibility of having anything more to say on this very vital subject other than the authorization and appropriation of money. I would ask the chairman of this committee, if he does

not agree first of all that the basic purpose of the act as it was passed into law in 1961 was that the ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

Arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of U.S. arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning U.S. arms control and disarmament policy, and can assess the effect of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

Does not the gentleman feel that, with this language and with the limitation provided in section 33, we cannot do anything as far as reducing arms and armament of the United States without a treaty or further legislative action of the Congress; that the Agency should counsel with the House and Senate if they expect to find a sympathetic view for their gigantic proposals?

Mr. MORGAN. Section 33 was added on the floor of the House 2 years ago, and it requires that an agreement must be ratified by the Senate as a treaty or by a majority of both Houses of the Congress.

The Arms Control Agency recognizes that it is dependent on the Congress and is ready to consult with the Congress. They have a very good congressional liaison man and I am sure that he will be glad to arrange consultation with any Member whenever a Member has a question.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. I should like to say to the Members, that if they have the opportunity they should read the report to Congress submitted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It is a document of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and it is their report to the Congress, their Second Annual Report from January 1, to December 31, 1962, and reads in part, as follows:

The two basic general disarmament proposals considered by the Geneva Conference have been the U.S. "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" and the Soviet Union's "Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament Under Strict International Control."

Our proposal was made in Geneva to the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference.

For those who are interested in constitutional law, and I am sure most of us are, we find that because our Constitution makes treaties the supreme law of the land, we are faced with the question of whether or not, first, the Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense of this country; because we would be eliminating our arms and leaving ourselves in an indefensible position. Second, the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but if we do not have an Army and a Navy he has nothing to command. Third, certainly the Congress has the power to declare war. But here again, by building up the U.N., which is the stated purpose under the treaty, to the point where no nation could resist it, it raises large questions, at least in my mind. Fourth, it raises the very controversial question whether or not our judicial powers in the United States should remain in the Supreme Court or whether they should be turned over to an International Court of Justice. I would say again, referring to the report filed by the agency, that the International Disarmament Organization would have tremendous power—and this is the first time this comes into view—

The International Disarmament Organization, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

We are faced again with the basic concept of what our country, as a sovereign power, is supposed to do. As was said here earlier there is not a soul in this body who advocates that we go to war. Yet because of the votes here in the last 3 years on defense we will do whatever is necessary to defend the United States and have a force big enough to protect us and to keep the peace of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, we voted, I believe, at this session almost \$50 billion for military hardware. Even when you say that fast, it is still 50,000 millions of dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, today we are considering whether we will spend \$20 or \$30 million over a 2-year period, as the case may be, to explore paths toward the halting of the expensive and potentially dangerous arms race.

Mr. Chairman, the path to peace is a very difficult and rocky path. I do not charge any Member of this House, nor even intimate, that any Member of this House would not be for peace. But you will not obtain peace without exploring every honorable means consistent with our national security.

Mr. Chairman, we have obtained results from this Agency, modest results, but at least meaningful results.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no hesitancy at all in supporting the legislation under consideration.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, many statements have been made this afternoon about various Members being for peace and against war. I am sure that we can all agree on that. I certainly am in favor of this philosophy. But the type of peace I think most of us are in favor of, is the old-fashioned American kind which is peace coupled with freedom and not the brandnew Communist kind of peace which results in the complete and total cessation of opposition to the onslaught of world communism.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a single major nation in recent history that has disarmed which has not found itself involved in a war. It seems that as soon as any major nation disarms, there is always an aggressor around which will take the offensive against the nation and involve it in some kind of conflict.

Mr. Chairman, actually, it would seem to me, if we used recent history as an example, that disarmament or arms control can actually result in war.

Two good examples of this are in the period before World War II when the allies disarmed and found themselves attacked by Nazi Germany.

Then, after World War II the United States disarmed and found itself involved in the Korean conflict.

Someday I hope that Socialist aggressions which have plagued the world will be eliminated. Then perhaps it will be safe to disarm. At the present time I believe that the best way to keep the peace which we all want so badly is for the United States to remain so strong that no aggressor will dare to attack us.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to analyze what I believe is a very important document. It is called the blueprint for the peace race. This document is an outline as to how the United States should propose to disarm. This is an official document of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It was released in May 1962, several months after the Agency was started.

I would call your attention, first, to the foreword of this document, about halfway down the page, where it says:

President Kennedy on September 25, 1961, presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations the "United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." To provide a more precise statement of the United States approach to disarmament and the manner in which that approach should be implemented, the United States on April 18, 1962, presented to the conference of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, meeting in Geneva, an "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." Although not a draft treaty, the "Outline" elaborates and extends the proposals of September and provides in specific terms a substantial basis for the negotiation of arms control and disarmament treaty obligations.

This document describes three stages of disarmament, made up of three 3-year periods. On page 7 it goes into a description of stage I, and I would like to call to the attention of the Members that possibly we are into stage I already. I will give you some examples of why I raise this possibility. I might also add that I have not heard of any similar program being put forth by the Russians.

The paragraph entitled "Reduction of Armaments," provides for various weapons to be reduced. It reads:

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 40,000 kilograms or greater; missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometers or greater, together with their related fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles and air-to-surface missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

Mr. Chairman, we have now cut back on the RS-70 program and reduced this program to only three prototypes.

We have stopped production of the B-58 bomber. We are also retiring the B-52 bomber 2 or 3 years ahead of schedule. Also the Skybolt missile program has been eliminated. The RS-70, the B-58, and the Skybolt cannot be considered as obsolete.

Perhaps these are examples of disarmament. I read the next paragraph:

(2) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms and those missiles not included in category (1) having a range between 300 kilometers and 5,000 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads.

Perhaps the early retirement of the B-47 aircraft is an example of this category. We can add the Jupiter and Thor missiles that were taken out of their sites in Turkey and Italy 7 months after they were installed.

Continuing on:

(5) Anti-missile missile systems, together with related fixed launching pads.

I would direct your attention to the fact that the Nike-Zeus missile has been very materially delayed in development. It is becoming more doubtful every day whether it is going to fly.

Now, I would like to call attention to page 11. This paragraph refers to the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons. I understand our plants that manufacture nuclear weapons are going to be reduced by half.

On page 12—"Nuclear weapons test explosions"—as Mr. Foster says, the nuclear test ban treaty has already been accomplished.

Let me go now to page 13, "Prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in orbit." I would point out to the chairman of the committee this has been accomplished in that an agreement was recently reached in the U.N. that provided that we would not orbit nuclear weapons in space. This particular action was agreed to at the United Nations by the U.S. Government without any consent of the Senate or the House.

Then, paragraph No. 2 concerns "Peaceful cooperation in space." This would involve the program that the President has proposed in encouraging Russia to accompany us to the moon.

On page 15 is a paragraph that discusses the "hot line" between heads of government. As we have already discussed, this has been accomplished.

To go back to page 2, the first paragraph, "Military research, development, and testing would be subject to increasing limitations during the disarmament process." I would point out to the Members of the House that since

Mr. Kennedy's speech of September 1961 outlining this plan of disarmament, not one single new weapons system has been developed and placed into inventory.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the last gentleman who said that we are in stage 1 of the disarming process. He gave us his reasons. I think he left out the fact that we no longer make the B-29's or the B-24's, or the B-17's, or the Spads of World War I, the Enfield rifle, and that we no longer wear triangular hats going into battle. The fact that we find some of our weapons are obsolete is not indicative of itself that we are disarming. This "blueprint for the peace race" that the gentleman referred to is not a proposed treaty that was submitted. It was an outline of those proposals that would have to be met before the United States could consider disarming in any phase.

It is not a question of unilateral disarming, as the gentleman would have us believe. On the contrary, it sets forth to all those people who are interested the fact that the United States is prepared to seek peace if the Soviets are prepared to meet the terms that we outline in this blueprint for peace. So that there is great misunderstanding about this whole matter.

I served at the Disarmament Conference last summer along with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD]. I can say and report to this House that this agency is doing an outstanding job with the weapons at their command, and that any treaty that is brought about will be brought about only if it is done through competency or knowledge that we acquire through research or which we acquire through our own efforts.

I heard my colleague from Iowa say, "Let us not trust the Russians." I agree. I have heard several of the speakers here today say, "Let us not trust the Russians." I agree with this. But I do feel that we should trust ourselves. I think that history and our experience will prove to all of us that it is impossible to trust the Communists, so if we go on that supposition, let us proceed to the next. How are we going to bring about a successful search for peace if we do not possess the knowledge and the competency to bring this about? I think the only way we can do this is by trusting ourselves. We did not trust the Russians when we entered into the test ban treaty but we were prepared to enter into the test ban treaty as a result of the technical proficiency that has been brought about by this country through the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. So today it ought not to be a matter of trust, it ought to be a matter of our own competency in this very technical field.

I heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] say he would like to cut this figure down to \$1 million. If you want to be against the program, it is certainly one's right to discuss whether or not this whole program should be abandoned. On the other hand, if we should retain this program, than I think we ought to

allow the people to perform their job adequately.

The difference involved in the amount of money we are seeking here today is for the basic research contracts that are outlined on pages 19 to 21 here. This is the difference in what will happen if the amount of money is cut out. I wish all Members before they vote on the bill will review that which will be eliminated from this program if we do drastically cut out this amount of money.

Basically, what it does is preclude us from extending our competency in the field of intelligence and research. It affects us in those areas where we can sit down with certain knowledge and tell the Russians we can go this far, or know with certainty whether we can accept the proposals which they submit. I might say that on the blueprint for peace the Soviet Union on many occasions at the conference submitted its plan for total disarmament. We have rejected it because it does not go about it with the degree of security that is necessary to the United States engaging in any negotiations.

I heard it said here this morning that we ought to go along with the Senate's proposal, which is for \$10 million, instead of the House version, which is for \$15 million. I see no reason at all why we should accept the other body's guidance in this field, since your committee did far more extensive work in the matter before Chairman MORGAN presented this bill to the committee here this morning.

The Senate had 1 day of hearings. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs had 10 days of complete hearings. We not only had the witnesses from the Agency, but we had Mr. McCone, of the CIA, and people from the Department of Defense and we had all of the people who are interested in this important field.

So this bill comes before the Committee of the Whole House today not on the basis of the Senate hearings, but on the basis of the long and tedious hearings that were held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. I see my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] here. He said the control of enemy arms could be done by the Pentagon. The Pentagon cannot control the enemy arms unless we are engaged in war.

What we are trying to do is to prevent war, but to do that without jeopardizing the security of the United States. The control of the enemy arms can only come about at the negotiating table. I think we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the world to proceed with knowledge and with competence to find out if we can bring about a disarmament agreement. I want to say there is no one in this room today who thinks this is going to be brought about immediately or in the next 5 years or in the next 10 years or in the next 20 years.

But if we owe anything to our children, we owe them this. We ought to try to do this, but in trying to achieve this goal we cannot jeopardize the security of the United States. It cannot be done by going in with a group of nice fellows who sit down around the table and say, "Well,

what are we going to do about disarming?" We must go in with knowledge and with competency and with technical efficiency and superiority so that we can evaluate what we are proposing and so that we can also properly evaluate what we are going to do if the Soviet Union should make some new proposals.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Can the gentleman give me one example of where a country has prevented a war by disarming?

Mr. GALLAGHER. What I am trying to do is to present the gentleman with the situation that has developed in our lifetime where we must attempt to find a way to disarm without incinerating the world as we know it today.

Mr. STINSON. But the gentleman cannot give me an example?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I can give you an example. The example is the United States—if 100 years from now we still exist, it is because we have found a means to live in peace honorably and with security.

Mr. STINSON. I hope there is no doubt in anybody's mind but that we will still be in existence.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, what little research was done in this highly specialized field was done on a spasmodic, part-time basis by agencies whose primary concerns lay in other directions. The need for coordinated research under a centralized authority was recognized by witnesses who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee when we considered the bill to create the Agency in 1961. Among those supporting the creation of the Agency were President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower; two former Secretaries of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Robert A. Lovett; a former and the current Secretaries of State, Christian A. Herter and Dean Rusk; Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric; former Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. Herbert York; Atomic Energy Commissioner, Leeland J. Haworth; two former and the current U.S. Ambassadors to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, James J. Wadsworth, and Adlai Stevenson; former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther; and the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer.

During the course of the authorization hearings this year, top officials from other Government agencies such as the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. They testified that there is no duplication of research conducted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in this field. They supported the work of the Agency and pointed out that it made important contributions to both the hot line agreement and the limited test ban treaty.

The utility of Agency research in the formulation of arms control and disarmament

policy has not been restricted to the hot line and test ban. This is true even though the Agency is only 2 years old and its first research contract was entered into on February 6, 1962. According to the Agency, it usually takes 12 months or more to complete major research contracts.

The committee was provided with a number of examples of studies that have relevance to current and anticipated negotiating needs. They all involve problems which must be resolved if arms control and disarmament are to offer a safe route to advancing the national security.

The problems of verification and control are central to the achievement of arms control and disarmament objectives. Accordingly, the Agency has placed greatest emphasis on developing acceptable approaches to these problems. During fiscal year 1962, more than nine-tenths of the Agency's contract effort was concerned with this area of research. There were contract research studies, for example, on the problems of verifying limitations on levels of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Such limitations pose a central issue of arms control and disarmament negotiations. The Agency adopted a twofold approach. First, through a contract with the Bendix Corp., research was conducted to identify elements of strategic weapons systems which would be most susceptible of control and verification, and to design specific monitoring techniques. Second, through a contract with a separate group of researchers in the same organization, an effort was made to determine the type and significance of violations that might conceivably take place under an arrangement limiting levels of long-range missiles and bomber aircraft.

As a general principle, the United States has advanced the concept of progressive inspection. This means that the extent of inspection should be related to the amount of disarmament undertaken and the degree of risk which possible violations might present.

During fiscal year 1962, two contract research efforts were devoted to these broader aspects of the verification problem. Under a contract with the Raytheon Co., the concept of progressive inspection by zones was subjected to detailed examination.

Additional consideration of aspects of the broad concept of progressive inspection was assigned to a summer study sponsored by the Agency under a contract with the Institute for Defense Analyses. Twenty-five scholars from the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the law were called on to participate in this examination of verification procedures. The study focused attention on a new approach under which access for inspection would increase in gradual steps as disarmament progresses.

A fiscal year 1963 contract with Sylvania Electronic systems included an analysis of the problems associated with the possible emergence of nuclear delivery systems in space orbit and the monitoring of a ban on such systems.

On September 19 of this year, the Soviet Union suddenly indicated a desire to agree to our longstanding policy of restricting the use of outer space to peaceful purposes. The Sylvania contract study was of assistance in arriving at the determination to support the recent U.N. resolution rather than a binding agreement banning bombs in orbit.

The Soviet Union also indicated an interest recently in the possibility of reaching agreement on establishing observation posts at specified ports, and highway and rail centers. This was proposed by the United States some time ago as a measure to promote confidence and to reduce the risk of surprise attack by detecting, in advance, suspicious military movements and maneuvers of a tactical nature. Such an agreement could lead to changes in Soviet attitudes that might pave the way for future on-site inspection arrangements. It has been the subject of research by Agency personnel and ties in with an Agency contract on "Verification for Retained Levels of Ground Forces, Armament, and Tactical Nuclear Delivery Vehicles."

These are just a few examples of previous research contracts and grants. The proposed fiscal year 1964 research program represents a maturing effort and is even more essential to sound arms control and disarmament policy formulation than past research. Out of the \$15 million budget request for the next fiscal year, the Agency plans to allocate \$11 million, or almost three-fourths of the total budget, to research. I believe that the committee's recommended authorization of \$30 million total for the next 2 fiscal years represents a small investment in the only Agency in Government exclusively dedicated to developing safeguarded alternatives to the arms race. This amount would cover both fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and if half of it is used for the current fiscal year, it would amount to less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the annual budget. This is a small amount for a field so important to our national security.

As the President said in his September 20 address to the United Nations:

There can be no doubt about the agenda of further steps. We must continue to seek agreement on measures which prevent war by accident or miscalculation.

We must continue to seek agreement on safeguards against surprise attack, including observation posts at key points. We must continue to seek agreement on further measures to curb the nuclear arms race, by controlling the transfer of nuclear weapons, converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and banning underground testing with adequate inspection and enforcement. We must continue to seek agreement on a freer flow of information and people from East to West and West to East.

And again he said:

The contest will continue—the contest between those who see a monolithic world and those who believe in diversity—but it should be a contest in leadership and responsibility instead of destruction, a contest in achievement instead of intimidation. Speaking for the United States of America, I welcome such a contest. For we believe that truth is stronger than error—and that freedom is more enduring than coercion.

Mr. Chairman, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is playing an integral role in achieving this goal.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be in the public mind at least some miscalculation relative to the extent and the capabilities of the Disarmament Agency to perform certain functions. We heard a lot about instant peace when this Agency was first created—not in just those particular words but in the implications that all we needed was to buy this Agency and we thereby buy peace. What this Agency can do is limited and what it should do is limited. What it should do is not only to initiate itself but to find out what ideas exist that might help to reduce the risk of the world in which we live. We do, in fact, live in a very risky world. It is not an easy job to take such an idea and calculate that, after we have adopted it, that our world is less risky than it was before. Many of these proposals, all good intentions in the world notwithstanding, would leave us with a riskier world than before they were adopted.

So the basic purpose of the Disarmament Agency is that of analyzing, that of evaluation, that of discovering pitfalls that may exist, and by that means to assist us toward a more stable, a more peaceful world.

The Disarmament Agency Act does not efficiently permit the Disarmament Agency to carry out that function. There are defects in the act. I have introduced legislation which I feel would eliminate many of those defects. It is still sitting in committee. So I am going to try to offer amendments to this bill today to get those corrective measures on the law books.

I think one of the most glaring deficiencies in the Disarmament Agency Act is the fact that the semantics of its name are wrong. This Agency cannot at this point, nor can it at any foreseeable point in time, do any real work on disarming this country or the rest of the world. The best that it can do is to work on some arms control measures. Yet we call it a Disarmament Agency—an unrealistic title describing duties that it cannot accomplish. One of the first things I would like to do is to change the title of the Agency or the name of the Agency from the Disarmament Agency to a more relevant title, the "Arms Control Agency."

The next thing I would like to see done, and I will offer amendments to do so, is to keep this Agency from building up a great big staff for research. Why would I like to do that? We all know that in any agency of the Government it is only the most exceptional administrator, who probably has not been born yet, who is going to hire very many people who will argue with him. We know that argument and punching holes in these schemes is the very essence of the Disarmament Agency's or the Arms Control Agency's duties. All you are going to end up with over a period of a few years in a research staff—in-house research—

in the Disarmament Agency is a bunch of people who all day long nod at each other and compliment each other on their ideas and compliment the Director on his suaveness and capability. What has to be done is to have this research put out in the universities and other research institutions of this country where you can get a variety of thinking and get arguments on both sides of these issues and end up with the ultimate truth. The only way we will do this is to get this research contracted out. It is still not going to be contracted out wisely unless Congress stays on top of the man who runs the Disarmament Agency and sees that he himself does not pass out those contracts just to those people who will compliment him and agree with his own thinking, but that job is manageable. The job of hiring a lot of like-minded people, putting them on civil service and then trying to get rid of them is not manageable with respect to the diverse type and quality of thinking which should be done in this Agency.

There is another very serious defect in the law that is on the books now. That is, it authorizes the Administrator of the Agency to be sent out to the negotiating tables. Under the act the Administrator is supposed to be directing a top group of thinkers who are coming up with shrewd and logical conclusions. If you put him in the position of going out over the negotiating table and having, in the give and take of negotiations, to take positions that are illogical with respect to the research work that is being done, then in order to accommodate the Administrator's position at the negotiating table, the research has to be compromised, and it is no longer unbiased research. It becomes no more than a brief writing chore to support the public position that has been taken at the negotiating table, even though that position is a very wrong one. The negotiating duties of the Administrator ought to be cut out and I will propose an amendment to do this very thing.

One of the amendments that is already in—and it is a very, very important one—is to prevent this Agency from spending Government money to propagandize the American people. This Agency, as a matter of fact, is supposed to act as an adviser to the President, an adviser to the State Department, an adviser to the agencies of the Government designated by the President. It gives its advice to them and if they do not take it, as things now are it can go to the Treasury and get public funds to propagandize the public to put pressure on the other agencies to get them to accede to the Disarmament Agency's ideas. What logic is there in letting that sort of thing happen? The other agencies of the Government and most other departments are operating under a prohibition against spending public funds for propagandizing the American people. Certainly, if there is virtue and if there is wisdom and if there is good in what the Disarmament Agency has to offer, it does not have to take public dollars to propagandize it to the public.

Another problem that this Agency is suffering is that it really is not an inde-

pendent agency as it was designed to be. It is housed in the State Department with the Secretary of State and all the Assistant Secretaries of State hovering over it day and night. It depends on the State Department for logistics support. All of this is bound to influence its independent thinking.

Another amendment that I shall offer will take it out from under the hovering wings of the State Department, put it in a separate building, give it logistic support through GSA and have it operate in independent fashion as it should. I do not think that is a very wild notion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] for his forthright and provocative statement here this afternoon. I am inclined to think his comments are the most realistic of all remarks heard during this debate and I wish to associate myself with them.

The problem of arms control is indeed extremely complex. It places a demand on the finest minds in this country—I am not convinced that people with these talents would permit themselves to be placed in an Agency that could conceivably restrict their recommendations. Therefore, I concur in the recommendation to contract with our colleges in this important field—it is worthy of serious thought and consideration. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will offer amendments to the bill that will carry forth this objective. I will vote for the amendments; if these amendments carry, I will support the bill—if not, I will oppose the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of the bill creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency 2 years ago, I rise in support of this legislation which is essential if the Agency is to continue its vital work.

As its very able and distinguished Director, Mr. William C. Foster, has pointed out in his second annual report to Congress, this Agency was brought into existence in the belief that arms control and disarmament measures can be acceptable alternatives to a continued arms buildup, and that these alternatives in no way jeopardize this Nation's security interests.

The time for evaluation has been brief. Only a little over 2 years has elapsed. But already the "hot line" agreement and the limited test ban treaty—both steps largely formulated and carried out by ACDA—have, when combined with

our continued military preparedness and vigilance, proven the wisdom and soundness of this belief.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that today's world is not only divided by ideology, it is endangered by an arms race involving weapons of such mass destruction that their explosion could virtually end civilization as we know it. In such a world, balanced, phased, and fully safeguarded control of arms cannot only help to insure the maintenance of our national security, but can actually enhance it. There is no contradiction between the aim of achieving peace through such measures and the national determination to maintain the defense of our vital interests as progress on arms limitation is sought.

There is a natural tendency, of course, to conceive of national security as promoted only by a maximization of arms, and disarmament—even mutual disarmament—as contrary to national security interests. To advocate disarmament becomes equivalent to advocating weakness.

But this attitude does not adequately reflect the realities of present day armaments. It does not recognize the dedication to national security of those who believe that some means more realistic than the threat of mutual annihilation may be found to promote such security. And it does not recognize the fact that a continuing escalation of weapons, of counterweapons, and of counter-counterweapons, is scarcely a gain in national or international security.

In the short period since 1945, there have been approximately 30 limited military conflicts, several of which could easily have resulted in the devastation and holocaust of nuclear war. Today we are faced with explosive situations around the world—in South Vietnam and Berlin, in particular. The need is certainly as great now as it was in 1961 for an organization which can insure the constant and full-time application of U.S. resources toward reducing the dangers of war; which can give our disarmament negotiators previously lacking continuity of direction; and which can administer the political and scientific research necessary for developing sound national security policies on arms control and disarmament.

I would like to add briefly, that I am delighted the Agency has taken cognizance of the importance of the economic factors related to disarmament; that they have recognized the United States cannot repose blind faith in the unaided ability of the American economy to adjust smoothly to disarmament and at the same time satisfy neglected demand in the private and public sectors. As the distinguished economist, Paul Samuelson, said recently in commenting on the post-Korean war period:

Only part of our swords went into plowshares; part went into unemployment and a deceleration of economic growth.

I would encourage that economic planning be made an increasingly important part of our overall disarmament efforts.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the Agency cannot perform these functions

with the \$1.67 million remaining under its original authorization ceiling. It should also be obvious that the research essential for successful program development will be crippled unless the full amount approved by the committee is provided. Mr. Foster stated the case quite clearly to the committee when he said, in commenting on the reductions made by the other body:

A cut of this magnitude in our research program would require us to reduce substantially some high priority projects. It would also require us to eliminate other projects which are important for a comprehensive, coordinated program.

Mr. Chairman, \$30 million over a 2-year period is certainly a small price to pay for efforts which can lead to a more peaceful and stable world. It is a price, furthermore, which must be paid, for arms reduction and control are social, economic, and moral imperatives in a world fraught with tensions and an uneasy peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 5061 to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The bill provided for an open end authorization, which I thought would be appropriate for an Agency with such a long-term objective as arms control and disarmament. Seeking alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our security and promote lasting peace will require many years of effort.

Both the Senate and the House Foreign Affairs Committee rejected an indefinite authorization for appropriations and recommended a 2-year authorization instead. The House committee recommended \$30 million for the 2-year span of fiscal 1964 and 1965.

It is my firm conviction that it would jeopardize our security should this authorization be reduced further. Almost three-quarters of the funds requested would be spent on contract research. The purpose of this research is to protect our security by preparing us properly for arms control and disarmament negotiations.

Negotiations of this kind will inevitably continue in the future as they have in the past. During this past year, negotiations for which the Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a nuclear test ban, and a U.N. resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons.

Even limited arms control agreements such as a test ban can have an impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries which are parties cheat on the agreement. We must be able to determine if they are cheating. One of the main ways in which research prepares us for negotiations is to show first, what the impact of a particular arms control proposal might be; and, second, whether cheating could be detected by long-distance detection devices—as in the case of the lim-

ited test ban treaty—by onsite inspection, or by other means. Most of the research to be conducted by ACDA in this fiscal year is directed toward answering questions of this kind. This is certainly essential to our security.

It is true that the Agency's research program is more extensive than last year but this is to be expected. Now that needs have been identified and evaluated, more detailed research is necessary. The increases in the needs of the Agency can be explained in large part by the increases in the costs of research as it progresses through four typical steps: First, identification of possible techniques of detecting cheating; second, design of a detection system using these techniques; third, design of a model or other method for testing the system; and, fourth, conduct of a field test of the model or other method. Each successive step is ordinarily more expensive. However, every effort must be made to investigate all proposals thoroughly before they are negotiated. Any other course of action would be rash indeed.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created by Congress to fulfill a need that was not being met. Countless Government officials testified in 1961 that a centralized agency specifically devoted to pursuing arms control and disarmament objectives was necessary and that proper attention to these important matters could not be given by other agencies whose primary interests lay in other directions. Indeed, Congress stated in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act that "the formulation and implementation of U.S. arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field."

If the Agency is going to carry out this responsibility, it must have our support. The sum of \$30 million for 2 years is modest for such an important purpose—peace with security. We would be derelict in our duty if we did not support this authorization.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill. Some 2 years ago, a number of us worked for and supported the bill creating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We did so because of our deep conviction that there was no longer an alternative to peace. This conviction was evidently shared by most Members of Congress. The bill passed the House by a vote of 290 to 54 and the Senate by a vote of 73 to 14.

Nothing that has happened in the last 2 years has made me feel any easier about the need to make a maximum effort to find a means of keeping the peace.

Let us be clear what we are talking about. We are not talking about appeasement or surrender. We are talking about national security. One part of national security is maintaining an Armed Force that is good enough and

powerful enough to discourage a potential aggressor. No less important a part of our national security is the search for ways to lessen the likelihood of war.

There is no point in blinding ourselves to the facts of modern warfare. Once general war breaks out, there is no security. As President Kennedy has said, in less than an hour, 300 million human beings would die in a nuclear war. This is even if our defense system operates at maximum effectiveness. The truth of the matter is that our defense system does not today defend us in the classic sense. That is, it does not offer us protection against the ravages of enemy attack. Instead it depends for its success on the knowledge of any potential aggressor that it will instantly suffer as much or more damage to its homeland as it can inflict on us.

Our military system, if we look at it honestly, is concerned primarily with preventing war. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has precisely the same task, although it approaches it from another angle. While the military system relies on instilling fear of retaliation to preserve the peace, the Arms Control Agency is engaged in a search for alternative methods, perhaps more certain, more effective, and less expensive. Nothing the Agency is doing in any sense conflicts with the aim of our Defense Establishment. In fact the aim of the ACDA is to supplement and strengthen the goals of the Department of Defense. We need both, for to weaken either the Department of Defense or the ACDA is to weaken our national security and invite disaster.

Important as the work of the ACDA is to our security, however, it operates on an almost insignificant budget. The entire cost of operating the ACDA for a year under the bill now before you would be consumed by the Department of Defense in less than 2 hours, the time allotted for debate on this bill.

To appreciate how important the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to our security, let me mention some of the important things this Agency has done in the past 2 years and some of the problems they are now working on.

We now have in force a treaty with the Soviet Union, to which more than 100 other nations around the world have subscribed, banning the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. This is the first solid agreement with the Soviet Union since the Treaty of Vienna which settled the status of Austria. It is a self-enforcing treaty which removes a source of mounting tension between the two great world powers and at the same time protects the health of citizens of all countries. The ACDA played a leading role in making this treaty possible.

The "hot line," a direct communications link between the United States and the Soviet Union, is another example of the work of the ACDA. Although a small gain in terms of the outstanding differences between ourselves and the Russians, it may nevertheless be of great use in heading off a war nobody wants.

The ACDA also had an important hand in the United Nations resolution,

to which the Soviet Union subscribes, against stationing weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the world.

These steps have all played a part in creating a better atmosphere between the world's two superpowers, and this is important. A good atmosphere, however, is a fragile thing, as the Soviet harassment of American troops on the German autobahn over the last few days shows.

Far more important is that the ACDA has been able to remove some of the real causes of controversy between ourselves and the Soviet Union. This is the essential work of the Agency. Our military forces, for all their might, can do no more than prevent the Soviets from trying to settle outstanding disputes on their terms by force. The Armed Forces alone cannot settle the disputes. Yet if these disputes are not settled, they will continue to fester and tension will continue to mount, and, eventually, there will be war. To avoid that possibility, which we all recognize would mean unmitigated disaster for this Nation and the world, we have charged the ACDA with finding nonmilitary ways to settle disputes between this Nation and potential enemy nations.

These alternative methods of maintaining peace must be solid, enforceable steps, protecting American interests and the interests of the rest of the non-Communist world at every point. To do this complicated and delicate task, the ACDA needs the recognition and support of the Congress. For this reason, I urged that the ACDA be made a permanent agency of the Government, and I, and many others, have introduced bills to accomplish this result. I very much regret that the bill before you today does not contain such a provision.

Not only does the ACDA need the confidence of Congress, however; it also needs the funds necessary to carry out the function with which it is charged.

Let me briefly describe some of the crucial tasks the Agency is undertaking, for which the funds sought today would be used.

First. A contract has been awarded to the Bendix Corp. to study ways to determine whether a nation is engaged in the production of nuclear delivery vehicles. This will be useful in deciding whether it is safe and practical to enter an agreement limiting the production of missiles and similar weapons.

Second. A contract has been awarded to the Sylvania Corp. to determine what kinds of observation posts would be needed, and where they would have to be placed, in order to detect preparations for a conventional military strike. This would enable our policy planners to determine the feasibility of an agreement on the placing of observers to prevent surprise conventional attack.

Third. Another contract with the Sylvania Corp., partially completed, provides for investigation into the problems that would be presented in detecting nuclear weapons stationed in space, and in detecting missile flight tests. This information will guide this Nation in its efforts to reach agreements limiting missile flights, and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons into outer space.

These are just a few examples of the uses to which the money we appropriate today will be put. Certainly, the information we learn from these projects, which are being carried out by some of America's leading industrial firms, is important—even essential—to the security of this Nation.

The price tag on this Agency, considering its vital role in the safeguarding of our Nation, is small and the benefits America and the world derive from its work is incalculable. By supporting the bill now before the House, we will demonstrate to the world that the United States is serious about maintaining the peace, serious enough to do the hard work required to make sure that our safety is assured while the causes of international friction are removed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything about this bill but I felt compelled to speak when I heard some remarks awhile ago that seemed to me to be pointing a finger of treason at both the Eisenhower administration and the present administration. Neither of these great Presidents of our country is going to leave us prone to international or unilateral attack by disarming our country. President Eisenhower created the Disarmament Agency, the nonstatutory Agency which brought forth a blueprint for peace. This was the product of the nonstatutory Agency.

It has been revised since the Disarmament Agency, created by statute, has come into existence. But it has been revised in a more conservative manner, not in a more liberal manner.

Just a little bit about this blueprint for peace. It is my understanding, as I read it, that it is an outline of things that in the opinion of the Disarmament Agency would have to be done if we had worldwide disarmament. Among the things it suggests is that to have worldwide disarmament you would have to have a United Nations police force or some sort of international police force which would be so gigantic, so tremendous, that it would eliminate the thought of any nation going to war. It does not say that this is a possibility. It does not say that our country should go into this. It merely says that it is the conclusion of that Agency, as of today, that they see no way whereby you can have worldwide disarmament without creating an international agency or some other kind of agency of this type which would have the power to crush any war threat which might creep in.

Those of you who may have pacifistic leanings may be very discouraged by this announcement, because this is an announcement that in fact no worldwide disarmament is foreseen. Because, as a matter of fact, you cannot have, according to this "blueprint," a worldwide disarmament, unless you are willing to have a tremendous military force held by some international organization or some heavily armed balance of power or something of that type.

So, Mr. Chairman, realistically looking at this "blueprint for peace," which came originally from the Eisenhower nonstatutory Agency, it does not recommend that these things take place, but merely says these are the things that would have to take place if you were going to have worldwide disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to the members of the committee that I am an advocate of world peace. I am not an advocate of world disarmament without adequate security for our Nation and never have been. I was the original introducer of legislation creating this Agency. I called it a "Peace Agency." I did not call it a Disarmament Agency. Looking at armaments only is to look at the symptoms and not at the causes. This Agency is to discover and find out and report what can be found out in regard to eliminating war in our time, if it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, the Disarmament Agency has done something in this research by the "blueprint for disarmament," by showing the almost impossible objective that would have to be achieved in order for us to have worldwide disarmament. So, it was in this context that President Eisenhower and President Kennedy operated in suggesting that we look at this thing accurately and for what it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ought to know something about this. I have served for many years on the Committee on Armed Services and I am happy to tell you that this year the arms of the United States are much greater than they were last year, and last year they were much greater than the year before; and the year before they were much greater than the year preceding that. The arms of the United States not only cost more for our country, but they are also producing more in all aspects of defense to our country. No nation is as adequately armed as we are. So, we are not disarming. As a matter of fact, we are much more greatly armed in this country than we ever have been before in history.

If you look at this administration, you will find that while its armaments have increased, the nonarmaments fields in our country's budget have generally gone down. There are, of course, places where many of us would like to see our armaments increased still further. We would like to go forward with the RS-70 or some similar weapons system. I am confident that we will make improvement in these efforts in the future. As these new weapons are perfected, to hold reasonable budget lines, obsolete or outdated weapons will be abandoned; but our overall armament posture should improve through added strength, not by weakening our arms position.

This Agency is a part of our national defense by providing adequate research to prevent us from unwise decisions. It should be maintained. Whether its funds need great increases at this time is another matter which this debate should develop.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may

consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that all this debate about whether or not the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should receive the comparative pittance of \$15 million a year for 2 years fails to take an important point into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the RECORD shows that in 1961 we passed the act creating the Agency by a vote of 290 to 54. We should remember that in section 2 of that act we stated its purpose as follows:

An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

We should not forget that both 1960 national party platforms urged that we seek disarmament as a goal. The Republican platform said "We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements."

We should remember that the first U.S. proposal for general and complete disarmament was made during the Eisenhower administration. On June 27, 1960, the United States made a proposal to the 10-nation committee on disarmament which contained the following:

The ultimate goal is a secure and peaceful world of free and open societies in which there shall be general and complete disarmament under effective international control and agreed procedures for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

We should remember that the present administration has tried to advance disarmament proposals with the goal described as a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law.

So far, regretfully, these proposals have made little progress. Part of this is due to Soviet unwillingness to agree to verification procedures we consider essential to safeguarded disarmament proposals. Part of it is due to the fact that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been put on the defensive in trying to carry out the mandate of the people, as expressed by both political party platforms, by the last two administrations, and by Congress itself. A vocal but small minority has distorted the picture with nonsensical gibberish about disarmament. Too shortsighted to realize that this goal may be the only means of preserving our security, they try to brand safeguarded overtures toward peace with the label of subversion. In effect, they would cut off the left wing of the American eagle, thus dooming it

to perish. This type of thinking is unworthy of our credence.

Despite these obstacles, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has, as the Foreign Affairs Committee report stated, "given a fair account of itself since it began operations in September 1961." During the past year, negotiations for which the Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a limited nuclear test ban, and a U.N. resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons. These are all very limited measures but, hopefully, they could lead to more meaningful agreements.

It seems to me that if we want to demonstrate the sincerity of our oft-repeated convictions so that real progress can be made toward our stated goals, we should give this new agency for peace the support and encouragement it needs. Fifteen million dollars a year for each of the next 2 years is modest indeed for a task so important to our national security. The Foreign Affairs Committee, after extensive hearings, was convinced that the Agency needs this amount. Anything less than this would be falling short of our stated purpose in creating the Agency and inflict the brand of hypocrisy on our goals as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I should like to point out that if we are to attain the goal mentioned in the bill, we must do much more than this bill provides. We need to make every effort to create a more desirable image for our country on the foreign front. We need to make crystal clear through what we say and do that we are indeed a peace-loving Nation. This means that we must articulate a foreign policy that makes this clear to the people of the United States and to the people of the world—a foreign policy statement that tells our people and all people—that commits our people and Government to support only those propositions and programs that gradually extend the basic freedom we know so well here in America—will do much to make possible the goals mentioned in the bill we are considering today.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this legislation to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In enacting this legislation we will be making it possible for that Agency to render an even more efficient and effective service in the cause of world peace, in the relaxing of international tensions, and in furthering the security of the people of our Nation.

I am particularly pleased to be identified with the measure, not only as co-sponsor of the bill before us, my identical legislation being H.R. 3308, but as an original sponsor of the legislation which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I was privileged to have been among the small group of Members of both bodies of the 87th Congress who consulted and drafted the bill

creating the Agency in cooperation with the administration, including consultation with the President at the White House.

I can proudly say that this activity on behalf of the Agency is one of the most significant roles of my entire lifetime. It has been a labor of love to work toward the successful establishment of the Agency because no other organization is more directly dedicated to the ideal and goal of world peace. I feel every faith I have had in the concept of this Agency has been fulfilled. Its goals have not been pie-in-the-sky ideals. It has provided the tools and the machinery to lay a firm foundation for world peace. This is what we envisioned. This is what it has been doing—quietly, effectively, and efficiently.

Mr. Chairman, in considering today whether the authority for appropriations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be increased, I think we should look at the record and examine some of the accomplishments which the Agency has succeeded in fulfilling.

First, let us look at a most important development, the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, which was the first breakthrough in 18 years in the negotiation of measures limiting the risk of war by accident of miscalculation. The Agency was responsible not only for the concept of this measure, but for the detailed preparation for its negotiation and the conduct of the negotiations themselves. Our representatives went to Geneva fully prepared. The numerous technical and drafting problems involved had been well worked out in advance and coordinated with the appropriate branches of the Government. As a result, I believe we can be proud not only of the success of this effort, but of the thorough and well-directed work of this Agency which contributed so heavily to such success.

Next, there was the test ban treaty. As far back as August 1962, this Agency had prepared and offered in Geneva a complete draft treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. This draft was the product of months of effort in studying the effects of each provision on our own national interests as well as on the common interests in reducing radioactive fallout, inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology, and taking a first step toward arms control. Here again, there was thorough coordination with all affected parts of the Government in the preparation of the U.S. draft.

Even though this draft treaty met with a chilly reception from the Soviets at the time, the Agency continued to study the myriad aspects of bans on nuclear testing. Hence when it appeared last July that the Soviets were at last ready to negotiate in earnest on this subject, we were not caught by surprise or left to hasty improvisation. Instead, our negotiators went to Moscow fully prepared, and came back with an agreement which satisfied the U.S. Senate after the most detailed and careful scrutiny.

Most recently, the Agency played an important role in the development and formulation of the U.N. resolution call-

ing upon all states to refrain from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit. In cooperation with the Department of Defense, it had given careful consideration to the consistency of the proposal with our military interests. It had also studied the probable effects of the proposal in international law and on our foreign relations. And it had studied the technical problems involved in determining whether or not other nations were acting inconsistently with the resolution. In short, the Agency made sure that the United States was adequately prepared to introduce and negotiate this resolution with full knowledge of its implications and effects.

It seems to me that these three illustrations demonstrate the importance of the job which the Agency was set up to do and the admirable way in which it has done that job to date. They show that each of the actual agreements reached was merely the top of an iceberg—the part that could be seen. The advance study and preparation which underlay each such agreement, on the other hand, was like the unseen base of the iceberg—much more extensive and essential for support. And it must be remembered that these three agreements were merely first steps. Far more remains to be done in this field. We must not fail to authorize the funds necessary to see that this task is performed as ably and thoroughly as humanly possible. In my judgment, the full amount of the authorization contained in the bill as reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee is the least we can do for this purpose.

This is good legislation. It is vital. I again urge its overwhelming approval.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need a minute. However, I appreciate getting it. This plan is not a disarmament plan and it was never intended to be. If you will read the bill and the program you must finally come to this conclusion and this conclusion alone: It is a plan to turn the armed might of the United States over to the United Nations to establish a world government.

Mr. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill as amended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I would like to make the points in the brief time at my disposal.

We have been talking now for a couple of hours about a relatively small amount of money. This question is going to be asked of each one of us—How much should we provide in this authorization bill for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency? Should it be \$10 or \$15 million for the current fiscal year? The difference is a relatively small amount. The question is relatively simple.

Much more important than that, and this question has come up in a great

many ways, is the problem of our dissatisfaction over the lack of progress, and the difficulty, of dealing in a constructive manner with the Soviet Union.

There is lack of confidence, there is a very real awareness on the part of Members that we are dealing with a country whose courses of action are hard to predict. We are almost more cautious when they expose their friendly side than when they expose their hostile side. We are, unfortunately, dealing with an unreliable nation which gives continuing evidence of still being bent on aggression. The question that many of us ask is whether, under such circumstances, we are being realistic in supporting a program seeking ways in which we might reduce the level and types of arms? How realistic is this? How dangerous is it to talk about disarmament with world conditions as they are today?

No one really argues that the arms race in which we are now engaged is prohibitively expensive. This race constitutes a real, continuing, and probably an increasing danger to the security of all nations. As a consequence there is a realization that the exploration of alternatives is important, and that if we proceed properly we may increase, and not decrease, our own security. The ACDA has become involved in this larger concern. However, I think it should be said that the ACDA is not responsible for any of the decisions which have been mentioned with respect to the elimination or abandonment of certain types of weapons. If there is any unilateral disarmament, and I do not believe there has been, it is not the result of anything that the ACDA represents.

What we must realize is that the ACDA is basically only one small piece of machinery to help us develop more knowledge and understanding of the problems involved in negotiations on topics of arms control.

The gentleman from California put his finger on some of the weaknesses of the ACDA. He also demonstrated its importance as an instrument to help us in our thinking about these problems, in our evaluations, in our concern about possible pitfalls, and the ways in which we may develop a meaningful arms control program.

This brings me to my second point. Are we, as has been charged, squandering the taxpayers' money by suggesting that we spend \$15 million for each of the next 2 years for this Agency? Is there any realistic possibility that we may drown the Agency with too much money, as has been charged, if we give it, \$15 million instead of \$10 million? I think the answers are obvious. Of course we are not going to drown them. We are not squandering the money, whether we give them \$10 or \$15 million.

However, we should recognize that a reduction from \$15 to \$10 million would reduce the amount available for research in the current fiscal year by approximately 40 percent. As has been indicated, Operation Cloud Gap alone, the expenses for which are to be shared with the Defense Department, will cost approximately \$2,500,000. If we are not to cut

the Agency's contribution to that project, and I may say it is a very significant one, the cut from \$11 million to \$6,300,000 will have to come out of other grant projects. This will mean that the proposed grant research program will have to be cut by something like two-thirds from that which has been requested. Under these circumstances, I think it important that we authorize the full amount which the committee has recommended.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am filled with emotion. I have never learned to lower my eyes from the skies. The years and experiences at times discouraging have never dimmed my faith that that for which we pray can be attained if our faith is strengthened and not weakened by reverses and unflagging courage gives redoubled drive to our efforts.

I have lived to an old age. Three times in the period of my life I have seen the youth of my country march to major wars, and a fourth time to the war in Korea. Even now American youths are fighting and dying in Vietnam, and over the head of all mankind is the ghastly shadow of the nuclear bomb.

Mr. Chairman, I have never lost faith in peace on earth, good will among men. We may not have attained it but, Mr. Chairman, I have the hope and the faith that mankind will attain peace on earth, good will among men.

A few months ago we voted \$49 billion for defense. I voted for it. My friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] voted for it. All voted for it save one Member. We did that because we wanted our country to remain strong. We wanted peace, and to have a defense that we hoped would insure that peace. That was one side of the national security coin.

Let me read very briefly to you from the hearings of our committee. Assistant Secretary Nitze of the Department of Defense was on the stand. He said:

We consider that money spent to explore arms control proposals in depth well in advance of their consideration at the policy level and in international negotiations is well spent. Arms control is the other side of the national security coin.

Mr. Chairman, how can anyone who voted for \$49 billion for defense, one and the most expensive side of the national security coin, withhold voting for \$30 million for the other side of the coin? Oh, yes; it may hold just a hope of peace, but with timid hearts are we to run away because there is no guarantee? There is no guarantee that \$47 billion for armaments will assure the peace we seek. This is certain, the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency during the brief time of its existence has returned to the American people a greater measure of security than any comparable sum of money ever spent by this Republic. The "hot line" which ended the danger of war by inadvertence or accident, and the test ban treaty, are among its accomplishments.

Two sides to the national security coin. That is not my description. It is not the term of the members of the Committee

on Foreign Affairs that by an overwhelming vote reported out the bill now before you.

It is the term of recognition of the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency by the Department of Defense as a partner and coworker in the noble cause of peace and security. The Department of Defense with \$47 billion to advance the cause of peace with security is one side of the coin. Mr. Nitze tells us the Arms Control Agency is the other side of the coin.

What will be the image of our beloved country in the eyes of the world if the side of the national security coin expressive of the hope of peace, peace with security, peace on earth, good will to men, is battered out by destructive amendments? Can anyone on this committee be a party to that and live with his conscience? I am not the judge. The decision is with each of my colleagues. This is the hour of decision. Either we hold to the hope of peace, peace with security, peace on earth, good will among men, or we beat a retreat from the approach to the goal of our prayers, a hopeless retreat of timid souls, afraid of the challenge to this generation, a retreat back into the jungles.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777. This bill amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act in order to authorize appropriations of \$30 million for fiscal year 1964 and 1965, and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

I strongly believe that the bill before us today is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this session. For the first time in history nations possess the power to annihilate each other and Western civilization. Ever since August 6, 1945, the beginning of the atomic age, effective arms control and disarmament has been the great imperative of mankind. In his eloquent and historic United Nations speech on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy in full realization of this imperative warned the world:

Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

In an effort to achieve the objective expressed by the President, we have recently concluded the test ban treaty. But it must be pointed out that the President's words are just as true today as they were when he spoke of them. As long as the United States, the Soviet Union and others possess nuclear weapons the threat of annihilation "by accident or miscalculation or by madness" is ever present. We need only to remember last year's Cuban crisis or look at recent headlines concerning Berlin to realize just how slender is the thread which holds "the nuclear sword of Damocles."

When I came to the House in January 1961, one of my first concerns was to strengthen the U.S. capability in the field of disarmament. I had the privilege of working closely with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative

KASTENMEIER, and others in the formulation of the peace agency bill which was the prototype for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act. It is to the great credit of this administration and the 87th Congress that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established in September 1961. The creation of this Agency put the United States for the first time in a position to approach the vital subject of disarmament with a high level of full-time competence.

Under section 2 of Public Law 87-297—the Arms Control and Disarmament Act—the Agency has four primary functions:

- (a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formation;
- (b) The preparation for and management of U.S. participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;
- (c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and
- (d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of U.S. participation in such control systems as may become part of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities.

The statute plainly contemplated that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would be the governmental fountainhead for disarmament proposals, disarmament information, and disarmament negotiations. To achieve this goal the Agency operates under a Director, Deputy Director, and four assistant directors who are in charge of the Agency's four operating bureaus. These are: science and technology which sponsors and coordinates scientific research concerning the manifold problems of disarmament; Bureau of International Relations which is divided into two offices, the Office of Political Affairs which is responsible for the day to day conduct of international negotiations, and the Office of Political Research and Analysis which assesses the international implications of arms control and disarmament proposals and examines long-range international developments; Economic Bureau which investigates the economic and social consequences of disarmament; and the Weapons Evaluation and Control Bureau which advises on military weapons systems as they relate to arms control and disarmament. In addition to these Bureaus, the Agency is composed of the disarmament advisory staff which recommends policy, the General Advisory Committee of 15 private citizens appointed by the President, a public affairs advisor who disseminates public information, a reference research staff and an executive staff and secretariat which performs administrative functions.

The Agency as the primary agency of Government responsible for disarmament and arms control has, with a small but dedicated and competent staff, accomplished a great amount in its short history. The Agency has been responsible for three negotiating instruments of great significance: An outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world; a draft treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer

space, and underwater which, with modifications, became the test ban treaty; and a draft treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. In addition to the drafting of these documents, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been deeply involved in the disarmament and test ban negotiations at Geneva and deserves a major share of the credit for the test ban treaty. The Agency also deserves high commendation for the successful negotiation of the direct communications line—the so-called “hot line”—between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As we all know, the problems of disarmament and arms control are vast and complex. Before the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the United States did not have a full scale research program regarding this crucial subject. Trevor Gardiner, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force during the Eisenhower administration, in deploring the then-existing situation stated:

Most of our notions on the subject of disarmament have been developed by essentially part-time people who are busy with defense, state, or some other interest so that they really do not have the time to think full-time on the subject.

From the very beginning the Agency has been heavily oriented towards research. For the first year of the Agency's operation, fiscal year 1962, Congress appropriated \$1,831,000 of which \$600,000, or nearly one-third, was budgeted by the Agency for research. In fiscal year 1963 the Agency allocated \$4 million, almost two-thirds of its total budget of \$6,500,000, for research. The Agency again plans to increase the percentage of its total budget allocated for research. For fiscal year 1964 the Agency has requested, and the Foreign Affairs Committee has approved, \$15 million, \$11 million of which the Agency plans to allocate to research.

In addition to the research program, the Agency has fulfilled another vital function. The Agency, in conformity to its clear statutory mandate, has served as the all-important arms control and disarmament information center for the general public. Without an informed public it will be almost impossible to negotiate effective agreements in the field of arms control and disarmament. To bring the necessary knowledge to the public the Agency has, since its inception, published a total of 18 documents and has sent representatives to various conferences, forums, and study groups. I can say from personal experience that the Agency personnel are most cooperative and educational in regard to these conferences. Last spring I sponsored a conference on nuclear policy which was attended by over 1,000 people. Two representatives of the Agency, Robert Matteson of the disarmament advisory staff and Dr. Leonard Rodberg, attended that conference and did a splendid job of explaining U.S. policy.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill on February 7, 1934, speaking of World War I, told the Parliament of Great Britain:

Wars come very suddenly. I have lived through a period when one looked forward,

as we do now, with great anxiety and uncertainty to what would happen in the future. Suddenly something did happen—tremendous, swift, overpowering, irresistible.

On September 26, 1961, President Kennedy signed Public Law 87-297, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which created an Agency charged with the awesome responsibility to prevent the “tremendous, swift, overpowering, and irresistible” from occurring. I consider this Agency to be one of the most important in the Government. It represents mankind's great hope for peace. It deserves our fullest support. Recently we approved a military appropriation which adds up to more than half our national budget. The nation which can afford to devote half its budget to military defense can afford to devote one-sixtieth of 1 percent of its budget to the ultimate defense-negotiated disarmament. The nation which can afford to spend more than \$6 million an hour every day of the year for its military preparedness should be able to spend \$15 million per year to prepare for peace.

I urge all my colleagues to take another step in the “1,000-mile journey” to peace and vote for S. 777.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak this afternoon on the importance of giving the strongest possible support to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency wants, and needs, \$30 million for 2 years. That is the requested authorization. This represents a cut in what many originally thought would be a minimal amount.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, it is worth noting that in 2 years we authorize \$100 billion for arms buildup and defense.

There is much to be done. The test ban treaty was, in my opinion, a step forward. But it is a gain that can be lost. Much work needs to be done on inspection procedures and on problems of readiness. I am satisfied that implications of research effort is guarded against. The \$11 million provided for fiscal 1964 is justified. The largest research project programed for fiscal 1964 involves \$2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures. A variety of other projects have been programed in order to enable the Agency to deal effectively with both the conception and technical problems inherent in developing an arms control and disarmament program which will assure our national security.

The Agency should, in my opinion, institute studies of the economic impact of any future reduction in arms spending. This is one of the most neglected subjects of our time.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the Agency, Mr. William C. Foster, on a job well done.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original sponsors of legislation that resulted in the creation, back in September of 1961, of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency within the executive department of our Government I earnestly urge my colleagues here to unanimously approve this measure authorizing an additional appropriation of

\$30 million for the Agency to continue its operations over the next 2 years.

There can be no doubt that in the short space of the past 2 years this Agency has more than proved its worth and the continuing state of world tension and uncertainty very clearly demonstrates the vital necessity of maintaining the effective operation of this unique unit of government in exploring the paths that may lead to peace through arms control and disarmament.

The culmination of the limited nuclear test ban treaty; the connection of the telephone “hot line” between Washington and Moscow, to eliminate the dangers of accidental warfare and the recent United States-Russian agreement not to orbit nuclear bombs in space are certainly major steps toward our basic objectives of sensibly preventing a world holocaust and promoting honorable peace. That our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency made invaluable contributions to the accomplishment of these objectives is unquestioned. On the basis of the Agency's remarkable record in less than 48 months our only patriotic consideration today, in my humble opinion, should be, not whether this measure ought to be approved, but whether, in the best national interest, we should vastly increase the amount proposed in the bill and provide permanent status for the Agency.

Let me, please, remind you that the Congress is not, by this bill or through this Agency, relinquishing one whit of its constitutional, traditional, or legislative power over U.S. disarmament procedures or treaties. If it did I would not be in favor of it.

Let me further and respectfully observe that when few question an appropriation of some \$50 billion for an arms race it is difficult to appreciate how anyone can hesitate over approving \$30 million for the pursuit of honorable peace.

When we realize that the destructive power of one thermonuclear bomb surpasses that of all the bombs used in World War II it appears it would be just plain old-fashioned commonsense to encourage an agency of our Government to continue and expand its limited efforts of research and exploration to find ways and means to accomplish honorable peace through a guaranteed system of arms control and disarmament. Penny for penny it could well be the best investment the American taxpayer could make or that we can make for him and the civilized world. Let us then promptly approve this measure without further delay.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of S. 777, to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee on Foreign Affairs recommends \$30 million over 2 years, or an average of \$15 million per year. No further cut in the authorization should be made.

As one of the original sponsors of legislation establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I feel that the Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September

1961. During the last year, negotiations for which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was in large part responsible produced agreement on a "hot line" to Moscow, a limited nuclear test ban agreement, and a United Nations resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, almost three-quarters of the \$15 million per year for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency would be spent on contract research. The purpose of this research is to protect our security by preparing us properly for arms control and disarmament negotiations. Negotiations of this kind will inevitably continue in the future as they have in the past.

Even limited arms control agreements such as a test ban can have an impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries which are parties cheat on the agreement. One of the main ways in which research prepares us for negotiations is to show, first, what the impact of a particular arms control proposal might be, and, secondly, whether cheating could be detected by long distance detection devices, as in the case of the limited test ban treaty, by on-site inspection, or by other means. Most of the research to be conducted by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in this fiscal year is directed toward answering questions of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the bill because the basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors 2 years ago. I think my colleagues will agree that the results so far are encouraging, and the Agency should receive the increased authorization of \$30 million over 2 years.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the full authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be approved overwhelmingly. Certainly, opposition to this request will be founded on tortured logic. After exhaustive testimony, the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved an authorization of \$30 million for 2 years, noting in its report that the Agency has "given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961," and that "a research program of the magnitude planned for fiscal 1964 can be justified."

Does the opposition propose that we should halt all arms control discussions with other countries?

Discussions have been going on under three administrations since the war. They went on all through the period between the wars. I believe it both essential that they continue and inevitable that they will.

If these negotiations are to continue, does anyone suggest that we go to them unprepared?

If we are going to protect our national interests in these negotiations, we must be prepared to participate in them knowledgeably. We must know how the other side's proposals, as well as our own, would affect the military balance, and whether we could detect cheating. This

knowledge cannot come through osmosis—it demands research and study.

Top officials from the Defense Department, AEC, NASA, and CIA as well as the Arms Control Agency testified that there is no substitute for this research and that there is no duplication of it by the various interested agencies.

These officials pointed out that the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible for the formulation of the concepts of the "hot line" to Moscow and the limited test ban treaty. The Agency also supplied backup in terms of staff and instructions to Secretary Harriman in Moscow and to our negotiators at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. Since then we have witnessed the U.N. resolution calling upon other nations to follow our national policy of refraining from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit. Again the Arms Control Agency was largely responsible with Mr. Foster, its Director, actually conducting the negotiations.

All of these measures and activities are designed to promote our national security through safeguarded alternatives to the arms race. They are designed to lessen tensions and to promote peace.

The opponents of this budget request apparently believe that our negotiators should go to these negotiations unprepared and jeopardize our security. For the sake of a small sum, which the Foreign Affairs Committee believes would be money well spent, they apparently believe that these efforts to promote peace should be crippled. I think this is false economy.

According to the Agency, a reduction of \$5 million would result in a 40-percent cut in the contract research budget for this fiscal year since it could not be taken out of fixed operating expenses. It has previously been noted that out of the \$15 million budget for fiscal 1964, \$11 million is for research and \$4 million is for operating expenses.

I have obtained from the Agency a few examples of contract research projects which would probably have to be reduced in size or eliminated. They are:

First. Design of field tests of inspection methods to catch cheating by clandestine production of weapons in violation of a possible ban.

Second. Design of special-purpose inspection and detection equipment.

Third. Research on the problems of organizing and directing on-site inspection teams.

Fourth. Study of new weapons developments which, if placed under control by the United States and U.S.S.R. now, might enhance our security in the future.

Fifth. Evaluation of the impact of arms reductions on unemployment.

Sixth. Independent, outside analysis of new ideas for arms control measures.

Many of these studies deal with our ability to catch cheating under arms control measures. They could become tremendously important to our security if they became relevant to negotiations and we did not know the risks involved. And, suppose we were able to reach agreement on halting production of a particular weapon and no one had fig-

ured out how to keep the workers who had built the weapon employed?

Perhaps the budget cutters believe we should negotiate first and then find out—the hard way—if an agreement was in our national interest. I do not think this cart-before-the-horse approach to peace and security represents the thinking of the people of Wisconsin or the rest of the country. I, for one, think that the harm which could result from a failure to approve the full authorization would be grossly disproportionate to the minute saving involved—a saving which would prove harmful to our security and our quest for a safeguarded peace for ourselves and our children.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 777, as reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As representatives of the people of the United States, we have the foremost duty of doing everything possible to insure world peace. As responsible legislators, we should bend every effort toward the attainment of peace, for without peace all else will end in nothingness. It is a known and conceded fact that a nuclear war, if we ever permit it to come, will mean the end of civilization.

The bill before us provides another step toward the attainment of world peace. The nuclear test ban treaty was a firm step. The establishment of a "hot line" to Moscow, and the United Nations resolution calling upon all countries to refrain from orbiting nuclear weapons were other noteworthy steps. In all of these moves the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was in large part responsible for the successful negotiations. That Agency has proved its worth and ought definitely be continued.

Considering the fact that we have voted \$50 billion for defense, the amount here being asked for a peace research agency is a paltry sum. Let it not be said of this Congress that its Members tried to economize on peace.

I urge passage of the bill as recommended by the House committee.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because, in my considered judgment, it is designed to give stature and purpose to an agency which has neither.

When the resolution to establish this Agency was before us 2 years ago I said to consider disarmament at a time of accelerated arming of our Nation is almost unbelievable. What is needed, I pointed out, is a firm foreign policy so unmistakably clear and firm that no nation will dare challenge us for fear of their own extinction.

Unfortunately, this world is not yet ready for disarmament. Any efforts now on our part to do this will only project the wrong image of U.S. military power, and, further, the administration's failure to assess accurately the present danger of communism's goal of enslaving the world by arms or subversion.

When the world is ready for disarmament we can pass the necessary legislation. Prior to that time we are playing into the hands of the enemy by legislation such as this.

Since I made that statement 2 years ago the world situation has worsened. I cannot agree with the committee's evaluation of the performance of the Agency on page 3 of the report in which it is stated:

The committee believes that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961. The results so far are encouraging.

What results, may I be so bold as to ask?

There has been no lessening of tensions in the world. The Communists have given no indication that they have given up their objective of conquering the world and destroying the United States. The disarmament talks have dragged on month after weary month with the Soviet Union refusing to make any concessions while it continues to destroy U.S. prestige and influence by outlandish statements based on lies and senseless accusations.

Communist aggression has not been halted. It continues its arms buildup in Cuba. It ruthlessly disregarded the treaty in Laos to bring that sad country entirely within the Soviet orbit. It continues to export arms, rebellion and subversion from Cuba to every other country in South America. It has increased pressure on the Western nations in Berlin with the latest outrageous arrogance displayed on the autobahn. American boys are dying in a Communist sponsored war in Vietnam.

While the Communists have stepped up aggressive activities, what have we done? We backed down in Cuba and presented the Soviet Union with a victory. We have turned our heads on the increased Communist revolutionary activities in South America. We signed a test ban treaty which jeopardizes the security of the United States by preventing us from testing in an area in which we must test to stay ahead of the Russians in military power while permitting them to go ahead with the tests necessary to overtake us. We have steadily cut back our military strength by abandoning proper research and development of new weapons and by decreasing our striking force through a systematic reduction of airpower.

In the face of this tragic record of the increasing danger to our security we are now asked to give permanency and stature to an agency closely associated with our failure to maintain our military strength. To take this action will lead to only one result, a further distortion of the image of the United States and an increase in the danger of all-out war. If World War III occurs it will be because of miscalculation, on the part of our enemies, of our purpose and our ability to defend our Nation. To approve this bill and the fallacies contained in the report may well encourage some foolhardy dictator that we lack the will to resist and thus see in this an invitation to attack us. We are in the cold war phase now of World War II and we must not encourage the foolhardy to start a shooting war, thinking we are disarming and weak.

For myself, I will not be a party to any action which, in my opinion, threatens the United States and the lives of our people and, therefore, will vote against this bill.

At the same time I implore the administration, the Congress and the people to take whatever steps necessary to restore the power and prestige of the United States to the proud position it held before the apostles of appeasement began directing our foreign policy. Instead of talking disarmament we should be bending every effort to increasing our arsenal, to developing new and more powerful weapons, in creating an anti-missile missile. Instead of supporting an agency and an executive policy which quakes in fear before the sabre rattling of the conniving and ambitious Russian dictator, we should enunciate a firm, bold policy which at the very least would include getting the Communists entirely out of Cuba, ending Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere and serving notice on the Communist conspiracy that we do have the will and we are prepared to protect our freedom and the freedom of all those who look to us for leadership.

This will be a policy much more likely to insure peace than the timid, defeatist policy we have been following and which this bill now seeks to perpetuate.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 49(a) of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 639), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the sum of \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000".

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a few questions. I voted for this bill when it was first before the House. As a member of the subcommittee on supplemental appropriations and for the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary, I voted to supply the funds for this agency. Now there are some questions I would like to ask with reference to this bill. How many new employees are contemplated here?

Mr. MORGAN. There are approximately 70.

Mr. BOW. Seventy new employees are anticipated. In what grades and in what areas are the 70 employees going to be hired?

Mr. MORGAN. I would not be able to answer the gentleman. I think that would be a matter that would come before the gentleman's subcommittee.

Mr. BOW. The Committee on Foreign Affairs authorized 70 employees and you should have some idea of why they are being authorized and in what areas they

are going to be engaged and what they are going to do.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, with the increase in the amount requested for research, amounting to \$11 million, most of the 70 new employees will be in the research field.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us what grades they are going to be and what type of research they will handle?

Mr. MORGAN. No, we did not go into that aspect of the program. We looked primarily at the research projects.

Mr. BOW. It would seem to me, if we are going to authorize 70 new employees, and I would point out to the gentleman that in the State Department bill this year there were no new employees in the entire bill, and now we have a bill coming in here for the approval of a new agency where we are authorizing 70 new employees with no knowledge before this committee as to what their grades will be and what they are to do. Are we blindly going to say to this committee, "You can hire 70 people and we do not care what they are going to do and we do not know what they are going to do and just give them a blank check?"

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

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman. I hope he can give us some information on this.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The basic difference in the amount of money requested is primarily in the field of research. They have testified that there would be no more than 70 new employees added. We are not basically authorizing these new employees, but if they are needed in view of the enlargement of the program, they will be employed. It would be before the Committee on Appropriations where a breakdown would be made in the event of a possible increase in the number of employees.

Mr. BOW. You see—this is the kind of situation we get into. It is one of the reasons we had to raise the debt limitation not long ago to \$315 billion, because we merely go along with authorizations, saying that the Committee on Appropriations will take care of it and then after it is authorized, then we are told, "Oh, well, a legislative committee authorized it, and we ought to appropriate for it because the authorizing committee would not ask for it unless they knew what it was going to be used for."

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

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The basic problem and the difference between the \$20 million and the \$30 million is in the research field.

Mr. BOW. Let us go into that. What is the research; what are we going to do in research that will bring the gentleman from Illinois this peace on earth and good will to men?

Mr. GALLAGHER. If I may point out in the green book those areas that would be eliminated are \$6.3 million for research in fiscal year 1964. They are all listed on pages 19 and 21.

Mr. BOW. I know they are listed. You can take names and you can take projects and give them different names. Let us find out actually what they are and what they are going to do. Can the gentleman tell us, rather than just taking a subject and saying that they are going to put research in this? How are we going to do it? How will it develop?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Your own committee went over some of these programs in the past. Which ones have you vetoed?

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman acting upon the authorization of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, last year we granted all of the money that was authorized. We went over these items. But this is a great increase I say to the gentleman. I have asked the gentleman a question, and he is not answering it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I do not yield any further to the gentleman unless he is willing to tell us what are the programs and what are you going to have the money for. Do not give us doubletalk but give us facts.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am giving you the facts.

Mr. BOW. No, you are not giving us the facts but giving us titles in a book. You are giving us reference to a book that has titles in it. I will not yield to the gentleman any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment, and would like to point out very carefully to members of the committee that if you desire to vote for economy, in this instance your vote should be "no." You are voting upon the adoption of the committee amendment. By its action the House Committee on Foreign Affairs took the bill that was passed by the other body which provided \$20 million for 2 years and increased that amount to \$30 million for 2 years. If we vote "no" upon the committee amendment, we are voting to save \$10 million, to reduce the amount authorized for the biennium to \$20 million, the figure which the Members of the other body thought was adequate and sufficient to carry on this program.

Let us look at what has happened in the past. As I pointed out a short time ago, \$10 million was sufficient to carry this program for the first 2 years of its existence. There was left over more than \$1.5 million out of that \$10 million for appropriation this year. So that approximately \$8.5 million carried the program for 2 years. If we vote for the reduced amount, we are giving \$10 million for each of the following 2 years. Now, what will that be used for? We are asked to give about \$4 million of those \$10 million for operations, for the administration of this program, for carrying on the work of the Agency. That leaves, under the reduced figure, \$6 million for research. How much have we used for research in the past? In the year just concluded we used not quite \$4 million. So I would say to members of this committee, if you vote for the reduced amount you are still

giving \$2 million more than was used for research in the past fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amount which the other body found sufficient ought to be entirely adequate so far as we are concerned. I would urge Members to vote "no" upon the committee amendment so that the figure would go back to \$20 million for the 2-year period and thereby save \$10 million.

It has been said that \$5 or \$10 million is not a large amount; and perhaps in the context of the amounts which we authorize and appropriate here it is not. But I am sure that the taxpayers of this country feel that \$10 million is a very substantial amount, and should be saved. Even with the savings we are providing an amount which is more than adequate for the purposes of this Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" upon this amendment.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a most amazing thing has taken place this afternoon. That is, the amount of excitement that has been engendered by an authorization bill seeking to increase the sum of money for arms control and disarmament from \$20 to \$30 million for 2 years. I was present when the \$50 billion was appropriated for arms and armaments and certainly there was not anywhere near this excitement.

What are we actually doing? We are increasing the amount authorized from \$10 to \$15 million a year for 2 years; at least we seek to do so. The other body fixed the amount at \$10 million. We are seeking to fix it at \$15 million.

As a practical matter what is going to happen is that in conference that amount very likely will be split down the middle and so we will wind up with about \$12.5 million a year. We are just paring cherries; with all this excitement, it comes to just an increase of \$2.5 million. For what? For arms control and for disarmament.

I think that this organization certainly can be trusted with an additional \$2½ million a year. Last year I believe they turned back some money that they did not use. I do not think they are going to squander the money simply because we authorize it.

Also remember that the Appropriations Committee is going to go into these items. They are going to determine, I presume, whether or not 70 additional employees are necessary. They are going to determine whether or not any supergrade employees are necessary. So far as supergrade employees are concerned; who would receive from \$14,000 to \$25,000 a year? They are scientists. You will certainly want people who are worth their salt, and if you are going to get decent people for this organization, you will certainly want to pay them a decent salary.

As to contracts that are to be turned over to colleges and universities; that is done when in the wisdom of the Agency it is determined that it is necessary.

We had an open-skies amendment during Mr. Eisenhower's administration. It was an organization of this type that

worked that plan out. What are some of the functions of this organization? They are going to backstop among other things the various ideas submitted for arms control; they are going to backstop the various proposals that are made by different agencies of the Department of Defense. When some subdivision gets an idea for arms control, they submit it to this organization which will review it. This organization is going to determine whether or not there is duplication, whether or not there are three or four or five different groups in the Department of Defense that are working on the same suggestion for arms control.

Certainly these people have to be qualified in order to determine whether or not a proposed suggestion is worth while and unless you have people who know their business they are not going to be able to determine the validity of the various recommendations.

How much in the way of actual money are we talking about? We are talking about \$2.5 million a year when you spend \$50 billion for defense. I think, when we consider what is involved, we will not want to be penny wise and pound foolish, which we will be unless we vote for the committee amendment. This is a young organization. This organization has not developed to the degree where we have to be disturbed or worried about it. I am certain as time goes on the various ideas and suggestions that are made and the research that is done by this organization will prove worth while. And so I urge you to vote for the committee amendment to increase the authorization from \$20 to \$30 million for 2 years.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY
MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER as a substitute for the committee amendment: On the first page strike out line 3 and all that follows down through page 2, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (a) of section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2589) is amended by striking out '\$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$7,500,000 annually'."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, when this act was passed, section 49 provided an authorization for the appropriation of \$10 million to remain available until expended. It did not put the Agency on any kind of an annual basis. It did not place it in the situation where it would be difficult for it to attempt to balloon itself all out of reason.

Mr. Chairman, the pending committee amendment simply does this: It takes a 2-year period and says that we can appropriate up to \$30 million, or \$15 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, over in the other body they said, "No, we will take \$20 million and let them spend at the rate of \$10 million a year, and then when these 2 years are up, we will go into this matter again."

Mr. Chairman, the plain fact of the matter is that you cannot buy peace, you cannot buy peace by hiring researchers.

This Agency in the first year received \$1.8 million. In the next year, fiscal 1963, it received \$6.7 million. Now, we want to give them a 700-percent increase, up to \$15 million, according to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that is just ridiculous. You cannot expand an agency in that fashion and you cannot accomplish the peaceful millennium by doing so. Let us put it on an orderly basis.

Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does, is to say that the Agency can get up to \$7.5 million annually if it is appropriated. It puts them on a business-like basis. It will let it hire only a part of these 70 people it wants to hire. A gentleman who preceded me in the well was asked, "Who are they going to hire?" He replied, "Scientific types." I will tell you the type they are going to hire. They are going to hire, in part at least, the type that come in and write papers for the Disarmament Agency and who will tell us that this Nation must not have civil defense because it is provocative to the Russians. How do they reason this strange and curious assertion? They say, "Well, if we spend billions of dollars on civil defense, it must mean we are serious about it."

Now, Mr. Chairman, they said, "Everybody knows that unless the people are in a shelter when the bombs drop, they are not going to be protected. So, if we spend billions of dollars on civil defense, it means that we are planning the first strike, that we are going to know when the war breaks out because we are going to start it, and we are going to have our people in the defense shelters." Therefore, the Russians figure this all out and they become uneasy and look at our civil defense as a provocative act. That is what these so-called scientific types will be telling us.

Mr. Chairman, that is how nutball these people are who are going to get part of this money that you folk are going to authorize today, if you do not accept this substitute amendment. That is how silly it is. They will come in and try to lower the defense capability and safety of the people of this country.

I think it is time this country put its foot on—puts a lid on—this expenditure. A good job can be done with \$7.5 million a year. The Agency should be working to protect the people of the United States not only from its foreign enemies but from its domestic idiots. Let us not give them money to spend foolishly or dangerously. This is a very severe task, I grant, that we have before us, and for that reason I ask you, I implore you, I beg you to put sanity in this bill now before the House by putting this reasonable lid of \$7.5 million—a million dollars more than the Agency is spending this year—on the appropriation.

If you want to look at it later, if Mr. Foster is able to come up at some later date and with some results that are tangible and some actions that are clearly in the interest and security of the United States some years hence, let him talk to you about it then. But let us not have the kind of speculation we heard earlier in the day when somebody was asked for proof that disarmament ever avoided a

war or saved a nation, and the gentleman responded, "Well, if the United States is in existence a hundred years from now this will be the proof."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] said, we are quibbling over a very small amount of money in a very important field. A lot of people talk about disarmament.

I am not one of those who optimistically believes this agency or any agency is going to achieve disarmament, at least not in the foreseeable future; but I am very much interested in arms control. We are not talking about weapons that we referred to in previous attempts at disarmament. We are not talking about guns, rifles, aircraft carriers and battleships. We are talking about intercontinental ballistic missiles. If the estimates of the Defense Department are correct about what the Russians have—certainly they know what we have, and if they are correct in their estimates of overkill—there are enough intercontinental ballistic missiles and warheads to equip them to wipe life off the globe several times over. I think the average person just refuses to let this sink into his intelligence because it is almost too horrible to contemplate. But the fact remains it is true.

What we are trying to do here is to spend a few dollars, and I say a few dollars. The increase involved here is \$1 for every \$30,000 that we have invested in 1 year in these implements of destruction. We are trying to figure out a way to spend a few dollars to limit these weapons.

There is talk about the French force de frappe. I made a speech about it the other day, and I pointed out that if De Gaulle is successful in coming up with one bomb, one bomb that will work, he will have had an expenditure of \$2 billion. But by the time he gets that bomb we are going to have over a thousand, and the best estimates are the Russians will have 400 or 500. If this is going to be any deterrent, if this French force de frappe is going to be any deterrent by one single bomb against 1,000 or 450, if that is going to deter anybody from doing something, I would like to have it pointed out.

This shows you how far one nation will go to try to become a nuclear power. I think De Gaulle on balance has been good for France. He has stabilized the French Government and to a large extent the French economy, but it shows you how far afield a fellow can get when he goes into this business of the French economy spending \$2 billion to develop a single bomb, which is supposed to give France the status of an important nuclear power.

What we ought to be doing and what De Gaulle ought to be doing, what other nations ought to be doing and certainly what we ought to be willing to spend a few dollars for is to find some way to get rid of these atomic bombs.

I do not think anybody in the Disarmament Agency—Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is its proper title, and

as far as I am concerned you can drop the "Disarmament" out any time you want to; it certainly will not make me unhappy—I do not think anybody in that Agency has any visions that the United States ought to disarm or that we are going to get the Russians to disarm along with us if we make the offer.

I do not suppose it is possible to make a political mistake in proposing this, because if we never have a nuclear war the opponents can always say, "Well, it is a waste of money," and so on; but if we do have one all out, you do not need to worry about the political consequences because there will not be any constituents left to complain. It will be that horrible.

To be practical about it, the Senate has voted \$10 million. We are asking for \$15 million. Anybody who knows anything about the way this place works at all knows that means no more than \$12.5 million, or an increase of \$2.5 million, and that is a paltry sum compared with what is at stake.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] that I waited and waited for some word out of Paris a week or so ago, during the NATO Parliamentary Conference, from somebody in the varied assortment of people who went over there, some word about disarmament, and I did not hear a single word. As a matter of fact, I think probably that so-called Conference concerned itself with the buildup of arms. I do not know. I am not sure that anything was accomplished.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The speech I just said I made was made there. The gentleman might be interested to know that the chairman of the Liberal Party of England, Lord Ogmore, who happened to be a delegate, said in a later speech it was one of the most powerful heard during the NATO meeting. I did not say that, but he did. I am sure that some people on the other side will not like it. I am not attempting to blow my own horn.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman is telling me that somebody in England complimented him on his speech? The gentleman is telling me that?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. Maybe the gentleman would like to compliment me if he would bother to read the speech.

Mr. GROSS. I am still waiting for someone of the assortment of people who attended the NATO Parliamentary Conference to speak up in behalf of disarmament.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] says, in effect, "Vote \$15 million. Take the Senate's original figure of \$10 million and increase it to \$15 million and then go to conference and compromise on something less." This means it is not a question of the Disarmament Agency needing \$15 million, according to the gentleman from New York. All they need, he suggests, is

\$12.5 million. So blow it up to \$15 million today and then kick it down somewhere along the line, and in between, again caught in the middle, is the bedraggled taxpayer.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] spoke of someone being fearful they would drown this Agency with money. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey ever heard of any agency or department of the Federal Government being drowned with money at any time, any place, in the modern history of this Government?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the gentleman contending that an additional \$5 million being spent for research by the ACDA would drown the Agency with money?

Mr. GROSS. I am only repeating the phrase used by the gentleman previously. Of course, it will not drown them. You could not, figuratively speaking—and understand I say figuratively speaking—you could not drown them with \$5 million more—because they can drink that much, of whatever the additional \$5 million represents.

Now the alleged claim to fame on the part of the Disarmament Agency up to this point is the "hot line" and the nuclear test ban agreement. If I remember the accounts of the Moscow meeting at which the test ban was initiated, I did not see anyone from the Disarmament Agency mentioned—it was all Averell Harriman. He was the whole show as far as the United States was concerned. The Disarmament Agency had little or nothing to do with the Moscow test ban agreement. It was all Averell. Moreover, the Moscow test ban treaty is not removing a single weapon from the Russian arsenal or from our arsenal—not one weapon. That produced no disarmament whatever.

As for the "hot line"—we have had a teletype line into our Embassy in Moscow for years. The so-called "hot line" runs into the Pentagon and thence to the White House. And if anybody thinks Khrushchev is going to plant an operator at his teletype keyboard in Moscow and tell us that he is going to push the button and send his missiles on their way here, they ought to revise their thinking. How anyone can consider the "hot line" any kind of an accomplishment, that merits spending either \$5 or \$15 million is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my colleague, the gentleman

from Iowa, let me read to you from the hearings with regard to the Moscow negotiations.

I quote Mr. Foster:

The scientists who went were our scientists. The interpreter was our interpreter, the secretaries were our secretaries, so that we made up some 40 or 50 percent of the delegation and in the drafting committee, Mr. Fisher was the actual member of the drafting committee that worked with the representative of the Soviet Union in the final drafting of the treaty.

As you can see, Mr. Fisher who is the deputy of Mr. Foster, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, was Mr. Harriman's deputy when the mission was selected and he did the actual drafting of the test ban agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the principal question before the House in connection with this bill is the amount of appropriations we authorize for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the next 2 years.

The Agency asked for a continuing authorization and the budget request for the next fiscal year was \$15 million. The other body authorized \$20 million for ACDA for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The Foreign Affairs Committee approved an authorization for \$30 million to finance the Agency's operation for 2 years at the level planned for fiscal year 1964. We did not approve the request for a continuing authorization because we felt that Congress should retain at all times a limit on the development and scale of operation of the Agency.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a very small agency as Government agencies go. Its total personnel presently number a little over 200 and its programed not to exceed 277 by the end of fiscal year 1964. In light of its research, coordinating, and negotiating responsibilities, and the fact that this is the only Government entity devoted exclusively to seeking alternatives to the arms race, I feel that this represents a reasonable and necessary staffing level. Consequently, any budgetary cuts that do take place will have primary impact on the Agency's external research program.

I must admit that both I and many members of the committee initially approached the Agency's requested authorization with serious doubts as to its validity. We questioned both the need for the research planned and whether such research would not duplicate research already being performed by the Defense Department, the CIA, the State Department, and other Government agencies.

Because of these doubts, the Director of the Agency appeared before our committee twice, once in executive session so that we could really probe on these questions. In addition, we heard testimony from officials representing the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I feel that we explored the Agency's research program thoroughly, as well as the overall Government program of research in this area on the matter of waste and duplication.

The overwhelming view of the committee, as a result of the hearings, was that the Agency's research program is not only sound and necessary, but that it does avoid duplicating the research work conducted by other Government agencies. The vote of the committee on reporting the amended bill out also indicates that this evaluation and expression of confidence was shared by members of both parties. As stated in our report:

The committee believes the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has given a good account of itself since it began operations in September 1961.

On the basis of the detailed testimony presented to the committee during the hearings, the committee has been convinced that the research program for fiscal 1964 is justified. It represents an \$11 million effort, almost three-fourths of the total budget request of \$15 million. This growth of the research program is commensurate with the increasing demands for information to protect our security through knowledgeable arms control and disarmament negotiations. During much of the first 2 years of its existence, the Agency was developing the basic concepts of a research program. This early work was necessarily exploratory and did not involve much detail. Now that needs have been identified, more detailed research is required to provide technical support for sound U.S. negotiating positions.

The largest research project involves \$2,400,000 for Project Cloud Gap—a field test of inspection procedures. The cost will be shared on approximately a 50-50 basis with the Department of Defense. The project involves testing in the field of various concepts of inspection in order to determine the risks and operating difficulties involved.

It takes much detailed information to develop a good verification system. First the key indicators of violations of arms control agreements must be identified. Then a system to monitor those indicators must be designed. Then that system must be tested. This is where the field tests in Project Cloud Gap come in. The elements must be developed and tested.

A variety of other projects involving smaller amounts have been programed in order to enable the Agency to deal effectively with both the conceptual and technical problems inherent in developing an arms control and disarmament program which will assure our national security.

The committee was persuaded that the \$10 million which would be available for fiscal 1964 under the authorization passed by the other body is not sufficient to enable the Agency to do an effective research job. It would mean a 40-percent cut in the research program for the next fiscal year, from \$11 million to \$6.3 million.

The Cloud Gap project would have to be substantially reduced in scope.

Other important projects would either have to be eliminated or curtailed in a manner that would reduce their effectiveness.

The budget reduction would also reduce the grant research program by more than two-thirds. The Agency relies on grant-type research for some new ideas and concepts.

Finally, the testimony brought out that a cut in the research program cannot be measured solely in terms of individual project reductions and eliminations. The entire research program is a coordinated effort. Many projects are related and depend upon the successful conclusion of other projects for maximum effectiveness. This programing would be largely ruined by the mandatory modifications imposed by a smaller budget.

It seems to me that the question boils down to whether or not we want to promote our security by being properly prepared to negotiate measures to slow down the arms race. If we do, I think this comparatively small amount requested by the Agency should be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] for 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think at long last we are getting down to the meat of this question about what this Agency is doing. I want to say to you that \$1 million is a lot of money in the district that I come from. My people there do not want to relate it to the defense budget or to anything else, because every penny, every dime, every dollar, and every \$1 million is important to them. The question to me is whether this Agency really needs this money and whether it is justified, and I do not think so, and I rise here in opposition to the amendment of the committee.

This Agency is supposed to be a coordinator and a catalyst, to bring people together and to bring ideas together and so forth. I think it is just the opposite of that. I think if they weed out some of the unnecessary overlap and duplication that they are performing, this Agency could well operate on \$10 million a year and possibly a great deal less.

Nobody has said anything about those research contracts, but take a look in the green book that they have told you about. We are not talking about atomic bombs and how to get rid of atomic bombs. We are studying disputes between individuals. And one thing they are studying is the status of indigenous natives in South Africa. Now, I am for eliminating atomic bombs, but how about the problems of the status of indigenous natives in South Africa? I think we could well get along without that one. We would save quite a lot of money.

Then here is another one. The role of electromagnetic and mechanical centers of inspection. This is what they are going to look at. The possible role of aerial photography, radar, and other techniques in inspection and operation which will require extensive analysis.

Well, where is the Department of Defense, where is the CIA, where is the Atomic Energy Commission? Those people are all doing these very exact same things at the present time.

Then here is another one.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I have only 3 minutes and you had 5.

Mr. HAYS. I want to agree with you about something if you will yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. That is such an unusual situation that I will.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that I was unaware of the study about indigenous natives, and I will agree with him that that ought to be knocked out, and I will help to get it knocked out. They ought to discontinue that right now.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Very good. Just vote "no" on the committee amendment.

Here is just one other. Inspection for clandestine military activities. This study will be concerned with the detection of clandestine military activities on a very small scale.

Where is the CIA? Where are the other Government agencies? They are all doing the same thing. I hope you will vote "no" on the committee amendment.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I could hardly believe my ears a few moments ago when I heard some of our colleagues pleading with this House to cut down the amount which the committee has recommended, as an economy measure, an economy vote. Arms control, the nuclear test ban treaty, peace—all the efforts being made by the Disarmament Agency cannot be measured in terms of dollars. What kind of a price tag can you put on the nuclear test ban treaty? How can anyone measure the dollar value of lives that might be saved? A country that today spends far more than 100 times as much as the committee is asking on legalized gambling can certainly afford to gamble \$15 million a year or twice \$15 million on the Disarmament Agency that might somehow bring us a little bit closer to peace.

The Library of Congress has advised me that since World War II the United States and the Soviet Union have spent over \$900 billion on defense, almost \$1 trillion, and as a result we have fears and jitters and the threat of mass annihilation.

It has always seemed to me that if we could spend a fraction of this, a recognizable fraction of this on education and the pursuit of peace, perhaps maybe in 10 or 15 years from now our defense would be more secure and our position in world leadership even stronger because of it. If we allow the notion to get abroad in this land that the arts of peace are less important, less worth working for than the arts of war then we will have a very, very difficult time making the journey toward peace to which President Kennedy referred at the time of the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. At that time he said:

Let us—if we can—step back from the shadows of war—and seek the way of peace, and if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that in this land at this time we took the first step.

Let history record that in this Congress at this time we are willing to take yet another step.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that those who want to tear the heart out of the Disarmament Agency have not taken the proper perspective of history. Since the year 1898 this country and every other major power on the face of this world has engaged in disarmament talks, year in and year out, right through World War I and up to the beginning of World War II. And I think that those people who feel that by gutting the Disarmament Agency they can stop the discussion of disarmament are just fooling themselves, because if history is any indication we are going to go on talking about disarmament just as our Nation has talked disarmament for the past half century.

The result will be, if we gut this Agency and cut out this research and deprive the top officials of our executive branch from knowledge that comes from this research, that we are saying that we want our people, we want our representatives to go into negotiations with one hand tied behind their back.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] said that he is in favor of outside contracts to do the research for this Agency. But the truth is that with this amendment you would virtually cut out every outside contract. This would mean that the Agency would be limited practically to its own resources and to the research that could be carried on with its own personnel.

A question was asked about the new personnel, Mr. Chairman. That information is easily available. The new personnel account for only \$1.3 million of the increase asked by this Agency. If we cut the Agency's budget back to \$7.5 million we are going to cut back this Agency to a point where they are going to have less money for research than they had in the fiscal year 1963.

I would say that there are divided opinions in this House as to whether disarmament is the road to peace.

There are differences whether or not by pursuing this particular path we are going to bring about the kind of security that we want not only for our Nation but for people everywhere—and I would say that I do not happen to be one of those who believes that disarmament is a certain road to peace—I think we may have to first find a way of solving some of the political problems that exist in this world.

But, Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee that if we take away from our people who are responsible for conducting negotiations at Geneva and for conducting negotiations with the Soviet Union, if we take away from them the knowledge and the understanding that can be derived from the contracts for outside research, then you are handicapping them. You are saying that we want them to go into negotiations not well briefed, not thoroughly prepared, but instead on an ad hoc basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment and in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

It has been brought out here today that we are talking about a figure of \$15 million. Someone said here a little while ago that we have just appropriated \$50 billion for defense. Now, take 24 hours in a day and divide it into \$50 billion and you will find that we are spending \$6 million an hour for defense.

Mr. Chairman, we are asking here for 2½ hours in the cause of peace. I think this is a very small amount.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] said, it might be a gamble, but we are gambling small money.

Now in considering the \$15 million, the Agency made a good case before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. At the insistence of some of the minority members we called people from the CIA, we called representatives of the Department of Defense, we called them from NASA, and we called them from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Chairman, every witness testified that there was absolutely no duplication between their research and the research of the Arms Control Agency and that coordination as being carried out under the Executive order eliminated duplication.

This \$15 million has been justified, \$4 million for administrative expenses and \$11 million for research.

If the committee amendment is voted down and the \$20 million figure stays in the bill, we will have only \$3.7 million for administration and only \$6.3 million for research.

I say this Agency should be granted the full amount necessary to carry out their research program.

The gentleman from Wisconsin in speaking about the natives in South Africa referred to only one part of a contract. He did not indicate the nature of the project as a whole. The contract on that item was Analysis of International Disputes. Only a small part of this contract had anything to do with the African natives that he mentioned. But the contract provided for vital studies dealing with international disputes.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize that this Agency has proven its worth by the preliminary work it has done. It brought the "hot line" into being and it supplied the information that gave us the nuclear test ban treaty.

Let us vote for the committee amendment and vote down the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were ayes 66, noes 84.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. HOSMER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 111.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 73, noes 110.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. ADAIR.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 145.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 2 line 2 after the word "Act" insert the following: "Provided, That of this sum a minimum of \$100,000 shall be used to develop at least one econometric model which employs the input-output technique to be used as a tool to define and measure the regional economic dislocation problem caused by time phased cutbacks, stretchouts, and termination of military procurement and to assist in finding ways in which to minimize the adverse effects of such dislocation."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am deeply concerned with maintaining a strong military posture for the United States. As an American and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services as well, I am looking forward to the time, which I hope will arrive in the near future, when we can set about an orderly and safe program of disarmament. When this happens we must recognize that the geographical distribution of military contracts is uneven and that readjustments will bring severe hardship to certain areas of the country. This makes it mandatory that advanced planning by Government at all levels and by business firms and labor unions and other private organizations be entered into so that this economic adjustment can be made with a minimum of difficulty.

We now have techniques which can define and measure a potential regional economic dislocation problem and can also provide an adequate tool to efficiently and practicably deal with the problem. These techniques are varied. Some are called computer models, others are called econometric models. It is a technique of input and output analysis developed by economists like Professor Leontief of Harvard and many others. For those of you who are interested I refer you to an article in the Scientific American for April 1961 entitled "The Economic Effects of Disarmament."

In our own area, the San Francisco Bay area, which includes nine of California's counties, 10 percent of the total

payroll is in defense industry. There are roughly 1.5 million people employed in all industries in the bay region, and 100,000 are involved with military oriented activities.

My point in offering this amendment is that we have definite and finite techniques developed by leading economists where we can use computer models or econometric models to definitely forecast what the effect of disarmament will be on a regional area and to make predictions as to what can be done to meet that effect. My amendment would make it mandatory that the Disarmament Agency employ this tool on a regional basis.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the gentleman's amendment. I am sure the Agency is already doing studies along this line. I assure the gentleman as far as I am concerned I intend to use my influence to have them continued, but I do not feel that any money should be earmarked for particular studies in a certain area of the country. I am sure that studies along this line are now being made by the Agency.

Mr. GUBSER. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Agency is interested in this particular type of activity, but this is a tool for arriving at conclusions rather than a research project. I am hopeful that the gentleman would see fit to communicate with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and urge that they consider the use of such a tool on a regional basis. Would he be willing to do that?

Mr. MORGAN. I will be glad to.

Mr. GUBSER. With the Chairman's assurance that this will be urged upon the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and not wishing to tie the hands of the Agency in particular, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I be allowed to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Section 45 of the Act entitled "Arms Control and Disarmament Act", approved September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 637), is amended by redesignating subsection 45(b) as subsection 45(c) and by inserting after subsection 45(a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In the case of contractors or subcontractors and their officers or employees, actual or prospective, the Director may accept, in lieu of the investigation prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a report of investigation conducted by a Government agency, other than the Civil Service Commission or the Federal Bureau of Investigation, when it is determined by the Director that the completed investigation meets the standards established in subsection (a) hereof: *Provided*, That security clearance had been granted to the individual concerned by another Government agency based upon such investigation and report. The Director may also grant access for information classified no higher than 'confidential' to contractors or subcontractors and their officers and employees, actual or prospective, on the basis

of reports on less than full-field investigations: *Provided, That such investigations shall each include a current national agency check.*"

SEC. 3. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training."

SEC. 4. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Not more than 20 per centum of any appropriation made pursuant to this Act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last month of a fiscal year.

"(d) None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

SEC. 5. In section 31(2) before the word "private" insert the words "United States".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out line 25 down to and including line 8 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2573) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education, or training.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 3, line 25, strike out the words "in support of any pending"; and on page 4, line 1, strike out the word "legislation".

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment to section 3(d) on page 3 is adopted, it would read as follows:

None of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda concerning the work of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This amendment would prohibit the dissemination of propaganda on all matters concerning the Agency's work. There seems to be in the Agency an effort to do more propagandizing of the American people. For instance, one of the research projects for which money has been requested is \$100,000 for the following purposes. It is entitled "Analyses of Nongovernmental Arms Control and Disarmament Efforts."

They give as justification for this \$100,000 as follows:

This group of studies covers the interactions between public attitudes and arms

control policy. In the United States, national policy must be consistent with and supported by an informed public opinion. This series of studies is designed both to aid the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in interpreting public opinion and to indicate in what areas the public may be inadequately informed.

Also in the budget which they have requested of this Congress they are asking for three additional public affairs officers with an amount of about \$28,000 annual rate increase.

This in no way, in my opinion, will stop the Agency from putting out facts and informing the American public of facts. But it will stop them from putting out propaganda in their own behalf.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. In leaving out the words which you strike out you do not prevent the dissemination of information concerning disarmament and its problems?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is my belief that the Agency can put out information which informs the people of facts. It should not continue any propaganda as such. There have been many instances of this Agency and others engaging in actual propaganda.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not sure that I understand the intent of the gentleman. This language was put into the legislation in the other body by the senior Senator from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER. The language in the bill is the Senator's identical language. The words that the gentleman from California seeks to eliminate would, in my opinion, remove the intent of Senator HICKENLOOPER's amendment.

During the hearings in the other body Senator HICKENLOOPER and some of the other Senators had been bombarded with letters concerning this legislation, some of it from around the large university areas in California. At that time the Agency denied that they had taken part in any campaign to stimulate correspondence to Members of the other body. However, the Hickenlooper language was the result of that campaign.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. This amendment will in no way prohibit them from doing the necessary work which they have to do. They can still issue their materials overseas, if they so desire.

For instance, they have published a book entitled "Blueprint for the Peace Race," printed in Russian. It is published by the U.S. Arms Control Agency.

If they have the money and want to go to the trouble and have the time and want to make the effort to distribute this "Blueprint for Peace" in Russian overseas, that is their prerogative. But this amendment will eliminate the dissemination of propaganda in their own behalf and prevent the propagandizing of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a good amendment and I respectfully ask the consideration of the members of the committee.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the gentleman have a copy of the act before him?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I have the language. Mr. MORGAN. Section (c) assigns the Arms Control Agency among its functions:

The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament.

Now, would the gentleman's amendment abolish section (c) of section 2?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. No, it would not. I am talking about propaganda.

Mr. MORGAN. It would not?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It would not. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. The gentleman from Florida, I think, is under the impression that this particular book to which he has referred, the "Blueprint for the Peace Race," was from a former administration.

I would like to point out to the gentleman that this book was published in May 1962, some 16 months after the current administration took office.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If the gentleman will look at what the gentleman from Florida said, as it appears in the Record, that is exactly what I said on the floor, and I have not changed it. It is that: "The Blueprint for the Peace Race" as recently issued is the result of the original work of the nonstatutory agency. It has been reissued and revised in the years since that time. I believe it has been revised twice. But every revision has been a revision toward conservatism rather than toward liberalism. Furthermore, this document only shows the bases you would have to have in a world organization with a world peace force. It is not something they can do. It would have to be done by treaty. It came out of the nonstatutory agency. Can anybody deny that is true? I am sure it is true.

Mr. STINSON. It did not come out of the former administration in its present form.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. It has been revised more conservatively under the present administration, but it was originally drawn by the nonstatutory agency.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to call attention to another matter. The gentleman said that military forces that would be created in the United Nations would be created before disarmament. I would like to point out to the gentleman on page 33 of this particular document there is the following:

United Nations Peace Force. The parties to the treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force established in stage II until it had sufficient armed

forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

Stage I provides for the reduction of weapons. The United Nations Peace Force under this plan would not be created until stage II after our weapons had been reduced.

Now, on page 113 of the hearings our colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] made an insertion in the RECORD which said:

The United Nations Security Council directs the U.N. military actions, and I presume that this will also be the case with the U.N. Peace Force. I wonder how many people know that since the beginning of the United Nations the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been a Russian?

The Russian Under Secretaries are listed as follows:

Year 1946 to 1949, Arkady S. Sobelov, U.S.S.R.

Year 1950 to 1953, Konstantine Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.

Year 1953 to 1957, Ilya Tchernyshev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1957 to 1960, Anatoly Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.

Year 1960 to 1962, Georgei O. Arkadev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1962 to 1963, Eugene D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.

Year 1963, Vladimir Suslov, U.S.S.R.

The gentleman can see this would be done in stage II after the reduction of the weapons system.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I am glad my colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] pointed this out. He points out that it is not likely our Government would agree to any such arrangement. The Disarmament Agency is pointing out the things that would have to take place if you do have a worldwide disarmament. But it does not say it is going to occur.

Mr. STINSON. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been spending the taxpayers' money for printing this in English and also in five other languages and has distributed it around the world as an official U.S. proposal.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If you are going to have a worldwide disarmament it is going to be a dangerous thing but that is not what this Agency is bringing about. It is advising of facts of their research.

Mr. STINSON. I doubt if it is in that direction. This is an outline of the disarmament plan that was submitted by Mr. Kennedy at the United Nations in September 1961. This is stated very clearly in the foreword of the document.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER—

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and I will explain the amendment.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is 10 pages long. Will the gentleman be able to explain the amendment in 5 minutes?

Mr. HOSMER. I think I can.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to dispensing with the reading of the gentleman's amendment. I think it should be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 4, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert the following:

"Sec. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 31 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2571) is amended by striking out 'disarmament' and inserting in lieu thereof 'arms control'.

"(b) The second sentence of such section is amended to read as follows: 'To this end, the Director is authorized and directed, under the direction of the President, (1) to review and evaluate research, development, and other studies in the field of arms control; (2) to make arrangements by contract, agreement, and grant for the conduct of research, development, and other studies in the field of arms control by United States private or public institutions or persons; and (3) to coordinate the research, development, and other studies conducted in the field of arms control by other Government agencies in accordance with procedures established under section 35 of this Act.'

"(c) The fourth sentence of such section is amended by striking out 'and disarmament' immediately before the colon and in paragraph (a) by striking out 'control, and elimination' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and control'; and in paragraph (d) by striking out 'reduction, and elimination' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and reduction'; and by striking out 'and disarmament' each place that it appears in paragraphs (e), (f), (h), (i), (j), and (k).

"Sec. 6. Section 1 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2551 note) is amended by striking out 'and Disarmament'.

"Sec. 7. Section 2 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2551) is amended to read as follows:

"PURPOSE

"Sec. 2. An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this Act to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of control of armaments and their reduction to minimum feasible levels.

"Arms control policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of United States arms control policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with support and advisory responsibility for this field. This organization must have such a position within the Government that it can provide the President, the Secretary of State, other officials of the executive branch, and the Congress with recommendations concerning United States arms control policy, and can assess the effect of these recommendations upon our foreign policies, our national security policies, and our economy.

"This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technological information upon which realistic arms control policy must be based. It must be able to carry out the following primary functions:

"(a) The evaluation, support, and coordination of research for arms control policy formulation;

"(b) The accumulation and preparation of data required for United States participation in international negotiations in the arms control field;

"(c) The accumulation, coordination, and distribution of information concerning arms control from, within, and amongst Government agencies; and

"(d) The development and evaluation of plans for United States participation in such control systems as may become part of United States arms control activities."

"Sec. 8. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2552) is amended by striking out 'The terms "arms control" and "disarmament" means the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, reduction, or elimination,' and inserting in lieu thereof: 'The term "arms control" means the identification, verification, inspection, limitation, control, or reduction.'

"(b) Paragraph (c) of section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act is amended by striking out 'and Disarmament'.

"Sec. 9. (a) Section 21 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2561) is amended to read as follows:

"UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

"Sec. 21. There is hereby established an agency to be known as the "United States Arms Control Agency'.

"(b) The first two sentences of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2562) are amended to read as follows: 'The Agency shall be headed by a Director, who shall serve as an adviser to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the President on arms control matters. In carrying out his duties under this Act the Director shall have advisory responsibility within the Government for arms control matters, as defined in this Act.'

"(c) Section 25 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2565) is amended by striking out ', under the direction of the Secretary of State,' and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Director to establish within the Agency any bureau, office, or division to conduct research activities.'

"(d) The first sentence of section 26 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2566) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'. The last sentence of such section is amended by inserting 'the Secretary of Defense,' immediately before 'the Secretary of State,' by striking out 'Disarmament' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Arms Control'; and by striking out ', disarmament,'.

"Sec. 10. Section 34 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2574) is hereby repealed. Section 35 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2575) is hereby renumbered as section 34 and is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 11. (a) The second sentence of paragraph (a) of section 41 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2581) is amended to read as follows: 'It is the intent of the section that the Director rely upon the General Services Administration for general administrative services in the United States and abroad to the extent agreed upon between the Administrator of General Services and the Director.'

"(b) Paragraph (f) of such section 41 is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 12. Section 43 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2583) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 13. The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 47 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2587) is amended by striking out 'and disarmament'.

"Sec. 14. Section 48 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2588) is amended by inserting immediately after 'international conferences' the following: 'in any advisory capacity'.

"Sec. 15. The title of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency', approved

September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 631), is amended to read as follows: "An Act to establish a United States Arms Control Agency."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I shall be much briefer than was the reading of the amendment. It was necessarily long because it deals with many portions of the Disarmament Agency Act. The amendment is drafted to do four simple things:

First, It takes the word "disarmament" and drops it from the name of the agency and eliminates the function of disarmament from the responsibility of the agency so that the agency is now named and is responsible for arms control.

At such time in the future as disarmament becomes other than a dream, the agency can be shifted to that function. But now the function is arms control and let us make no mistake about it. If we confuse disarmament with arms control, we derogate the actions and the responsibilities and the capability of the agency.

Secondly, this amendment will bar the agency from setting up its own research shop and thereby abrogating this function to an inwardly oriented group of civil servants who cannot be fired. By contrast, it requires the agency to go out on the private market for its research, doing it by contract in a broad fashion so that the best American minds can be brought to bear on this very important problem.

The third thing that the amendment does is to strip the administrator of the Agency of the responsibility to go to the international negotiating table as a negotiator. We already have people in the State Department hired and trained to go to do this work. It keeps him at the side of the table as an adviser, where he should be, and it keeps him as an administrator of an inquiring research agency, which he should be. It avoids the contingency of his taking positions off the cuff and shooting from the hip during negotiations, then having to distort the Agency's research function to support such hasty, illogical, and often mistaken and dangerous positions.

The fourth thing the amendment does is simply take the Agency outside of the influence of the State Department. In the future it would look for its support to the General Services agency rather than to the State Department. It would look for its housing to the General Services Administration rather than the State Department. It is an agency to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense and other agencies of the Government and should not, by any logic or reason, be smothered by the State Department as it is today. That is it.

I think that today the Disarmament Agency is a sick Agency with a dreary past and a dismal future unless we, the Congress, act to reform the charter under which it operates, and unless we do so reform it I see no reason for spending public money to perpetuate it.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope that I shall not have to use all of my time. I think it is obvious that an amendment

of this import which changes many sections of the act and which comprises 10 pages and which is offered late in the day should have been considered in committee. The gentleman did introduce a bill which purported to do many of the things his amendment proposes to do, but he made no attempt, as far as I know, to come before the committee and propose this as an amendment when the committee was considering the bill. I think the House would be well advised not to go this far in changing this whole bill around, because after hearing the amendment read—and I think I am speaking truthfully when I say that not very many people in the House know what the amendment does. The author of the amendment talks about taking the matter out of the State Department and taking the director away from the negotiating table. The director is not at the negotiating table unless the President wants him to be there, and if he needed him there, I think he ought to have the opportunity to have him there. I think the House would be operating in the dark if it adopted this amendment, and I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to establish the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was before us in September 1961, it was the understanding of the gentleman from Texas and many others that the purpose of the act was to pull together into one office of Government activities that had been conducted, often independently, by a number of separate offices virtually since the end of World War II.

We had engaged, in those years since the end of World War II, in more than 70 conferences in which arms control and related matters were discussed. On some occasions, it was clear, we were not prepared properly to take part in these conferences. Overlapping research activities, failure to coordinate certain background studies, poor communication between agencies and departments—all these were difficulties that the Congress wanted straightened out by putting arms control study and informational work under one agency.

At the time the 1961 legislation was enacted I had strong reservations about the proposed name of the Agency. While realizing that the name was designed to serve our propaganda interests, it was as clear then as it is now that disarmament in this divided world is for the foreseeable future an impossible dream. We have no alternative but to remain militarily powerful. As President Kennedy declared in this Chamber in his state of the Union address on January 14 of this year:

Until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms near.

It was my feeling 2 years ago that although we in the Congress, having

given careful and thorough study to the matter and having amended the bill to provide maximum protection against unilateral disarmament, understood the objectives of the new Agency, the American public generally might be led to misconstrue its purposes. I crossed my fingers in hopes that the true purpose of the agency would be clear to all. Unfortunately this was not the case. The very fact that the Agency was termed the "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" led a number of well-meaning citizens to believe, in error, that the purpose of the Agency was to provide for our unilateral disarmament, to strip us of our defenses in the face of a continued and aggressive worldwide threat from the forces of international communism.

The confusion resulting from well-intentioned misunderstanding was then compounded by certain persons who seem to be bent more on downgrading their own Government than in facing constructively the problems with which it must deal.

Many of the Members are aware of the attacks that have been made on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and on the Congress for providing for its establishment—in the months since Public Law 87-297 was enacted. So virulent had some of these attacks become that elements of the press which most usually criticize American involvement in international activities felt some responsibility to set the matter straight for their readers. The publication *National Review*, while supporting the repeal of Public Law 87-297, told its readers in the June 18 issue that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is not "engaged in the business of selling out U.S. sovereignty, nor has it treaty power, nor the power to effect U.S. disarmament." The *National Review* article concluded:

When disarmament comes, it will be important enough to be transacted by the conventional agencies of Government; e.g., the President and the Houses of Congress.

The American Legion magazine devoted much of its September issue to a lengthy explanation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the legislation which provided for its establishment. The article stated:

Thus the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is basically a study and informational body. It could not take over operation of American disarmament programs until they were approved by the entire Government, which we shall see includes both executive and legislative branches. Whatever danger of that exists, the law in question does not permit it.

And the article concluded:

In short, the responsibility for the defense of the United States and the exercise of power either to assure or to undo our security rests today exactly where it did before the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was adopted in 1961. There may be dangers in what people acting in the name of the Agency propose. Their proposals will bear watching. But the circulation of groundless rumors about that Agency and about the law under which it operates does no good. It could have the dangerous result, for our national safety, of causing objective spokesmen for adequate defense to be tarred with

the same brush as the spreaders of wild tales. That could be a disaster.

So concluded the American Legion magazine article.

Because of the widespread misunderstanding about the Agency and its functions, I am glad the Committee on Foreign Affairs saw fit to amend the bill before us to make clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has absolutely no jurisdiction over the possession or use of firearms by individuals. I am glad also that the committee amended section 3 of the bill so as to retain the provision contained in section 33 of existing law, to wit:

That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

This language was written into the original act by amendment of the entire House of Representatives. I am pleased that I had a part in helping to draft the amendment and in helping to secure its passage to the original bill. It is my conviction that the language be preserved in any new legislation, and it must be made crystal clear that it is the intention of the Congress that further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States is an absolute condition precedent to any attempt or action to disarm this Nation or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States. I also approve of the wording in section 4, amending section 49 of the act, by adding a requirement that "none of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for the dissemination within the United States of propaganda in support of any pending legislation concerning the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

As the Committee on Foreign Affairs stated in its report on the bill now before us:

The basic job of the Agency is to provide the backup support essential to the conduct of the highly complex and technical disarmament negotiations in which the United States has participated since the Agency opened its doors.

It is my considered opinion that the amount of funds recommended by the committee for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 is unjustifiably excessive and far beyond any needs for carrying out the primary purpose of the act in the first instance.

I must say to my colleagues that I cannot support an authorization of this magnitude. In my opinion these amounts would be much better spent for arms increases than for the purposes associated with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Nothing has occurred to convince me that we are any closer today than we were 2 years ago to an agreement permitting any reduction in our Armed Forces. In the absence of any real easing of international tensions or lessening of the danger to our security, I can see no need to step up the pace of research into matters involving arms

control. Perhaps someday the world will see the opportunity for real progress in the field of disarmament. That day is not now in sight. Until it is, it is my conviction that study and informational activities in the area of arms control and disarmament should be continued at no more than minimal level—and every effort must be made to maintain the United States as the best defended, best armed nation in the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to the bill which created this Agency in September 1961, and I am even more opposed to it today. The people who man this Agency cannot be trusted in their judgment. They have an unreal outlook on world communism and are deluding our people. It is elementary to say that the only way one can make peace and disarmament look plausible is to paint an untrue and unreal picture of our enemies, the Soviet Union and the Communist tyrants. This is exactly what this Agency is doing.

The Washington Evening Star, of June 12, 1963, gives a good indication of this approach. William C. Foster, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, talking about the test ban, was quoted as follows:

Mr. Foster believes the Russians sincerely want to end nuclear testing.

"They are logical people," he said. "They know the risks of continued testing. They know testing is expensive."

Mr. Foster has further said that he believes the Communists will keep their word on the test ban. A man with judgment such as this should not be allowed to remain in office let alone get more money and authority to promote these ideas.

In their annual report, the Disarmament Agency included several studies which it would like to pass off as not containing their real views. I disagree. I feel that the reports well present the obvious views of this Agency and they should be studied carefully. Note this quote from the appendix of the report:

Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200 million odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918.

Note further this statement from the study "Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World," which was also included in the report this Agency submitted in April of this year:

In addition, to avoid making martyrs of the individuals controlled and thus prevent a surge of national anger against the international police force, the force would be wise to avoid the use of violence against persons wherever possible and to restrict its acts against property to the minimum necessary. Thus weapons that temporarily disorient or incapacitate the victim without killing (like tear gas or vomiting gas, or perhaps newer substances like tranquilizers, hallucinogens, etc.) would be preferable at

the first response level of enforcement. Thus also, arrest and imprisonment of violators might be avoided as long as it was possible to end the violation without removing or punishing the violator. And where possible, the destruction or removal of machinery crucial to continuation of the violation (such as critical missile components, rifle bolts, the electric powerlines to a tank factory, etc.) would be preferable to deliberately harming the violating persons.

This type of fuzzy thinking abounds along the New Frontier. The American people cannot trust their basic sovereignty to this Agency nor can it be secure in having men like Walt Whitman Rostow planning our destiny. Mr. Rostow's own words indicate his disposition on our American sovereignty. Writing in his book, "The United States in the World Arena," Rostow put it this way:

The nature of modern weapons in a context other than American monopoly is a danger to the national interest sufficiently grave to justify acceptance of important constraints on the Nation's sovereignty. Put another way, it is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined.

When I addressed this body on September 19, 1961, warning of the dangers in setting up this Agency I pointed out the direction in which we were heading. Two years later, sad to admit, these plans are fully operative. Recall these words with which I warned this body:

Another leading member of the Kennedy team recently stated that a U.S. plan for disarmament should contain the following elements:

1. Complete disarmament of all nations rather than reduction or limitation of armaments.
2. Permanent world police force under international authority to forestall or suppress any breach of disarmament or other violation of world law.
3. As a part of the disarmament treaty, a world law, in constitutional and statutory form applicable not only to nations but also to individuals whose activities endanger international peace.
4. World judicial tribunals to interpret and apply this world law.
5. Extensive revision of the United Nations Charter which would include—
 - (a) Universal membership in the world organization.
 - (b) Revision of voting procedures to assure larger and more powerful nations having equitable voice and vote in one General Assembly with no veto.
 - (c) One development authority to administer economic and social council among underdeveloped nations of the world.
 - (d) Executives elected to this Assembly holding much the same relationship to the Assembly as the British Cabinet does to the House of Commons.
 - (e) Its own revenue system for the world organization to provide operating budgets to sustain the world police force, for the annual cost of operating the limited world organization outlined above, and for proposed development authority.

Now, just how stupid can we get? The first premise is fallacious—that we can get all nations to disarm. Russia does not have any intention to disarm and we should not

believe this traitor nation if the Reds would say they were willing. Their plan has not changed from communism's inception—eventual subjugation of the world and the establishment of their brand of freedom and workers' paradise. In the first place, they will not disarm because it does not suit their objectives—objectives which those who are supporting this bill either fail to see or do not want to see. Secondly, how can you consider their disarmament while the uneasy tyrant over 800 million oppressed, captured people? The entire record of the Communists is one of lies, deceit, murder, and treachery which makes this gesture verge on the ridiculous. The real danger comes from the strong likelihood that we are foolish enough to proceed with a plan of the type described without Russian participation or based on their fraudulent promises.

I repeat the last sentence:

The real danger comes from the strong likelihood that we are foolish enough to proceed with a plan of the type described without Russian participation or based on their fraudulent promises.

I was wrong on one score—we are doing both. The evidence presented here today fully justifies this charge and gives great cause for alarm. We are witnessing the unilateral disarmament of this country at the same time we are signing treaties based on the assumption that their word, bloodstained and tarnished as it has been, for some reason is now good and dependable.

I believe that we should not only defeat this bill but, for the good of this Nation and the whole world, scuttle this unfortunate Agency which, operating under the aura of State Department policy, is placing our American interest last and jeopardizing our security in today's troubled world.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, as to the merit of this program I have been greatly disappointed that more study has not been given to the economic impact of reducing military expenditures. Frankly, for years I have urged establishment of a program looking toward private industry meeting the economic impact of disarmament. My idea is to prevent Federal controls in such an emergency by having defense contracts prepared in advance to adjust to a cut in military spending.

As I am informed, three studies of the domestic impact of changes in defense spending are contemplated with fiscal year 1964 funds.

According to information given me these three studies will cost not to exceed \$475,000.

Under leave to include extraneous matter following my remarks I include a description of these three studies together with other details of the Agency's projected research programs:

1. A joint research effort with DOD to develop the means of measuring and defining the effects of defense expenditures on the economy and the impact of changes resulting from revised military programming, whether

or not attributable to arms control and disarmament. After consultation between DOD and ACDA it was decided to pool resources and effort in three related studies through the Bureau of the Census, the Institute for Defense Analysis, and Research Analysis Corporation.

2. A study of studies for the purpose of developing approaches to the more acute problems of regional economic adjustment to declines in local receipts from defense spending. The project will analyze the short-run and long-run income and employment problems which a community, metropolitan area, State or region significantly dependent on defense expenditures would face in the event of a decline either in the total national level of defense expenditures or in defense expenditures in the applicable area(s) under examination.

3. A study of the problems and opportunities of the electronics industry under conditions of reduced allocations of national resources to military needs. The study will examine the extent and nature of the dependence of the electronics industry upon demand arising from national defense requirements. It will attempt to identify the industry's output for major types of market (military, industrial, consumer space) and the employment generated by such output.

There has also been planned for fiscal year 1964 a study of the economic impact of specific arms control and disarmament measures in the U.S.S.R., with the purpose of evaluating the significance for the Soviet economy of the release of specific resources through disarmament measures. It is designed to give the United States valuable information for negotiation of these measures consistent with the dictates of our national security.

It may be, that instead of this study, increased emphasis will be placed in the current year on a study of the structure of Soviet industry with reference to the production of specified weapons. This latter study will be designed to provide both specific information useful in the design of an inspection system and an overall summary of resource use by which the economic impact of production controls can be judged. No meaningful estimate of cost is at present possible but it would bring the total cost of fiscal year 1964 economic impact studies to over half a million dollars.

ACDA has also been working with the Department of Defense in order to obtain an amendment of the armed services procurement regulations which would make conversion planning costs allowable as indirect costs under defense contracts with commercial organizations. This procedure should provide an inducement to industry to undertake conversion planning.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the recommendations made by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

That committee reviewed the Arms Control Agency's activities and research program in detail. It heard witnesses not only from the Arms Control Agency but also from the Department of Defense, the CIA, the AEC, NASA, and the public. The committee concluded that the Agency needed \$30 million for 2 years or an average of \$15 million per year. It has done a thorough and careful job. I think we should accept its recommendations.

Two years ago I urged that creation of this Agency because I felt a central agency was needed to assure that our negotiators at Geneva were thoroughly prepared.

Even arms control agreements such as the limited test ban can have a significant impact on the military balance of power, particularly if other countries cheat on the agreement. In the past, our Government and our negotiators have not always had adequate knowledge of the impact of their proposals and of the techniques for detecting cheating. It is this Agency's job to do just that.

Our Government cannot effectively participate in these discussions unless it is well prepared to answer Soviet arguments and to judge those proposals which could weaken our security and those which would strengthen it. A vast fund of technical information must be available to our negotiators if we are to participate intelligently at the conference table. The Arms Control Agency was created to consolidate and coordinate our research in this field so that this important objective could be realized.

As chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have watched the Arms Control Agency at work over the past 2 years. I have had no occasion to doubt the wisdom of my support for the Agency 2 years ago. I do not think it has yet fulfilled all the hopes we had for it, but it could not do that in 2 years. It needs to grow and to gain knowledge and experience.

That is why we are here today—to give it the wherewithal to grow and gain knowledge and experience. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish. The national security stakes are too high.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees, pursuant to House Resolution 558, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will read the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, S. 777, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 134, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—251

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adair | Gallagher | Morgan |
| Addabbo | Garmatz | Morris |
| Albert | Gary | Morrison |
| Arends | Gialmo | Morse |
| Ashley | Gibbons | Morton |
| Aspinall | Gilbert | Mosher |
| Ayres | Gill | Murphy, Ill. |
| Baldwin | Glenn | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Barrett | Gonzalez | Murray |
| Barry | Goodell | Nedzi |
| Bass | Grabowski | Nelsen |
| Bates | Gray | Nix |
| Beckworth | Green, Oreg. | Norblad |
| Beil | Green, Pa. | O'Brien, N.Y. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Griffin | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Blatnik | Griffiths | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Boggs | Grover | Olsen, Mont. |
| Boland | Gubser | Olsen, Minn. |
| Bolling | Hagan, Ga. | O'Neill |
| Bolton | Hagen, Calif. | Osmers |
| Frances P. Bolton | Halleck | Ostertag |
| Oliver P. Brademas | Halpern | Patman |
| Brooks | Hanna | Patten |
| Broomfield | Hansen | Pelly |
| Brown, Calif. | Hardy | Pepper |
| Burke | Harris | Perkins |
| Burkhalter | Hawkins | Pike |
| Byrne, Pa. | Hays | Pirnie |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Healey | Powell |
| Cahill | Hébert | Price |
| Cameron | Hechler | Pucinski |
| Cannon | Hemphill | Purcell |
| Carey | Hollfield | Quie |
| Chamberlain | Holland | Reid, N.Y. |
| Chief Clerk | Horton | Reifel |
| Clark | Ichord | Reuss |
| Cleveland | Joelson | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Cohelan | Johnson, Calif. | Riehlman |
| Conte | Johnson, Wis. | Rivers, Alaska |
| Cooley | Jones, Ala. | Robison |
| Corbett | Jones, Mo. | Rodino |
| Corman | Karsten | Rogers, Colo. |
| Curtin | Karth | Rogers, Fla. |
| Daddario | Kastenmeier | Rooney, Pa. |
| Daniels | Keith | Roosevelt |
| Davis, Ga. | Keogh | Rosenthal |
| Davis, Tenn. | King, Calif. | Rostenkowski |
| Dawson | Kirwan | Roush |
| Delaney | Kluczynski | Roybal |
| Dent | Kornegay | Ryan, Mich. |
| Denton | Kunkel | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Diggs | Laird | St Germain |
| Donohue | Langen | Schenck |
| Downing | Lankford | Schneebeli |
| Dwyer | Leggett | Schweiker |
| Edmondson | Lesinski | Schwengel |
| Edwards | Libonati | Secrest |
| Elliott | Lindsay | Sheppard |
| Ellsworth | Long, Md. | Shipley |
| Everett | McCulloch | Sibal |
| Evins | McDade | Sickles |
| Fallon | McDowell | Sisk |
| Farbstein | McFall | Slack |
| Fascell | McIntire | Smith, Iowa |
| Feighan | Macdonald | Smith, Va. |
| Finnegan | MacGregor | Springer |
| Fino | Martin, Mass. | Staeble |
| Flood | Mathias | Stafford |
| Fogarty | Matsunaga | Staggers |
| Ford | Matthews | Stratton |
| Fountain | May | Stubblefield |
| Fraser | Miller, Calif. | Sullivan |
| Frelinghuysen | Mills | Taft |
| Friedel | Minish | Taylor |
| Fulton, Pa. | Monagan | Thomas |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Montoya | Thompson, La. |
| | Moore | Thompson, N.J. |
| | Moorhead | Thompson, Tex. |

Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik

Vinson
Wallhauser
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis

Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Wylder
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—134

Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burlison
Burton
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtis
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Findley
Fisher
Flynt

Foreman
Fuqua
Gathings
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harrison
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClary
McLoskey
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Natcher
Passman
Pillion
Poff
Pool

Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Snyder
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Rains with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Randall.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT HOME BUYERS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

During the recent hearings by Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Small Business Committee on dual distribution, it has repeatedly come to the attention of the subcommittee that all too frequently the home buyer is confronted with defective equipment and other problems in his new home. Often because of divided responsibility, the home buyer is unable to obtain correction of these conditions.

There can be little question that FHA has been one of the most successful programs in the history of the Federal Government. It has enabled millions of Americans to obtain adequate housing on terms and conditions that were within their means.

However, it is equally clear that many home buyers purchasing under the terms of an FHA-insured mortgage believe that they are receiving protection which is, in truth, nonexistent. The term "FHA insured" unfortunately extends only to the mortgage itself, not to the premises covered by the mortgage. A family which purchases a home is usually making the largest single purchase of a lifetime. Many years of savings are included in the downpayment. This is, of course, followed by 20 to 30 years of monthly payments of principal and interest. These people are entitled to more protection than they are currently

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—47

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbt | Harsha | Philbin |
| Abele | Harvey, Ind. | Pilcher |
| Auchincloss | Henderson | Poage |
| Bonner | Jennings | Rains |
| Brotzman | Kee | Randall |
| Broyhill, Va. | Kelly | Roberts, Ala. |
| Buckley | Knox | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Casey | Lloyd | St. Onge |
| Celler | Long, La. | Senner |
| Cunningham | Madden | Shelley |
| Dague | Mailliard | Smith, Calif. |
| Derwinski | Meador | Teague, Calif. |
| Dingell | Milliken | Trimble |
| Duncan | Moss | Westland |
| Forrester | Multer | Younger |
| Harding | O'Brien, Ill. | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Casey against.
Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Harsha.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Harding with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Pilcher.

receiving in terms of correction of structural or other defects.

"FHA insured" is popularly understood and believed to mean that, since the home has been built to conform to FHA minimum standards and specifications, there is a guarantee that it will be properly and soundly constructed and that the equipment, wiring, and plumbing contained in it will function properly.

In a sense, to give the public less than this places the Federal Government in a situation of engaging in a practice which comes, to my mind, perilously close to what the Federal Trade Commission might well denominate a "deceptive practice," if it were carried on by a firm in the private sector of the economy.

I am proud to join with my able colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], and the 11 Members of the Senate who have joined with the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, the distinguished Senator from the State of Alaska, in introducing this proposal. Additionally, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, has introduced a similar bill, H.R. 8956. There are certain slight technical differences between these two bills, and the exact consequences of these differences upon the ultimate goals and objectives of the legislation are extremely difficult to determine. However, I have every confidence that they will be resolved to the ultimate good of the consuming public by the very capable members of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over these bills.

One of the most significant innovations of this administration has been the emphasis which it has placed on informing and protecting the consumer. This proposal carries out the spirit of that portion of the President's consumer message in which he cited the right of the consumer to be informed concerning the goods which he purchases. This proposal, if adopted, would give validity for the home buyers of our Nation to the long-used and misunderstood phrase, "FHA insured."

PROVIDE FOR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS FOR VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 3 OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act for the purpose of allowing private litigants to avail themselves of this provision of the law as a basis for treble damage actions.

During the 7 months of hearings which my Small Business Subcommittee has held on dual distribution, there have come before the subcommittee many instances where small businessmen have been seriously injured by the practices prohibited by section 3.

The provisions found in section 3 of the present act do to a degree act as a deterrent against sales at unreasonably low prices. However, allowing private litigants to file treble damage actions for such violations would make relief available to individuals injured much more promptly than is the case at the present time. Furthermore, it would enable smaller firms which have suffered economic distress as a result of illegal acts on the part of their suppliers to recover their losses.

The Congress should act to restore to the small businessmen of this Nation that protection which has been removed by judicial interpretation. There is neither logic nor justification for the present situation in which a law violator is or is not subject to liability for treble damages depending upon which section of the act he violates. Passage of this bill will be a step toward making the structure of our antitrust laws more adequate for its vital role in preserving competition within our economy.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not voting on rollcalls Nos. 202, 203, and 205. I was unavoidably absent. If present, I would have voted "yes" on all three questions.

MOHOLE PROJECT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a result of last week's further investigation by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Oceanography into the administration of the Mohole project, the multimillion-dollar program of drilling a hole into the core of the earth, I requested the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman ALTON LENNON, of our Subcommittee on Oceanography, to have the staff and counsel check into this matter further to determine the possibility of a conflict of interest involving the former AMSOC technical staff.

Chairman LENNON has informed me that he thought this matter should be looked into further, and that he has requested committee counsel and the committee's technical consultant to review the record and conduct further investigation into the background and surrounding facts and circumstances bearing on the Mohole project, and related matters.

I feel the Mohole project and the clouds of doubt surrounding its administration should be cleared up now, and if there has been any impropriety, then it should be brought to the attention of Congress and dealt with accordingly. The cost of government is high enough when its programs are properly administered, and to allow a possibly misman-

aged project to continue at added cost to our Government would be a gross injustice.

SPEED VERSUS JUDGMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislative process of this and recent Congresses has been dissected and put back together countless times by both the experienced and the casual observer. Constructive criticism is never out of place, but when the volume reaches such a level that inaccuracy and distortion become part and parcel with fact, those who would make a fair judgment are left with little or no perspective. As a contribution to the restoration of that perspective, may I recommend the editorial comment of the Wall Street Journal of November 18 titled, "Speed Versus Judgment."

SPEED VERSUS JUDGMENT

Just the other day Senator DODD made headlines with a blast at the Senate leadership for inaction on the long list of major legislation—civil rights, taxes, and foreign aid among others—still pending in Congress.

Though he apologized a few days later, his outburst reflected a widespread complaint against the congressional system. It's a complaint heard quite often from the executive branch; at his last press conference President Kennedy showed some disappointment that his legislative program is being held up in Congress. But it is also a complaint frequently made by others, including such critics within the Congress as Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, who thinks that legislatures at all levels are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process.

The substance of all these criticisms, both old and new, is the charge that the congressional system is just too slow and cumbersome for the challenges of the supersonic age.

Well, we've little doubt that Congress, like every other political institution, can stand improvement. Perhaps, as some say, there is a better basis than seniority for selecting committee chairmen, although no one has really thought of one. And we'd certainly agree that there seem to be more committees in Congress than are absolutely necessary.

But what most of these critics have in mind are not just some changes in the way Congress does things. Their real complaint is that the deliberative process itself is too time consuming.

The first thing to be said about this, it seems to us, is that congressional slowness is vastly exaggerated. When time is of the essence—as, for example, in a foreign crisis—Congress has proved again and again that it can act with dispatch. When it acts slowly it often does so by intent.

To be specific, in the present session Congress has been slow in acting upon such measures as the tax bill and civil rights legislation. Doubtless laws covering both matters would already be on the books if they could be put through a rubberstamp parliament.

But the tax bill, despite the extravagant claims being made for it, has raised much doubt in the minds of Congressmen already

concerned about the deficit principle involved. In the case of the civil rights bill, the proposal is a radical change in our methods of dealing with social problems, involving not only philosophical but also grave constitutional questions.

But in no such instance is the delay—if that is the word—the fault of congressional procedures. Nor is it caused just by the obstinacy of Congressmen. The people of the country, too, are divided on each of these questions, and the deliberative process in Congress simply reflects the deliberative debate going on within the country itself.

Moreover, in none of these instances will prolonged deliberation, though it seems excessive to the impatient, endanger the Republic. On the contrary, if we are to have such controversial legislation as the tax or civil rights bills, it is far better that they be exposed to extensive public debate.

For one reason, only in this way can what is finally decided represent a true consensus of the Nation's feelings. For another, only in the sifting process of debate, where both the virtues and defects of a proposal are examined, can the Nation be confident that what it does is wisely done. Though Senator CLARK and those who share his views would bypass all this deliberation in the name of speed, the verdict of history is that nations are not better governed by the wisdom of any one man, whoever he be.

Maybe Congress is sometimes slower than the critics like in approving some of their fancier legislation. But there are worse things than being slow. Like being in a hurry without really knowing enough about the road you're traveling.

BLANKET CENSURE OF CONGRESS FROM MANY QUARTERS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 months I have served here, Congress has come under heavy censure from many quarters. News stories continually raise questions of unethical conduct, conflicts of interest, and abuse of privileges. Cartoonists display the 88th Congress as slothful and totally heedless of national needs. Commentators point accusatory fingers, and psychologists speculate over our syndromes. And, most important of all, my constituents in Georgia ask me, "What's going on up there?"

As a first-term Congressman, it might be considered intemperate for me to speak about this condition. Yet the people are paying me the same salary as the senior Member of this House, and I take my responsibilities as seriously as any other Member.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of blanket indictments of Members of the Congress. I am weary of the all-inclusive accusation and the general condemnation.

Unfortunately, abuses by a very few Members reflect adversely upon each of us. Many careers of selfless dedication are buried in the welter of comment over a single act of impropriety.

I do not presume to speak for anyone other than myself. Yet, in my view, the duties of the office are too demanding to be evaded by junkets and personal pur-

suits. The opportunity, in the words of Webster, "to perform something worthy to be remembered" is too challenging to be squandered on ventures of personal gain.

There is much talk of late concerning the proposal that Members disclose their personal interests. I would be reluctant to require that other Members make public their incomes and holdings. However, there is no hesitance in making that disclosure for myself. There is not much to disclose. What small holdings my wife and I have are listed below:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Equity in my home in Atlanta, Ga. | \$5,000 |
| Equity in my residence in Bethesda, Md. | 5,000 |
| Patent | 300 |
| Savings accounts | 505 |
| Checking accounts | 560 |
| Cash value of life insurance | 3,000 |
| Two automobiles | 1,500 |
| Stocks, bonds, mortgages, notes, etc. | |

Unfortunately, there are also some liabilities, including a small remainder on my 1962 campaign debt.

Income in 1963, other than my congressional salary and rental from my home in Atlanta, is as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Royalties from my book, "Process and Service" | \$132 |
| Legal fee for drawing a will in 1962 | 50 |

Mr. Speaker, I consider my duties in Congress to be exclusive of and inconsistent with personal advantage or financial gain. I asked the people of my district to send me to Washington to work for them. I intend to do just that.

YEAR FOR A SHEVCHENKO FREEDOM STAMP—1964

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the ground-breaking ceremonies held in the city of Washington, D.C., on September 21, 1963, for the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko have led to widespread interest in the works and significance of this East European freedom fighter. Needless to say, this is all to the good, particularly as it concerns Shevchenko's universal stature as a poet of freedom and the powerful force of nationalism among the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

THE PRESIDENT AND SHEVCHENKO

The year 1964 will mark the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko. To prevent the Soviet Russian totalitarians and their puppets from stealing and exploiting Shevchenko to satisfy their own ends, the 86th Congress wisely authorized in 1960 the erection of a statue in honor of this poet of world freedom. On May 30, 1964, his statue will be unveiled in the Capital of both our Nation and the free world.

In addition to the Congress, President Kennedy praised the universal role of Shevchenko and the perpetuating scholarly works of the Shevchenko Scientific

Society. On March 25, 1961, the President declared:

I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

Only this past March the President had this to say about the world-renowned society that bears Shevchenko's name:

My congratulations on the 90th anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, and on your sustained program for support for distinguished scholarship. Among your members have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt. As you move into the decade which will culminate in your centennial, you have our best wishes and felicitations. May you continue to extend the frontiers of human knowledge in the years ahead.

A POET OF MANKIND

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks one of this city's newspapers has shown a complete lack of knowledge in its editorial comments on Shevchenko. If the editor of an opinion-forming organ is so ill informed, then we can well wonder about some others in our intellectual area. But this is all to the good because it indicates the work that still must be done to disseminate the truths about Shevchenko, Ukraine, the captive nations of Europe, and our allies behind the Iron Curtain in the cause of freedom. This evidence shows how important a Shevchenko stamp is to direct attention to these truths; such evidence in itself justifies a section designated as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in our Library of Congress.

At this point I wish to include the address of the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD which was delivered at the Taras Shevchenko Memorial ground-breaking ceremonies on September 21:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

I am honored by your invitation to participate in this ceremony at which the ground is being broken for the erection of a memorial to Taras Shevchenko.

Taras Shevchenko belongs in the first instance to the Ukrainian people. But in a larger sense, he belongs to all mankind. And this I think is the special meaning that succeeding generations will read into the existence of this monument to a Ukrainian poet in the heart of Washington, the acknowledged capital of the free world.

We honor Shevchenko as one of the great poets of all time, as a man who has justly been described as "the last bard and the first great poet of a great new Slavonic literature."

We honor him as a fighter for freedom and as a champion of all the persecuted and oppressed.

We honor him as a universal hero and as one of the towering moral personalities of all time.

The monument for which we are breaking ground today was authorized by a joint resolution of Congress passed on December 13, 1960. While I was only one of a very numerous majority in the Senate who voted for the measure, I am proud of the small contribution I was able to make toward its enactment.

Let me read to you the opening words of this resolution so that you may have a clearer understanding of the motivations

which inspired Congress to grant permission for the erection of the Shevchenko memorial:

"Whereas throughout Eastern Europe, in the last century and this, the name and works of Taras Shevchenko brilliantly reflected the aspirations of man for personal liberty and national independence; and

"Whereas Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land; and

"Whereas in many parts of the free world observances of the Shevchenko centennial will be held during 1961 in honor of this immortal champion of liberty; and

"Whereas in our moral capacity as free men in an independent nation it behooves us to symbolize tangibly the inseparable spiritual ties found in the writings of Shevchenko between our country and the 40 million Ukrainian nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any association or committee organized for such purpose within 2 years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution is hereby authorized to place on land owned by the United States in the District of Columbia a statue of the Ukrainian poet and national leader, Taras Shevchenko."

Shevchenko's life was in a way symbolic of the tragedy of the Ukrainian people. He died at the young age of 47; and of those 47 years, he was a serf for the first 24, a conscript in the Russian Army for the next 10 years, and under police supervision for the ensuing 3½ years. All told, therefore, he knew only 9 years of personal freedom.

Although the son of a serf, with little opportunity for formal education, his genius, his soaring spirit, and his unshatterable faith enabled him to take the Ukrainian language, rough-hewn as it was at that time, and convert it into a literary instrument as sensitive and as expressive as any of the great world languages.

Shevchenko had an ardent democratic and revolutionary faith. He called for an end to the degrading institution of serfdom. On the one hand, he appealed to the Ukrainian nobles to renounce their privileges and liberate their serfs; on the other hand he appealed to the peasants to renounce hatred and vengeance. His appeal was for a world of equality and brotherhood, and in his poem, "Epistle to My Country, Living, Dead, and Unborn," he voiced his appeal in these words:

"Brothers, embrace the feeblest among you,
That the mother may smile through her tears."

Shevchenko poured out his greatest passion, however, when he addressed himself to the theme of freedom and of his beloved Ukraine. Although the English translation loses much of the force and flavor of the original Ukrainian, I should like to quote to you a few lines from a song he wrote during his confinement in St. Petersburg:

"It makes no difference to me,
If I shall live or not in Ukraine—
No father will remind his son
Or say to him, Repeat one prayer,
One prayer for him; for our Ukraine
They tortured him in their foul lair.
It makes no difference to me,
If that son says a prayer or not.
It makes great difference to me
That evil folk and wicked men
Attack our Ukraine, once so free,
And rob and plunder it at will.
That makes great difference to me."

Shevchenko to his people was many things. He was a bard in the tradition of the Ukrainian kobzars, who chronicled the heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past. He was a national

poet in the unique sense in which Robert Burns is regarded as the national poet of the Scottish people. And, as a freedom fighter and prophet of liberty, Shevchenko was also regarded by his people with something of the special reverence that we in America reserve for Thomas Jefferson and George Washington.

Shevchenko was no narrow nationalist. He was concerned not only over the oppression of the Ukrainian people by Moscow but also over the oppression of the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Georgians, and the other ancient peoples who had been subjugated by an increasingly aggressive Russian imperialism.

He fought for the liberty of all men and the freedom of all nations.

In erecting a memorial to Taras Shevchenko we would be engaging in an action devoid of all meaning if we failed to speak about the plight of the Ukrainian people today and if we failed to honor his lifelong commitment to the freedom of his people by recommitting ourselves on this occasion to the goal for which Shevchenko sang and fought.

It is a great pity that there is no Taras Shevchenko today to write of the agony of his people in inspired verse, to appeal to the conscience of the world on their behalf, and to give once again to the cause of Ukrainian freedom the precious inspiration of the poet's song.

The history of the Ukrainian people has been one of brief but glorious periods of independence and of long centuries of struggle against the tyranny of Moscow, both under the czars and under the Soviets. The Ukrainian people through the centuries have had more than their share of suffering and tragedy. But the agony of the Ukrainian people under the rule of Soviet bolshevism in recent decades surpasses by far the agony they have known under previous despots and conquerors.

I propose to relate this story briefly, knowing that my prose is inadequate to a theme which would have challenged Shevchenko himself.

The chaos and disintegration that reigned in Russia during the latter part of World War I made possible the rebirth of an independent Ukraine, which called itself the Ukrainian National Republic. Because they sought their support, the Bolsheviks promised the right of self-determination to the subject nationalities of the old Russian empire. On December 17, 1917, almost immediately after they seized power, Lenin officially recognized the Ukraine as a sovereign and independent state. Let me quote the words of Lenin on this occasion because they constitute the first of a thousand major acts of perfidy the Soviets have perpetrated over the past four decades and a half.

"We, the Soviet of People's Commissars," said Lenin, "recognize the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to separate from Russia or to make an agreement with the Russian Republic for federative or other similar mutual relations between them. Everything that touches national rights and the national independence of the Ukrainian people, we, the Soviet of People's Commissars, accept clearly without limitations and unreservedly."

One year later, in December 1918, the Soviet presented the Ukrainian Government with an ultimatum; and when this ultimatum was rejected, the Red army swarmed across the boundaries of the Ukraine. The capital city of Kiev fell after a bloody struggle; and the Bolsheviks, when they entered the city, introduced a reign of indiscriminate terror, massacring thousands of innocent civilians on the street.

But this was only the beginning of the struggle. The battle between the people of the Ukraine and the Soviet military forces sawsawed back and forth for almost 2 years before the Ukrainian National Republic suc-

cumbed to the repeated onslaughts of the far more powerful Red army.

At this point the Ukrainian people entered upon the darkest and most agonizing period in their long and tragic history. The Ukrainians were not only the largest and strongest of all the so-called national minorities in the Soviet slave empire, but they were also the most stubborn and the most militant. Though thousands were executed and scores of thousands were deported, the spirit of Ukrainian independence refused to die.

The agony of the Ukrainian people under Soviet rule reached its zenith during the period of Stalin's forced collectivization. When it became evident that the Ukrainian peasants could not be induced to abandon their farms and enter the collectives by means of persuasion, Stalin decided to resort to organized starvation. In 1932, the entire grain reserve of the Ukraine as well as all other crops that might support the population were removed from the country by Red army convoys. In the mass famine that resulted, it is estimated that 6 million Ukrainians, men, women, and children, lost their lives. In the political terror that accompanied the famine, 80 percent of all the Ukrainian intellectuals were liquidated by the Soviet terror apparatus.

The Ukraine became a desert and a place of pestilence. There were many places where the entire population perished, so that there was no one to bury the dead.

There are those who say that the Soviet regime today is somehow more moderate than the Soviet regime under Stalin. To those who harbor such illusions, I would point to the fact that the project manager in charge of the forced starvation of the Ukrainian people and of the liquidation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, a man who will forever be identified by history as "the butcher of the Ukraine," was none other than Nikita Khrushchev, the present Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

But despite starvation and terror, the Ukrainian people remained stubborn and unyielding in their resistance. One wave of terror succeeded another—but still the Ukrainians persisted. During World War II, a mighty Ukrainian insurgent army rose up out of the soil of their tortured land, fighting with incredible heroism against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. For years after the close of World War II, the Ukrainian guerrilla army continued to harass the Bolsheviks and even to engage them in fixed battles.

For the Ukrainian people, the life and death struggle with Soviet imperialism has never ceased. Even in exile, the Soviet terror apparatus has pursued the leaders of the Ukrainian resistance movement. Their hired assassins have in recent years murdered Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera, as they murdered other Ukrainian leaders in exile after the close of World War I.

This is the story of the Ukrainian people's agony and of the unsurpassed heroism they have displayed in the fight for freedom. It is a story to inspire us all—and one which I am convinced will some day terminate in the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation in a world of free and independent nations.

It is a story particularly appropriate to tell at any ceremony commemorating the life and work of Taras Shevchenko.

Speaking at the funeral of Shevchenko in 1861, his contemporary, Kulish, ventured the prediction that "all that is really noble in the Ukraine will gather under the banner of Shevchenko." This prophecy has already been borne out. As they have gathered under the banner of Shevchenko in servitude and suffering, the Ukrainian people will, I am confident, still continue to gather under the banner unfurled for them by their immortal national poet when the light of freedom again shines upon them.

In again hailing the memory of Taras Shevchenko, I can think of no more fitting way of closing my remarks than by quoting a few lines from Shevchenko's prophetic verse.

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?
And receive him we will some day!"

I look forward to joining you again when this memorial to Taras Shevchenko, poet laureate of the Ukraine and one of Europe's great freedom fighters, is unveiled.

The full import of Senator Dodd's address is seen against a brief history of Ukraine. Such a background is provided by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an outstanding national organization of over 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. The Ukrainian Congress Committee is the parent organization of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America which was specifically established for the purpose of erecting the Shevchenko statue in Washington. A brief history of Ukraine follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF UKRAINE

Area: 289,000 square miles (larger than Poland and Yugoslavia combined).
Population: 45 million.

Location: Southwestern part of the U.S.S.R., bounded on the west by Hungary, Rumania, and Poland, on the east by the Don region, on the south by the Black Sea, on the north by Byelorussia, and on north-east by Russia.

Ukraine has had three periods of independence:

1. From the 9th century when its history began under the name "Rus" until the 13th century when the country was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tatar successors.

2. During the 17th century when the Ukrainian people overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tatars were defeated. This independence ended in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky made a treaty with Moscow, on condition that Moscow would guarantee the autocracy of Ukraine. Muscovite troops settled in Ukraine to protect Ukraine from the Poles but actually as occupation troops. During the occupation period the dream of an independent Ukraine was kept alive in literature. A leader in the revival of the spirit of Ukrainian national independence was Taras Shevchenko.

3. In March of 1917 the Ukrainians rose to freedom and established their own independent state by organizing the Ukrainian Central Rada, which became the nucleus of the Ukrainian sovereign state in modern times. On January 22, 1918, Ukraine declared its full independence and, as the Ukrainian National Republic, was recognized by a number of European states, including Soviet Russia. But immediately upon the recognition of Ukraine as an independent state of the Ukrainian people, the Soviet Government dispatched powerful armies against Ukraine, and after more than 3 years of valiant opposition of the Ukrainian nation, the Bolsheviks succeeded in destroying the Ukrainian National Government and its armies and imposing a puppet Communist regime upon the country. In 1923 Ukraine was made an unwilling member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But rule over foreign affairs and most domestic matters was taken over by the Soviet Government in Moscow, which was, in effect, the Government of Russia.

The original name of Ukraine was "Rus." The name of the lands ruled by Moscow had been known as the Grand Duchy of Moscow or Muscovy. Peter the Great, the Muscovite

empire builder, took over the name "Rus" and called his domain Russia. Ukrainians adopted the name Ukraine, whose origin derives from the Ukrainian word "kral," or country. Since the end of the 17th century Ukraine has been divided between Poland and Russia and later between Russia and Austria until the outbreak of World War I and the establishment of the free and independent state of the Ukrainian people in 1917.

At present Ukraine is nominally an independent state, known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and one of the 16 constituent republics of the U.S.S.R., and a charter member of the United Nations. But in reality Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia, with Ukrainians being the largest captive people behind the Iron Curtain in Europe.

UNITED STATES AND RECOGNITION OF UKRAINE

Mr. Speaker, the questions of "Why a stamp?" and "Why a Shevchenko Freedom Library?" receive further solid answers when one reads the theme developed by the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley at the recent Shevchenko groundbreaking ceremonies. To enlighten further some of our citizens, I submit Mr. Bentley's remarks on the "United States and Recognition of Ukraine," and also a brief biography of Taras Shevchenko, issued by the anti-Communist national American organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America:

UNITED STATES AND RECOGNITION OF UKRAINE

(Remarks by Hon. Alvin M. Bentley at groundbreaking ceremonies, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Shevchenko Statue site in Washington, D.C.)

Many people believe that U.S. foreign policy is solely the province of the executive branch of our Government and that Congress confines itself to voting appropriations and ratifying treaties. This is usually the case, but not always. There are occasions when Congress actively asserts leadership in the creation of foreign policy and the passage of Public Law 86-749 was one of these.

In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Taras Shevchenko for which we break ground today, Congress was not only paying tribute which was both well deserved and long overdue to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom. We are all familiar with the inspiration which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln and an admirer of George Washington, has given the people of his native Ukraine and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

But far more important from your standpoint, Congress in 1960, by the passage of Public Law 86-749, took the initiative in one phase of foreign policy by recognizing the independent existence of Ukraine as a separate entity, a separate people, a separate state. Congress stated and President Eisenhower, by his approval, ratified the recognition of Ukraine and its people as a separate, distinct being and demolished any confusion about Ukraine being a part of Russia except insofar as bondage has created a relationship. Whether the State Department cares to admit it or not, it is now a historic fact that in 1960 the U.S. Government officially recognized the existence of a Ukrainian nation by approving this tribute to the greatest of Ukrainian heroes.

Although many may not have recognized this fact, I did; and that is why I worked so hard for the passage of the bill. The Russians recognized it too, which explains the propaganda attacks on us for having passed this legislation. And I am certain that the people of Ukraine also recognize it and that

it will cause the flame of liberty and the desire for self-determination and freedom to burn even brighter in their hearts.

Continued acts of recognition by our Government will help to strengthen this desire for freedom. This is why the passage of House Joint Resolution 174, sponsored by Congressman DULSKI and providing for the issuance in 1964 of a Shevchenko champion of liberty commemorative stamp would be a further recognition of the independent status of Ukraine by the American Government and the American people.

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Taras Shevchenko (1814-61) was the greatest of Ukrainian poets.

Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile 3½ under Russian police supervision, and only 9 as a man free to come and go as he wished.

From 1840 on, his voice was raised in poetry for human liberty and against serfdom, for national independence of Ukraine and against czarist Russian imperialistic rule, for individualism and against tyranny. He loved his native Ukraine and regarded Russia as a foreign country and a rapacious empire.

During his free years Shevchenko fought for the rights of freedom for all mankind. He met and became friends with Ira Aldridge, a noted U.S. Negro actor who performed in Europe and in czarist Russia. Shevchenko's works have been translated into more than 40 languages.

CHRONOLOGY

In 1814: Born in Ukraine in serfdom (March 10).

In 1838: Freedom from serfdom bought for 2,500 rubles with the help of the painter Karl Bryulov. Shevchenko entered the Academy of Art in St. Petersburg.

In 1840: Published a volume of poems called "Kobzar." Kobzars are folk bards who keep alive the memory of heroic deeds of the Ukrainian past. This book immediately made him the first poet of Ukraine.

In 1841: Published "Haydamaky," his longest and greatest poem.

In 1845: Graduated from the Academy of Art as a free artist. Found a position in the Archeological Commission and settled in Kiev, Ukraine.

In 1846: Took part in the Society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, organized to propagandize against serfdom and to create a free union of all Slavic peoples under a republican form of government.

In 1847: Arrested by the czar's police and sentenced to serve in penal exile in the czarist imperial army "under the strictest supervision with the prohibition of writing and drawing."

In 1857: Pardoned by Czar Alexander II, but remained under police supervision to the end of his life.

In 1859: Visited Ukraine and freed his family from serfdom.

In 1861: March 9, died in St. Petersburg. (More details; see "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko," a documentary biography of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero, H. Doc. 445, 86th Cong., 2d sess.)

SHEVCHENKO'S UKRAINE AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

The statue of Shevchenko to be erected in Washington will symbolize an issue far greater than just a statue honoring an immortal figure. Our American tradition clearly rubbed off on Shevchenko and the Ukrainian nation, and it was a most unique historical phenomenon for Shevchenko to lean on our own George Washington. This vitally important aspect was vividly portrayed at the groundbreaking ceremonies by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University. At this point I wish to include his short address

on "Shevchenko's Ukraine and George Washington," and also a release by the two sponsoring organizations of the statue on the "Significance of the Memorial Statue to Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian Poet and National Hero":

SHEVCHENKO'S UKRAINE AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Opening remarks by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, at the ground-breaking ceremony, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Shevchenko site, Washington, D.C.)

Your Excellency, Most Reverend Archbishop Mstyslav, honorable Senators and Congressmen, Reverend Fathers, fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent, Ukrainian exiles, and distinguished guests:

We have gathered today, from near and far, in the Capital of the United States to break the ground for the monument of the Bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko.

In the dark ages of the Russian czars, in the year 1848, the famous Russian poet, Tyutchev, demanded as natural boundaries of the Russian empire the river and lands from the Nile to the Neva, from the Elbe to China, from the Volga to the Euphrates, from the Ganges to the Danube. He got an answer. Taras Shevchenko condemned Russian imperialism and proclaimed as an ideal for Ukraine, "the new and just law of George Washington."

Shevchenko believed in the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence, the ideals of freedom, human dignity, inalienable rights, and self-determination, not only for Ukraine but for the people of all Eastern Europe.

He fought and suffered for the freedom of all nations enslaved by Russian imperialism, from Finland to the Caucasus, from Poland to the Turkestan, including the oppressed Jews.

But all of us who came to honor Shevchenko cannot help but reflect on the present tyranny, as Shevchenko's American program for Eastern Europe still is not realized. Its final and complete realization is the only way to a true peace in the world.

We are deeply grateful to the American Nation and its Congress which unanimously passed the law calling for the erection of a monument to this fighter for Europe's freedom, in Washington, D.C., the Capital of the greatest democratic power in the world. We are equally grateful to the President of the United States of America and the U.S. Government for promptly endorsing the law.

We are grateful to all our distinguished guests and fellow Americans for coming today to witness the beginning of the construction of a permanent symbolic link of the city of George Washington with Shevchenko's Ukraine and the struggle for freedom of all captive nations, and I implore God Almighty to help us to realize it.

(In Ukrainian). Faithful to the Testimony of Shevchenko we gathered here today to start the construction of his monument—may the spirit of our Father bless our beginning. We remember and will never forget his call: "Fight and you will gain the victory, because you are backed by God, truth, glory and the holy liberty." (Continuing in English.) Now it gives me great pleasure to introduce our master of ceremonies for this historic event. He is a former captain in the U.S. Army, the supreme president of the Ukrainian National Association, executive vice president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and executive director, of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America: Mr. Joseph Lesawyer.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEMORIAL STATUE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, UKRAINIAN POET AND NATIONAL HERO

The United States and Soviet Russia are waging a serious tug of war over the memory

of a Ukrainian poet and national hero who died just over 100 years ago. He is Taras Shevchenko.

In Moscow and Kiev Communist propagandists have been working to prove to 45 million Ukrainians that Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet-hero of the 19th century, having been a leader in the fight against serfdom, was, thus, a Bolshevik who died before his time.

In Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, those who oppose the Muscovite tyranny emphasize that Shevchenko was a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny, and sought national Ukrainian independence from Russian rule.

Shevchenko expressed his yearning for Ukrainian independence and for the republican form of government of the United States, in these lines:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe
your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man!"

Shevchenko's stirring poetry fought the Russian czars who had enslaved Ukraine. He was a true revolutionary for human liberty who, were he alive today, would fight against the totalitarianism and the tyranny of the commissars of the Soviet Union as some poets in the U.S.S.R. are now doing.

ACTION OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko, the U.S. Congress held extensive hearings on Shevchenko's life and works. These concluded with the passage in 1960 of a bill authorizing the erection of a statue of the poet on public grounds in Washington, D.C., "without expense to the United States." President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the bill into law. Americans of Ukrainian descent have raised over one-fourth of a million dollars to cover the cost of erecting the statue of Shevchenko.

The Russian Communists and their lackeys in Ukraine have launched a wave of bitter attack against the memorial statue to be unveiled at 22d and P Streets NW, Washington, D.C., in May 1964, on the basis that it promotes the independence of Ukraine from Russian overlordship.

In the views of Dr. Lev Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Communists are fearful of the desire of many Ukrainians to gain independence from Moscow and dread the psychological and political impact of the publicity for Shevchenko arising from the groundbreaking and the unveiling of the memorial statue in the Capital of the United States.

In Dr. Dobriansky's words, "The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

The erection of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet and national hero, is an expression of American devotion to human liberty and national independence everywhere in the world.

BEYOND PAROCHIALISM

In conclusion, one of the most solid results of this entire Shevchenko project will be the eventual conquest by some of our citizens of their lingering parochialism concerning world figures and world freedom. Such parochialism is inexcusable in these grave days of the cold war and our struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. In this regard I append to my remarks an unpublished letter to the Washington Post, written by a former naval intelligence officer and careful analyst of the Soviet Union, Mr. Donald L. Miller, the

editor of Freedom's Facts, a publication of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
November 12, 1963.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: Your editorials on the Shevchenko memorial statue have raised an issue larger than any with which your editorials have dealt. What image of the United States do we wish to project to the world through the memorials we raise in our Nation's Capital?

Should it be an image of a provincial power with its eyes turned inward upon its own domestic affairs and its own heroes alone? Or, should it not be an image of world leadership ready and willing to support those of every nation who fight in a responsible way for human liberty and national independence?

Our fate is unavoidably intertwined with the fates of all other peoples. We can neither ignore the oppressions they suffer, nor their honest strivings for freedom and from tyranny.

It is in this context that the Shevchenko memorial will be raised on free soil in Washington, D.C., in May 1964. By honoring the ideals and goals of Shevchenko—who is well known to millions of peoples in Ukraine, East-Central Europe, Russia, and the United States—we tell the world that, as the foremost of the free nations, we are leaders in supporting and perpetuating the ideals of human liberty and national independence for all peoples everywhere. What more fitting expression could be found than a poet and artist who fought for freedom with implements of the mind and of the spirit rather than with the sword?

Is it this expression which you, an outstanding proponent of freedom for the press and editor of a major newspaper in a free nation, wish to silence with vague and unsupported charges? Rather, it would seem that someone on your staff has been misled into opposing what many peoples here and abroad clearly recognize as a dramatic expression of America's unshakable support for human liberty and national independence for all peoples.

Sincerely,

D. L. MILLER.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PROFESSOR BARGHOORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the strange case of Professor Barghoorn and his vague reports to the press concerning his recent detainment in Moscow have given rise to a great deal of speculation.

His first interview with the press, in New Haven, Conn., created the impression he was unwilling to criticize the Russians for his arrest and detention. This attitude of studied detachment from the real implications of his arrest and detention was accepted as the reaction of a scholar who was overly tired from his recent experiences.

But his State Department press conference in Washington yesterday, as reported by the press has increased the amount of speculation on this strange case. As a recognized leader of thought among the "Sovietologists" and "Kremlinologists," who exercise a heavy influence on our national policy toward the

threat of imperial Russia, it was expected that his story would provide sharp and penetrating analysis of his arrest and detention. But the disappointment which followed was exceeded only by the high expectation that he would at least charge the Russians with behavior unbecoming a civilized government and confirm his experience as normal Russian behavior toward all outsiders.

After hedging his Washington press conference answers with such qualifiers as "so far as I recall" and "I am not completely sure" he proceeded to present reasons why the Russian Government should not be judged harshly in his case. He maintained he was treated quite well within the framework of the "Soviet system," that he was not "physically molested," that while he did not sign a confession he did sign a "protocol" of his interrogation by the Russians, that his case might not be typical and accordingly he refused to charge the Russians with a frameup, that no general conclusions should be drawn from his case, and above all, his experience should not be allowed to interfere with a continuation of the Soviet-United States cultural exchange programs. This is indeed strange behavior for a man whose case provided such a public uproar in the United States that President Kennedy suspended negotiations with the Russians on cultural exchange programs and demanded his release by the Russians.

While all discerning people will detect Professor Barghoorn's overboard effort to maintain the image of a detached if not absent-minded professor, the absurdity of his press conference performance calls for a few pointed questions.

Since it is clear beyond any doubt that Professor Barghoorn was not involved in any intelligence activities for the United States, these questions are pertinent and demand forthright answers from the professor before he is allowed to depart the public arena into which he projected himself.

First. Why this studied effort to please the Russians?

Second. Is there a possible connection between this entire episode and the professor's forthcoming book, which suggests it should be read with prudence and forethought to detect the interjection of more Russian whitewash into the academic streams of American life?

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary which has been inquiring into the cultural exchange program will request Professor Barghoorn to appear as a witness.

MORE MANAGED NEWS?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the meanings we ascribe to words to some extent condition our views on important affairs

of the day. The history of the cold war, for instance, is partly a history of a battle over the meaning of words.

George Orwell called attention to the importance of managing words in his memorable book, "1984."

The highest form of managed news is managing the meaning of words.

The Richmond News Leader of November 2, 1963, carried the following editorial, which I quote at this point:

LIBERTY, REVISED

Two of the most interesting people in this Commonwealth, Capt. and Mrs. Robert W. Orrell, of Cardinal, publish an occasional bulletin known as Our Country. This is a literate, stoutly conservative bulletin, written and distributed as a labor of love and a work of patriotism.

In their current issue, Mrs. Orrell writes of some of the strange revisions that have been made in Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. She recently abandoned her dog-eared Fifth Collegiate, dating from 1936 to 1941, in favor of the new Seventh Collegiate. Some old truths, she discovered, have now been rewritten.

In the fifth edition (and in the Sixth Collegiate of 1949 also), liberty was defined in this fashion: "Individual liberty now generally involves freedom of the person in going and coming (personal liberty), equality before the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and freedom of conscience." The new Seventh Collegiate defines liberty as "the power to do as one pleases . . . the positive enjoyment of various social, political, or economic rights and privileges."

In the fifth edition (and also in the sixth), democracy was defined as a system of government in which the supreme power is "retained by the people." In the new seventh edition, the verb is subtly altered. Now democracy is a system of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. There is an enormous difference—the difference between owning property by inheritance and merely renting property by lease. How many students, we wonder, ever will pause to puzzle this out? How many will check back to see that once upon a time, in specific and unequivocal terms, liberty embraced "security of private property"? Now liberty, by Webster's definition, involves no more than "various rights and privileges."

In George Orwell's terrifying 1984, the masters of a totalitarian society see to it that all encyclopedias and reference works constantly are rewritten, so that every item inconsistent with the government's policy will be obliterated. The offending items then are dropped down the memory hole. There are times, when these little discoveries of changed definitions creep across the desk, that we suspect Mr. Orwell dated his society 20 years too far in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing suggests that the weather vane of semantics points foul weather. Here we find a strong suggestion that future generations will be conditioned through the changing of important political definitions.

EXTENSION OF FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOANS INTO AGRICULTURAL AREAS SUFFERING FROM ECONOMIC DISASTERS

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced to the House of Representatives a bill that would extend Farmers Home Administration loans into agricultural areas suffering from economic disasters.

Presently Farmers Home Administration loans are only available to meet credit needs arising as the result of a natural disaster—emergency loans for economic disaster are not presently authorized.

My legislation would, Mr. Speaker, amend present law to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans to relieve severe production losses encountered in a limited area by producers of specified commodities and producers suffering from an economic emergency.

LEGISLATION'S BACKGROUND

Economic disaster loans by the Farmers Home Administration were first authorized by Public Law 81-38, but the areas eligible for such loans were limited to those so declared to be disaster areas by the President under title 42, United States Code, section 1855 and the following.

Public Law 83-727 liberalized this loan authority by allowing emergency loans for any agricultural purpose, a broad definition which included economic disaster. Public Law 83-727 was temporary legislation and was periodically extended up to the time of enactment of the consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

In 1959, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, introduced H.R. 7628, which was known in the 86th Congress as the Allott-Cooley bill. Section 21(a) of that bill—as well as section 301(a) of H.R. 11761 of the clean bill which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] later introduced after the committee had considered H.R. 7628—contained permanent authority for economic disaster loans. H.R. 11761 was passed by the House of Representatives on June 2, 1960. The Senate, however, failed to act on the bill and it died in the 86th Congress.

The language of H.R. 7628 and the Allott-Cooley bill, H.R. 11761, provided as follows:

(2) That the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster or severe production loss.

During the 87th Congress the Allott-Cooley bill was revised by the new administration and included as title III of the omnibus Agricultural Act of 1961.

The Kennedy administration bill proposed permanent economic disaster authority. Section 321 of H.R. 6400, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] carried this language:

(2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster, severe production losses, or cultural economic conditions encountered in the area by the producers of specified agricultural commodities and products.

This language was included in the bill H.R. 8230, passed by the House of Rep-

representatives on July 27, 1961. The Senate version, S. 1643, carried only authority for natural disaster loans. For the conference the House receded to the Senate on this provision and section 321(a) of Public Law 87-128, which is the present law, limited these emergency loans to natural disasters only.

Section 321(a) of Public Law 87-128 provides as follows:

(2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster.

WHAT THIS DOES

The language of my bill is identical to that requested by the Kennedy administration in 1961. It is similar in purpose to that of legislation requested by the Eisenhower administration in 1959 and 1960.

The provision which is the heart of my bill has passed the House of Representatives on two previous occasions—the Allott-Cooley bill in 1960 and as a part of H.R. 8230 in 1961.

In each of the previous instances, the Senate has refused to accept the proposal of the House of Representatives, a version which would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to make FHA economic disaster loans.

DANGEROUS DELUSION ON NATO

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary McNamara apparently is suffering under the dangerous delusion that the present NATO structure is strong and durable.

The fact is NATO is built on sand, and the sand shifts with each wind that blows. The free-world alliance is today weaker than at any time since World War II.

Mr. McNamara would be wise to concentrate on building solid unity in NATO, instead of emphasizing a detente with the Soviet Union.

I refer to Secretary McNamara's warning published today that the West should stop "deluding" itself with "obsolete images" that the United States has overwhelming nuclear power and Russia overwhelming armies.

Mr. McNamara's appraisal of the relative strength of NATO and Russia is grossly misleading. NATO today is a rapidly deteriorating paper alliance. Its military might is impressive only when the parts are added together, as they were by Mr. McNamara.

But the parts are not truly unified. They are united only on paper, and in a showdown each member of NATO—ourselves included—will follow the course of action which at the moment seems to be most expedient.

We cannot be certain, under the present NATO framework, that the 15 nations would act together if Khrushchev pushes the button. By contrast, Rus-

sian military forces are unified and disciplined under a single command which is not subject to veto or change at the local level.

In nuclear power, we cling to the ridiculous policy of secrecy in dealing with our NATO allies. We deny to the nations to whom we must look if a showdown comes the know-how and weapons which we know the enemy already possesses.

As a minimal first step toward strengthening NATO, we should abandon this obsolete policy and share weapons and know-how with our allies. Right this moment, without further delay, we should provide them with tactical nuclear weapons.

This action would give our allies assurance that at least some of our nuclear power would be at their command in case of trouble.

Under present circumstances, they may properly wonder if we actually would defend their cities with our nuclear power. After all, they can point with alarm and concern to our weak followthrough in Cuba and Berlin, our withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, and our avid promotion of a nuclear test ban agreement with Russia.

NATO nuclear power is actually U.S. nuclear power and our nonnuclear friends in NATO know it. The other 14 NATO nations have no way to commit or control any part of this nuclear power. We treat them as if they were irresponsible children.

They are at the mercy of our own uncertain national policy and to a lesser degree, we are at the mercy of theirs.

We should replace the shifting sand under NATO with a solid foundation that will stand the test of time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, November 19, I was unavoidably absent from the House at the time of rollcall No. 207 which was on the public works appropriation. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE IMPROPER USE OF CONGRESSIONAL STATIONERY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would prohibit the

improper use of congressional stationery. Recently there has been a great deal of discussion about so-called "conflict of interest" in regard to our public servants. However, there are instances when perhaps the service offered is not in the least improper, yet the means used, in the case of congressional stationery in particular, carries with it certain implication of influence which, in itself, can be improper.

It was recently brought to my attention that former Congressmen have sometimes offered their services to business firms in regard to their dealings with various Government departments and agencies and in doing so used their old official stationery which carries the letterhead of "Congress of the United States," "House of Representatives," or "Senate of the United States." It seems to me that this infers a possibility of influence which an ex-Congressman or Senator should not use.

Therefore, my bill prohibits the use of any envelope, letter paper, or other stationery printed with the name of the "Congress of the United States" or "Senate of the United States" in the solicitation of services for remuneration of any person in connection with any business with or claim against the Congress of the United States or any court, office, department, or agency of the United States. Violation of this would incur a fine of not more than \$500, or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

This bill may only be a small step, but it could be an important one for we must all be concerned with keeping the dignity and integrity of the Congress of the United States at a high level.

While this bill which I am introducing today is not a conflict-of-interest bill as such, I feel strongly that the Congress should face up to its responsibilities in this field and enact some meaningful legislation.

Last August I introduced a bill, House Resolution 498, which would set up a Committee on Standards in the House of Representatives. This committee would receive in confidence complete financial statements from every Member of Congress. If the committee determined that there might be a conflict of interest between the Member's public duties and his private interests, he would be called before the committee to make an explanation. If the committee thereafter found that the conflict had not been explained or resolved, it would make a report to the House containing such financial information about the Member as the committee found results in the conflict of interest. The report might include other information filed with the committee concerning the Member as the committee determined to be in the public interest. This information could be considered by the House in determining the qualifications of the Member to be seated.

A committee along the lines I have proposed would be an effective safeguard against conflict-of-interest problems, but the possible pressures and demagogic temptations of general public disclosure would largely be avoided. The Congress should study, and then act affirmatively on this legislation.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9140, 1964 PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the conservation and development of this Nation's natural resources is of the greatest importance to all citizens of the United States. I want to commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations for their diligence and laborious effort to bring H.R. 9140 up for our consideration in the House.

The Kansas programs which are included in this bill have evolved through a careful deliberative process starting at the local level, advancing to our Kansas State Water Resources Board, the Kansas Legislative Council, and the Governor, and finally into the legislative process here in Washington. In Kansas we have a deep interest, motivated by experience, to join hands with the Federal Government in the conservation and development of water resources and the planning of protection against disastrous floods.

The 1964 public works appropriations legislation includes \$3.8 million for continued construction of the Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas. This project is a joint development of the Bureau of Reclamation and the city of Wichita. The reservoir project, which is in my congressional district, was authorized by the 86th Congress and first construction funds were appropriated during the 87th Congress. Construction work is progressing and I have been pleased to learn that the costs are running somewhat less than first estimated.

The full realization of the Cheney division Wichita project is essential to the future economic development of the Wichita metropolitan area. It represents the key to the solution of a water shortage which extends over a decade.

This legislation also includes an appropriation of \$1 million for initiation of construction of the Marion Dam and Reservoir on the Cottonwood River by the Corps of Engineers. This project was authorized for construction by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950. Preconstruction planning for the Marion Reservoir was initiated in fiscal year 1960.

Orderly construction should continue on the Council Grove Reservoir and Dam with the appropriation of \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1964. Construction is underway and completion is scheduled in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 9140 because it represents a necessary and important investment in the development and conservation of natural resources throughout the Nation.

TFX INVESTIGATION

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Investigations Committee has started public hearings into the Government policy decision to award a \$6.5 billion TFX warplane contract to the General Dynamics Corp. when a competitor, Boeing Aircraft Co., placed a bid \$415 million lower. Secretary of Navy Fred Korth has already resigned under charges of conflict of interest concerning questionable use of his position to further his banking interests.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric is testifying before the congressional investigations committee. He was a partner in a New York law firm, prior to his Defense appointment, which is reported to have received in excess of a quarter of a million dollars in legal fees from General Dynamics, and Mr. Gilpatric was, I understand, in charge of this particular account. A partner of the law firm has been made a member of General Dynamics' board of directors.

Whether Mr. Gilpatric was involved in a conflict of interest regarding the TFX contract may be determined by the special Senate probe. However, both Gilpatric and Korth actively participated in the Defense Department's overruling the unanimous decision of the top leaders of the uniformed services that on the merits the award should go to Boeing.

The public is entitled to know all the facts regarding these conflict of interest charges. Members of Congress should focus attention on the decisionmaking process, itself, to consider what future legislation may be needed to improve policymaking in the Federal Government. I commend the Senate for its attempt to provide the American people with sufficient information in regard to this case and hope all Members will give their full attention to these important hearings.

OCCASION OF THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, November 18 marked the 45th anniversary of Latvian independence. It was on November 18, 1918, following the armistice of World War I, that the patriots of Latvia proclaimed their independence from Russia. For 22 years, Latvia flourished as a vigorous, independent nation, until it was once again overrun and suppressed by the Red army of the Soviet Union on June 17, 1940. Few people of the world experienced greater

brutality and oppression than the Latvians during World War II.

Despite the horror of those years and the Soviet oppression since that time, the people of Latvia have maintained their desire and longing for freedom and independence. More than 100,000 Latvians left their homeland during World War II to escape to the West. In the two decades since then, Latvians in our country and other nations of the world have continued to celebrate their national holiday of independence even though their brothers at home are no longer free to do so. It was my privilege to participate in these observances this year here in Washington.

Our country has never recognized the Soviet Union's subjugation of Latvia and its sister Baltic republics. We continue to recognize, instead, representatives of the last free governments of these Baltic states, and our Nation is dedicated to a policy of free elections for the people of the Baltic states to determine their own form of government. So long as these and other captive nations are held by Communist Russia against the will of the people, it will be impossible to achieve a lasting peace in Europe. Self-determination for all these captive nations must remain the policy of the United States.

We pledge our continued support for the freedom-loving people of Latvia. We admire their courage and dedication to their ideals, and we will continue to work for the extension of freedom and liberty to all the captive peoples.

THE FOREIGN AID CONTROVERSY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the November 13 issue of the Daily Signal, Huntington Park, Calif., carried an editorial entitled "The Foreign Aid Controversy." I wish to commend this thoroughly objective and dispassionate appraisal of this country's foreign aid effort to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial, I believe, accurately reflects the overwhelming sentiment among people of the 23d District of California. The editorial follows:

THE FOREIGN AID CONTROVERSY

Let's for the moment ignore the panic-button approach to the foreign aid program taken by the Kennedy administration and take instead a reasonable, realistic look at some of the things Congress has done to it.

Have the recent acts of the Senate (and the House) in paring about \$1 billion from the President's \$4.5 billion request really been so drastic? We think not.

We are convinced, as a matter of fact, that Congress has moved as it has as a direct result of the failure of the Kennedy administration—and those which have gone before it—to use the foreign aid program with even a reasonable degree of judiciousness.

For example, even the normally liberal Senators who are leading the fight for the

reductions cannot buy an administration recommendation to give Nasser of Egypt funds to support troops he refuses to withdraw from Yemen.

Neither can they agree to continue aid to Sukarno of Indonesia to finance his sworn aim of destroying the new state of Malaysia.

FRITTERED AWAY

And how can even the most foreign aid minded Senator bring himself to vote to continue aid to President Goulart of Brazil when he has done nothing to keep it from being frittered away in uncontrolled inflation.

We are told by the administration and its supporters that for less than 1 percent of our gross national product we are helping maintain 3.5 million allied soldiers at the periphery of communism at one-tenth the cost of a comparable American force.

But how many of these soldiers are in Communist-dominated Poland? In Yugoslavia? How have we hurt this phase of the program by paring our aid to these tools of the enemy?

There is no evidence that the countless millions of dollars we have poured into Poland and Yugoslavia have accomplished one whit insofar as gaining us the support of Premier Gomulka or President Tito.

NO OTHER CHOICE

We certainly do not advocate that our foreign aid program be terminated. It is time, however, that we stop pouring out dollars in the mistaken belief that the good they do is in direct ratio to the number dispensed.

If the executive branch of the Government, which rightly is charged with the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy, must persist in such an unrealistic approach there seems to be little for the legislative branch to do but to tighten the reins in the only method at its disposal—paring back on the funds.

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it highly important to call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives a statement by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a New York speech last Saturday night. Mr. Hoover said:

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

If their constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

Mr. Speaker, every day Members of the House are telling me their mail has increased to major proportions urging they sign Discharge Petition No. 3.

Some Members say they are receiving more mail now on this subject than on any other issue before the Congress. They wonder why.

They are receiving this mail, Mr. Speaker, because of the increasing efforts of millions—an overwhelming majority of the American people—who agree with Mr. Hoover and others that prayer and Bible reading must be returned to the public schools—that our public manifestations of our reliance upon Almighty God must be preserved.

Let me say that discharge petition No. 3 is at the halfway point. As of yesterday afternoon, it bore 108 signatures; 218 are required. The last week has seen a tremendous increase in the rate of signatures.

The American people are really getting busy—they are letting their Representatives know how they feel about prayer and Bible reading in public schools and the protection of the heretofore accepted public manifestations of our reliance upon Almighty God.

In this connection, I insert at this point a letter from an 87-year-old woman who has sent to me a petition signed by 250 of her neighbors—signatures she obtained by walking every step of the way. She is sorry, she says, she cannot drive, at her advanced age, because she would like to obtain more signatures.

The text of the letter, from Elizabeth G. Hardy, 6814 Westmoreland Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., follows:

TAKOMA PARK, MD.,
November 11, 1963.

Representative FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: When I took the enclosed petition around and heard some of the signers say that the only religious training they got when they were young was from their teachers at school, I felt grateful that I am still strong enough to do this. I do not drive a car. By God's help I have walked from door to door. I am 87 years old. I am afraid to go at night so I missed most of the men and women who work. I covered a small territory. I am sending 250 signers.

I found very few unwilling to sign—most seemed pleased to sign, considered it a privilege. Those who did not sign said they sent their children to their own church schools, mostly Catholic, some Adventists.

I feel sure that if each could speak for himself that an overwhelming majority would vote to put prayer and Bible reading back into our schools.

I do not believe that our Founding Fathers meant that there was to be no religion in the schools but that there was to be no established State faith, as is the case in England.

It seems to me a great shame on America that an atheist can get God out of our schools. We owe every blessing we have to God, even our breath. Why should it be so decided after all these years by the few men who are the Supreme Court?

I heard on a broadcast between a man and a Unitarian preacher that they were going to try to get "In God We Trust" off of our coins.

Will you please, please use all of your influence to get prayer and Bible reading back into our schools?

May God be with you,
ELIZABETH G. HARDY.

I have instructed my staff to forward her petition to her own Congressman.

GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may

extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a republic of sovereign states such as ours precedents are usually based on formal determinations set forth in constitutions and rules of order. On the other hand, the prestige of this Congress, and indeed of the Nation, draws to an astounding degree upon the traditions that tie us so closely with the great men who have preceded us along this historic trail. By these tokens, then, we have a right to conclude that government will remain sound and effective only so long as those who serve it are honest and dedicated to the highest calling of their profession.

Second only to this privilege of serving in the Congress of the United States is that which came to me some 40-odd years ago when I enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in World War I. In that short experience I became indoctrinated with the firm conviction that the U.S. Marines are the finest fighting men in the world and throughout the intervening years I have come to appreciate that this esprit and pride stem largely from the devoted service tendered by those who have led the corps as its Commandant. In the forefront of that small but select group of distinguished military leaders stands the incumbent Commandant, Gen. David M. Shoup, and all that I have said about tradition and honor undergirding the prestige of the Nation applies to the enduring contribution made by this heroic and dedicated public servant.

As a humble private first class it was always my lot to quake in the presence of newly minted lieutenants—to say nothing of generals, of whom the Marine Corps of my day had comparatively few. As a result it has been a heartwarming revelation to encounter in General Shoup a down-to-earth professional soldier who early in his career shed all of the pomp and pretense so often associated with high rank. In him we find a man's man, a Marine's marine, a strategist at the top of his profession, but whose formative years were those of a country boy like myself. Admittedly, these are attractive qualifications but what drew me closest to this great American is his deep religious faith and his infectious good humor. Salty of speech, surely, as befits someone engaged in the roughest business in the world, but with it all a gentleman of great kindness with a respect for the other fellow, be he a member of his command, a trusted ally, or an honorable foe.

If there is an accolade of higher priority than our Congressional Medal of Honor I have never heard of it and the impressive factor in the makeup of all those who have received this highest decoration is the matter-of-fact manner in which they went about the tasks that led to the citation for "bravery in the face of danger above and beyond the call of duty." Col. David M. Shoup leading his Marines ashore on Tarawa on that bloody day in November of 1943 had only two things in mind; namely, to dislodge a

tenacious enemy and in the process to conserve his beloved troops as much as possible. That he did both attests to his "selfless devotion to duty" and brought to a victorious conclusion one of the bloodiest amphibious battles in all of history. It also elevated his name to the highest level in our Nation's galaxy of heroes and enshrined his name in the hearts of a grateful Nation.

As one who has insisted, perhaps ad nauseam, on a sound fiscal policy and the conservation of our financial and economic resources, I must not overlook one quotation attributed to this forthright leader. Referring to fiscal matters he had this to say:

I have frequently pointed out our duty to get full value of every dollar we receive from the public. Use the dollar wisely—insure that every dollar does full duty.

There, I submit, is a statement of policy you would expect from a penny-pinching Hoosier and I can tell you that it elevates him to a special place of esteem in the hearts of the frugal Quakers and Pennsylvania Dutch I am privileged to represent.

General Shoup, we are better citizens today and we have a better appreciation of dedicated public service because of our brief association with you. It is our fondest hope that a way will be found whereby your exceptional talents may continue to be made available to a Nation you have already served with such distinction. But as a good friend deeply concerned for your welfare and happiness I hope that you and your beloved helpmate will find a bit of respite from official obligations in the more relaxed atmosphere of a well-earned retirement.

THE MAGNIFICENT MARINE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I addressed this chamber with more pride than I do today, as I rise to pay tribute to the 22d Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David Monroe Shoup.

David M. Shoup was born December 30, 1904. On December 31, 1963, just 59 years later, he will retire as one of the most illustrious and most heroic in a long line of great marines. What happened to this man, and how he affected military history in those short 59 years is phenomenal. A brief glimpse into the life of this man will tell us a great deal.

The date is November 20, 1943—just 20 years ago. The commanders in the Pacific have known for some time the direction the war must take if there is to be an American victory. It is decided that the capture of the Makin, Tarawa and Apamama Atolls in the Gilberts is absolutely necessary to capture the Marshalls which in turn was absolutely necessary to win the war. The men of the 2d U.S. Marine Division, who had been

at Guadalcanal and who were recuperating from their battles, were designated to take Tarawa, the center of Japanese strength.

On November 20 the marines landed at Tarawa commanded by David Shoup. By November 23 the U.S. Marines had added another chapter in their glorious record, and the Marines had their 25th Medal of Honor winner, David Shoup. In spite of a leg injury and severe shock received in the early stages of the landing, David Shoup kept his men rallied for more than 3 days of the most sanguinary fighting of the Pacific war.

Mr. Speaker, as a former marine raider, I know from personal experience that whenever marines and former marines gather, the job the men of the 2d Marine Division and their commander did at Tarawa is still recalled with awe and pride. This is but one brief chapter in the life of this fine man. He has excelled equally in every job he has undertaken.

It is with enormous pride that I join so many Americans in saying "Well done, General Shoup, and thank you." You have served yourself, your country, your corps and your family well. I know you will wear our pride and our respect for you as gracefully as you have worn the uniform of a U.S. Marine.

GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP—A TRIBUTE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in honoring General Shoup today. He has had a distinguished career in the Marine Corps spanning more than 37 years. During this period, he has compiled an outstanding record which resulted in his rise from the rank of second lieutenant to Commandant.

It is particularly appropriate that we honor General Shoup today, for it is the 20th anniversary of the Battle of Tarawa Atoll in which he won the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor.

Tarawa was heavily fortified. A Japanese admiral boasted that a million marines could not take the island in a hundred years.

The marines landed on November 20, 1943. The fighting was bloody and bitter. The outcome was in doubt when Colonel Shoup took command of the troops and by his individual gallantry led them to victory.

His citation reads in part:

Although severely shocked by an exploding shell soon after landing at the pier, and suffering from a serious, painful leg wound which had become infected, Colonel Shoup fearlessly exposed himself to the terrific relentless artillery, machinegun, and rifle fire from hostile shore emplacements and, rallying his hesitant troops by his own inspiring heroism, gallantly led them across the fringing reefs to charge the heavily fortified island and reinforced our hard-pressed, thinly held lines. Upon arrival at the shore, he assumed command of all landed troops and, working without rest under constant withering enemy

fire during the next 2 days conducted smashing attacks against unbelievably strong and fanatically defended Japanese positions despite innumerable obstacles and heavy casualties.

By his brilliant leadership, daring tactics, and selfless devotion to duty, Colonel Shoup was largely responsible for the final, decisive defeat of the enemy and his indomitable fighting spirit reflects great credit upon the U.S. naval service.

General Shoup also twice received the Legion of Merit with Combat "V" and two Purple Hearts for his efforts in the war.

After the war, General Shoup served in a number of administrative posts. His superior performance in these assignments led to his promotion to brigadier general in 1953.

I am proud to say that during 1958 and 1959, General Shoup commanded the unit in which I once served, the 3d Marine Division.

On August 14, 1959, President Eisenhower nominated General Shoup to be the 22d Commandant of the Marine Corps. He assumed this post on January 1, 1960.

During his tenure as Commandant, General Shoup has maintained the tradition of the Marines as the best trained and equipped fighting men in the Armed Forces. In addition, General Shoup has stressed the moral and ethical responsibility of each marine. He recognizes that the cold war is largely a struggle for men's minds. Accordingly, each marine, as an ambassador of the United States, must display truth, honor, and steadfastness to the principles of our democracy.

In one address, General Shoup stated the watchword of his term as Commandant:

Each of us should strive to make sure the Marine Corps will be better because we've been marines.

Throughout his career, General Shoup has dedicated himself to this goal. His words and deeds have been an example and an inspiration to every marine. He has made the motto of the corps, "Semper Paratus," his personal credo. Throughout his career, he has been "always faithful" to the highest ideals of the Marine Corps.

General Shoup will retire as Commandant next year, but President Kennedy has assured the Nation that General Shoup will continue to serve his country. In these perilous times, we need men with his character and ability. So today, while we congratulate General Shoup on a brilliant career in the Marine Corps, we look forward to his continuing service to the Nation in years ahead.

THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Trade is performing a

great and important public service in a nationwide advertising campaign in behalf of the American farmer and also in the interest of the consumers of farm commodities. I take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the Chicago Board of Trade upon the unselfish spirit which prompted this campaign to bring true and accurate information to the public concerning the importance of agriculture in the daily lives of all of our people. The very able president of the Chicago Board of Trade, Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, has on many occasions demonstrated his great interest in both the producers and consumers of our Nation. Certainly those of us who are intensely interested in the welfare of our farmers are grateful to Mr. Liebenow and his associates.

Advertisements which have appeared in the Washington Post and the Evening Star, in the Wall Street Journal, Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, and in other national newspapers and magazines are vital parts of a well-planned program. The advertisements contrast the efficiency of American agriculture with the weakness of Communist agriculture in both Russia and China, a most important factor in world affairs. They also prove that food is a bargain in America, due to the productivity of our farmers. In the advertisements other pertinent facts about farming are emphasized.

The board states that the advertisements are printed:

In the interest of a better understanding of the American farmer and his dynamic role in helping to provide an ever-increasing standard of living and in contributing importantly to our national security.

Here are two brief quotations from one of the recent advertisements:

Each Chinese farmer feeds himself and two other persons.

Each Russian farmer feeds himself and six other persons.

Each American farmer feeds himself and 29 other persons.

Over 7 million persons are employed directly in agriculture, more than the combined workers in the automobile industry, transportation, public utilities, and steel. Every year farmers spend more than \$40 billion to produce crops and livestock and to buy food, clothing, furniture, drugs, and other articles of everyday living.

The Kellogg Co. of Battle Creek, Mich., one of the leading food firms, also has had an advertising program of wide scope which has emphasized the relative cheapness of American food, with due credit given to our farmers. I think this progressive company is to be congratulated also.

For many years I have tried, and many others have tried, to impress upon the American people the amazing productivity of American agriculture and its significance in terms of national security and cheaper food. A lot of money has been spent on Federal farm programs but, all in all, they constitute one of our best investments. Unfortunately, attention, all too often, has been concentrated on controversies about phases of the programs, and on their cost without regard to the benefits. Consequently, many persons, and in particular city people,

have erroneous impressions about agriculture.

The board of trade and the Kellogg advertising programs will help in a badly needed campaign of public education. I am hopeful that other industries and firms will follow their example.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is testimony I presented today to the House District of Columbia Committee supporting home rule for Washington:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IN FAVOR OF H.R. 5794, NOVEMBER 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear today and testify in favor of my bill, H.R. 5794, which would provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia.

During the early days of our Republic there was never any question but that the residents of the District of Columbia, over which Congress—by constitutional mandate—was to have exclusive legislative jurisdiction, would at the same time have the right to elect a local government. It is clearly stated in the Federalist Papers, and I quote James Madison, in Federalist Paper No. 43:

"As the inhabitants will find sufficient inducements of interest to become willing parties at the cession; as they have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

The Founding Fathers assumed that no Congress would, under the Constitution, deny citizens living in the Federal district the ordinary and widely respected rights of self-government.

On April 3, 1963, President John F. Kennedy said, in transmitting his home rule message to the Congress:

"We should no longer delay in restoring to the people of the District of Columbia a fundamental right enjoyed as a matter of course by all other Americans—the right to self-government by the elective process."

Mr. Chairman, until 1875 no one seems to have questioned the right of the citizens of the District of Columbia to home rule. We talk a good deal about the fact that our Government is based upon consent; we are always reminding others that freedom is the right to choose. Yet, Mr. Chairman, we have denied the right to choose to a substantial number of our citizens living in the Nation's Capital City where everyone from everywhere can see them. They are not a small group of politically deprived individuals living in an obscure community somewhere deep in the recesses of one of our less populated regions. They are right here in the Capital of the world where the leadership in the struggle for freedom and democracy issues its decisions affecting all of the citizens of the world.

The political status of the residents of the District of Columbia has increasingly become an embarrassment to us. We must find

a means of granting to Washington's citizens the same rights enjoyed by all our other citizens.

I would like for a moment to speak of the constitutional issue which is so often raised by the opponents of home rule. The argument is that since Congress, under the Constitution, is to exercise exclusive legislative control over the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever, that the Congress therefore cannot delegate this authority.

Are we then to believe that each of those Congresses which sat between 1802 and 1875 violated the Constitution by permitting local self-government? Are we then to believe that this Congress is violating the Constitution?

For if the language in the Constitution means precisely what it says, then, indeed, we are in violation of the Constitution, since everything that the District Commissioners or that the Public Utilities Commission does, it does because Congress delegates to them the power to do it.

Ever since I came to Congress I have been an ardent supporter, and I might say in the forefront of the fight for, home rule in the District of Columbia. During the present Congress, I have introduced no less than five home rule bills—H.R. 501, H.R. 502, H.R. 503, H.R. 504, and H.R. 5794—about which I speak today. These bills contain the various proposals which have been urged for home rule in Washington. They vary in detail and include a varying number of rights to be delegated to Washingtonians, but they all adhere to the principle that American citizens have the right to local self-government.

I will support any one of these bills or any other proposal which will give the people of Washington a foot in the door. To use another old cliché "half a loaf is better than none."

I strongly urge that this committee report out to the House a bill returning to them their rights as American citizens at the earliest possible time. Thank you.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently on a trip to my district, I had the pleasure and opportunity to visit with a group representing the people-to-people programs of Cartagena, Colombia, and Coral Gables, Fla. This twin-city program, I am proud to say, was the first in the United States.

I was deeply impressed by the spirit and enthusiasm exhibited by the group and, in my estimation, no further proof is needed that the program is working in high gear. Each meeting brings better understanding, a broader base for communication, more interest in each other's lives, activities, and problems and an increasing desire to continue the close relationship.

The people-to-people program's primary purpose is to encourage private citizens to interest themselves in the problems of peoples throughout the world and to join in the mutual struggle against oppression, poverty, fear, and distrust by forming lasting bonds of friendship to further the social, economic, and cultural life.

The achievements of the Florida program are effectively summarized in the following résumé by Robert E. Kingsley, vice president of the civic committee of the people-to-people program for the Southeastern United States.

THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM IN SOUTH FLORIDA

From its initiation in this area some 5 years ago, the people-to-people program in south Florida has gained momentum in many constructive channels. Already Latin America-oriented by reason of being the virtual "Gateway of the Americas," our citizens have tended to undertake activities primarily in this hemisphere to promote mutual understanding and friendship and to render assistance at the community level, paralleling the broader efforts of their Government on an international scope.

By offering stimulation and guidance and by sharing experience, one community to another, there has been a steady growth in the people-to-people program which by the middle of this year had produced sister city relationships between 10 Florida communities and their Latin American counterparts, plus 4 more, established with cities in other parts of the free world.

The plan of operation is designed to draw citizens from all walks of life into active participation, creating a resource of varied civic, business and professional talents.

From the initial two-way visits between sister cities, there has developed a broad range of undertakings. In the field of education, Coral Gables supported the exchange of graduate fellowships between the Universities of Miami and Cartagena and for the summer, arranged 2-week exchanges of university students to provide a common ground upon which the young people of both communities might exchange ideas and viewpoints, learn to know each other and form lasting friendships based upon mutual trust and respect. Each community contributed to its sister hundreds of books on its history, culture, and way of life, for distribution to primary and secondary schools.

Cultural centers have been established and plazas have been dedicated in each community to its sister city. In the case of Coral Gables, its "Cartagena Plaza" utilized as motif a replica which it provided of the famous "Old Shoes" of Cartagena, made famous in a poem by one of its great writers.

The people-to-people committees of these two cities were instrumental in getting our State Department to create a binational cultural center in Cartagena.

The attribute of benevolence in people has expressed itself through sharing with the less fortunate such things as vehicles, wheelchairs, artificial limbs, crutches, food and clothing.

The typical social and professional groups existent in most communities have responded individually to this challenge to promote a better way of life for all through people-effort.

Medical doctors and groups of dentists have made trips to sister communities, offering instruction and demonstration of new methods and techniques, taking with them thousands of dollars worth of instruments, equipment, and medicines which they had procured for that purpose.

Sports clubs have arranged exchange visits of teams, Little League ball clubs and other popular events.

This great source, the productivity of people, has begun to be tapped. And throughout the development of the south Florida people-to-people program, valued and practical guidance and assistance have been forthcoming from the officers of our own governmental and civic entities such as Mark Bortman, chairman of the civic committee of the national people-to-people pro-

gram; the U.S. Information Agency's Office of Private Cooperation; the American Municipal Association; and our own legislative representatives.

Each community has received the dedicated energies, time and experience of its civic leaders, through whose unselfish devotion, with the support and participation of each member, these committees are responding constructively to the challenge of our President to show "what you can do for your country." The Florida communities which have established sister city relationships are: Clearwater, Coral Gables, Fort Lauderdale, Hialeah, Hollywood, Homestead, Miami, Miami Beach, Orlando, Pensacola, Royal Palm Beach, Sarasota, St. Petersburg and Tampa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for November 21 through December 2, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia, for Monday and Tuesday next, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, for 1 hour, on tomorrow November 21, on the matter of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENTON and to include an article.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD on S. 777.

Mr. CEDERBERG (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) during debate on S. 777 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. MONAGAN.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speak-

er's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to increase the amount available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for advances for planned public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1380. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an index to our reports issued to the Congress, its committees, and Members during the fiscal years 1956 through 1963, as the result of our audits of various activities conducted by the Department of Defense and its component services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1381. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1382. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1962 with respect to the Bradley Lake project, Alaska"; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 8971. A bill to amend Public Law 88-72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 569. Resolution for consideration of S. 254, an act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 912). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 570. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3742, a bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the transfer of producer rice acreage allotments; without amendment (Rept. No. 913). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7152. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States

to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 914). 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. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 9173. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9174. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of the annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 9175. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive full benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9176. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe contract violations which warrant termination of soil bank contracts and the authority of State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees to impose civil penalties required by section 123 of the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9177. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9178. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9179. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foot-hills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9180. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9181. A bill to establish penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9182. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 9183. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9184. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9186. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9187. A bill to prohibit the exportation of the flag of the United States in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9188. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9189. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 with respect to the procedure for amending orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAFIT:

H.R. 9190. A bill to prohibit certain improper uses of official stationery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9191. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9192. A bill to regulate the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia other than as an incident to the practice of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 9193. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9194. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9195. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 9196. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9197. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9198. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to pro-

hibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.J. Res. 806. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projection, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9199. A bill for the relief of CWO Stanley L. Harney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9200. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Uberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (by request):

H.R. 9201. A bill for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9202. A bill for the relief of Wlodzislaw Cielecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 9203. A bill for the relief of St. Anastasia's Church, Fort Pierce, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 9204. A bill for the relief of Miss Jessie E. Benton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9205. A bill for the relief of Lina Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9206. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Zeytinoglu, Zeynep Zeytinoglu, and Fusun Zeytinoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9207. A bill for the relief of Julio Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9208. A bill for the relief of Frances F. Kasmak, Madeline A. Young, and Mildred O. Sacharceski; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT (by request):

H.R. 9209. A bill to authorize Col. John F. Wadman, U.S. Air Force, retired, to accept the award of the Croix de Guerre with Palm, and to wear and display the insignia thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

459. By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of the Puerto Rican Political Women Association, Inc., on behalf of 144 individuals to increase the personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

460. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William E. Townsley, secretary, board of directors, Jefferson County Bar Association, Beaumont, Tex., relative to supporting proposed

increases in salaries for designated legislative, judicial, and executive officials as contained in the Udall-Broyhill bill now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives,

and urging favorable consideration of any legislation which would effectuate such salary increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Accomplishments of the ARA in the Evansville, Ind., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, if called upon to do so, I could fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in describing the accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Administration in my part of Indiana. I want to be brief, however, and point out only three of the many accomplishments this agency has made in my district.

The first thing that ought to be pointed out is the fact that the city of Evansville, one of the largest cities in the Nation to be placed on the ARA list of depressed areas, is no longer on that list. No one single factor is responsible exclusively for the radical improvement in Evansville's unemployment rate changing from more than 10 percent a few years ago to about 3 percent today. But the people of that city have given some of the credit to ARA. Listen to what the president of Evansville's Future, Inc., a nonprofit organization for community development wrote to ARA last July:

While we have undertaken the rehabilitation of our community in the spirit and determination of self-help, the assistance which we received from your Administration was important and vital to our progress.

The mayor of Evansville, Frank McDonald, in another statement, dated July 29, 1963, told ARA that his city is now on the road to real progress. He said:

However, this progress would not have been possible insofar as the construction of needed basic facilities, which in turn provided us the opportunity to gain new industry and new jobs, without the assistance of ARA, and your kind consideration.

From my direct association with the staff of ARA, I know that their first and foremost goal is to repeat the Evansville story. That is, to eliminate depressed areas from their list. I also know that in Evansville and elsewhere in my district, before ARA came into being, I found much unemployment. Seven of the eleven counties in my district were so-called distressed areas. Today, I find new hope, new determination, and positive action.

The families of New Providence, Ind., also know what I mean by these words. In April of last year, the Borden Cabinet Co., located at New Providence, was totally destroyed by a fire. That fire not only destroyed the physical plant of the building but it eliminated in one blow

nearly 200 jobs—virtually the entire employment of the town.

As a result of ARA action, however, the town immediately received a grant for a new water system which would help prevent recurrence of the great fire loss, and the company obtained a loan to rebuild the plant, thereby not only providing continued employment for the original workers but also adding an additional 45 new workers. And all of this was accomplished within 90 days after the disastrous April 6 fire.

This type of program kindled the adrenal glands of other communities in Clark County and today several other projects have been instituted. These additional job-creating enterprises have either been approved or are awaiting final action by the ARA at this time.

In another part of my district, in Corydon, in Harrison County, the citizens and the businessmen of that community saw the product of a persistent effort to make a vague industrial project into a concrete enterprise through the ARA's application of the advice and counsel of several Federal, State, and local agencies. After several weeks of analysis and recommendations about supply, market, and management organization, ARA was able to approve a loan application for the Indiana Glass Sand Corp., to develop deposits near Corydon at Elizabeth, Ind. Here is a perfect example of a community knowing for years that its area contained adequate sand deposits, but being unable to exploit the potential in its own backyard.

Without ARA's existence, no organized effort would have been made to initiate this project and to see it through all of the tedious, but necessary steps so often required in the field of economic development. Today, as a result of such persistent efforts by all concerned, Corydon now has a glass sand company directly employing about 30 people and a nucleus around which other plants needing this type of sand can be created.

Second Anniversary of Jacques Loewe Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to salute the Jacques Loewe Foundation in Brooklyn on the occasion of its second anniversary.

We are all mindful of the enormous role played in health care by large hospitals which not only care for patients, but also maintain extensive training and research facilities. While we must not underestimate the importance of these institutions, too often we tend to overlook the contributions of small, voluntary, neighborhood hospitals.

This month, the nonprofit hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation, Brooklyn, celebrates its second anniversary under the auspices of the Loewe Foundation, a distinguished medical research organization. Over the past 2 years, this fine hospital has served residents of the Flatbush section of the borough in truly admirable fashion.

The hospital has steadfastly adhered to its pledge to provide "round the clock" emergency medical service, for it is keenly aware of the fact that about 800,000 people live in the immediate service area of the hospital, but there are less than 1,000 care beds available to them.

Since it was acquired by the Loewe Foundation, the hospital, under the expert direction of Administrator Robert Forhman, has seen a steady upward climb in its census in almost every area of activity. In all its efforts the hospital has maintained the highest possible health standards.

In the coming year, a member of every second family in Brooklyn will be hospitalized because of injury or sickness. The hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation therefore recognizes the need to expand and modernize its facilities in order to better serve the community.

Mr. Forhman, an astute and knowledgeable administrator, firmly believes that a friendly, personal touch is as vital to a patient's recovery as any other therapy or medication. This approach has therefore characterized the efforts of the entire hospital staff, and, I believe, the institution is to be saluted on its second anniversary for the eminent place it has earned in Brooklyn's hospital community.

Copperhill is Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia is filing a suit before the U.S. Supreme Court making an unwarranted claim to Tennessee territory. I take this opportunity to put Tennessee on record as ready, willing, and able to maintain the right of our citizens to con-